

To the memory of my dear aunts:

Müzeyyen Sezal and Adile Ağare

STUDENTS' AND TEACHERS' ATTITUDES TOWARDS THE USE OF
COMPUTER-MEDIATED COMMUNICATION VOICE & TEXT CHAT AS AN
INSTRUCTIONAL RESOURCE TO IMPROVE SPEAKING SKILL

The Institute of Economics and Social Sciences

of

Bilkent University

by

MÜZEYYEN AYKAÇ

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

In

DEPARTMENT OF TEACHING ENGLISH AS A FOREIGN LANGUAGE
BILKENT UNIVERSITY
ANKARA

July 2005

ABSTRACT

STUDENTS' AND TEACHERS' ATTITUDES TOWARDS THE USE OF COMPUTER-MEDIATED COMMUNICATION VOICE & TEXT CHAT AS AN INSTRUCTIONAL RESOURCE TO IMPROVE SPEAKING SKILL

Aykaç, Müzeyyen

M.A., Department of Teaching English as a Foreign Language

Supervisor: Prof. Theodore S. Rodgers

Co- Supervisor: Dr. Bill Snyder

July 2005

This study explored teacher and student attitudes towards use of computer mediated communication (CMC) in support of teaching speaking skills. Data were collected through the questionnaires distributed to 20 Tourism students and 60 English instructors at Muğla University and through interviews conducted with 12 CMC-experienced international EFL instructors.

The questionnaire for students investigated students' feelings about the four L2 skills generally, their computer use and their opinions about use of voice-text chat for developing speaking skills. The questionnaire for Mugla English instructors aimed to discover their personal background, computer background, attitudes about use of communication technology for teaching L2 and potential problems that they foresaw in using voice & text chat in their EFL instruction. The interviews with CMC-experienced international EFL teachers aimed to explore international English instructors' perceptions about teaching speaking skills, use of voice chat as an

instructional source for speaking instruction, and instructional advantages and disadvantages of voice chat.

Findings gathered from students' questionnaires revealed that students perceived speaking as the most important skill but had problems with both speaking itself and classes in speaking. Both sets of EFL teachers and students were positive in support of use of CMC in support of speaking instruction, although teacher responses indicated anticipation of some problems – fit to the curriculum, computer access, finding appropriate international partners – in implementing classroom CMC. All respondents indicated the need for appropriate training and administrative support to make the implementation of voice and text chat successful in the Tourism Department at Muğla University.

Key terms: CMC, CALL, CLT, -CMC teachers, +CMC teachers, asynchronous communication, synchronous communication, Chat Group, Webheads and Tapped In

ÖZET

KONUŞMA YETİSİNİ GELİŞTİRMEK İÇİN İNTERNET ÜZERİNDEN YAPILAN SESLİ / YAZILI KONUŞMANIN EĞİTİM KAYNAĞI OLARAK KULLANIMINA KARŞI ÖĞRENCİ VE ÖĞRETMENLERİN TUTUMLARI

Müzeyyen Aykaç

Yüksek Lisans, Yabancı Dil Olarak İngilizce Öğretimi Bölümü

Tez Danışmanı: Prof. Theodore S. Rodgers

Ortak Tez Danışmanı: Dr. Bill Snyder

Temmuz 2005

Bu çalışma, öğrenci ve öğretmenlerin, yabancı dil öğretiminde özellikle konuşma yetisinin desteklenmesinde bilgisayar destekli iletişim ve bilgisayar destekli eğitime karşı olan tutumlarını araştırmıştır. Çalışma için gerekli olan bilgi, Muğla Üniversitesi'ndeki 20 Turizm öğrencisi ile 60 İngilizce öğretmenine dağıtılan iki farklı anket ve uluslararası arenadan bilgisayar destekli eğitimde tecrübeli 12 İngilizce öğretmeniyle yapılan mülakatlar yoluyla toplanmıştır.

Turizm öğrencilerine uygulanan anket genel olarak öğrencilerin dört dil yetisi konusundaki düşüncelerini, ama özellikle konuşma konusundaki düşüncelerini, bilgisayar kullanım bilgileri ve konuşma yetisini geliştirmek için İnternet üzerinden yapılan sesli-yazılı konuşmanın dil eğitiminde kullanılmasıyla ilgili fikirlerini öğrenmeyi amaçlamıştır.

Muğla Üniversitesinde çalışan İngilizce öğretmenlerine uygulanan anket ise öğretmenlerin kişisel bilgilerini, bilgisayar konusundaki bilgilerini ve ikinci dil

olarak İngilizce öğretiminde kullanılan iletişimsel teknoloji konusundaki tutumlarını ve Internet üzerinden yapılan sesli / yazılı konuşmayı, dil öğretiminde kullanırken karşılaşılabilecekleri olası problemleri öğrenmeyi amaçlamıştır.

Uluslar arası arenadan 12 İngilizce öğretmeniyle yapılan görüşmeler de, öğretmenlerin yabancı dil öğrencilerine, konuşma becerisini kazandırmada yaşadıkları problemlerle ilgili görüşleri, öğrencinin konuşma becerisini geliştirmek için Internet üzerinden yapılan sesli / yazılı konuşmanın dil eğitiminde kullanılmasına yönelik fikirleri ve Internet üzerinden yapılan sesli / yazılı konuşmanın dil öğretiminde kullanılmasına yönelik edindikleri olumlu ve olumsuz izlenimleri öğrenmeyi amaçlamıştır

Öğrencilerin anketinden toplanan bulguların sonuçları öğrencilerin konuşmayı en önemli yeti olarak algıladıklarını, fakat konuşmayla ve konuşma dersiyle ilgili problemleri olduğunu göstermiştir. Bulgular, Muğla Üniversitesindeki öğretmen ve Turizm bölümü öğrencilerinin dil öğretiminde, konuşma yetisini desteklemek için sesli / yazılı konuşmanın eğitim kaynağı olarak kullanımı konusunda olumlu düşündüklerini göstermiştir. Bununla birlikte, İngilizce öğretmenleri sesli konuşmayı dil öğretiminde kullanırken karşılaşılabilecekleri problemleri de - sesli konuşma için partner sınıf bulma, her iki sınıfın öğrenci sayılarını tutturma, sesli konuşma seanslarının ders programına uyarlanması gibi- belirtmişlerdir. Bulgular ayrıca, bütün öğretmenlerin, Muğla Üniversitesi Turizm bölümünde, sesli / yazılı Internet konuşmasının ders programına başarılı bir şekilde uyarlanması için, eğitim ihtiyacının ve yönetim desteğinin önemine işaret ettiğini de göstermektedir.

Anahtar kelimeler: CMC, CALL, CLT, -CMC öğretmenler,

+CMC öğretmenler, Eşzamanlı olmayan (asenkronize) iletişim, Eşzamanlı olan (senkronize) iletişim, Chat Groups, Webheads and Tapped In

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my gratitude to my long term life partner, Orhan Murat Erdoğan, who always encouraged me and gave me power to go on throughout this program.

I am grateful to my advisor, Prof. Theodore S. Rodgers, for his help throughout my study.

I would also like to thank all classmates, MA TEFL 2004-5 class, and especially my dorm mates whose friendship means a lot to me, for their endless friendship and support throughout the year.

My most special thanks is for my family. They were very understanding, encouraging and caring all the time.

Finally, I am grateful to my instructors, Susan Johnston and Michael Johnston for being motivating and patient throughout the program.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	iii
ÖZET.....	v
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	viii
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	ix
LIST OF TABLES.....	xiii
CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION.....	1
Introduction.....	1
Background of the Study.....	3
Statement of the Problem.....	6
Research Questions.....	8
Significance of the Problem.....	9
Definitions of Key Terms.....	9
Conclusion.....	11
CHAPTER II: LITERATURE REVIEW.....	12
Introduction.....	12
Teaching Speaking.....	14
Teaching Speaking within Communicative Language Teaching.....	18
Teaching Speaking within a Cooperative / Collaborative Language	
Learning Framework.....	21
Technology in Language Education.....	25

CMC Tools in Language Learning and Teaching.....	27
Limitations of CMC Tools.....	33
Attitudes of Students and Teachers towards the use of CMC in Language Learning.....	35
Student Attitude Studies.....	36
Teacher Attitude Studies.....	40
Conclusion.....	43
CHAPTER III: METHODOLOGY.....	45
Introduction.....	45
Participants.....	48
Students.....	49
Instructors.....	50
English Teachers.....	50
Internationally Experienced Chat-Using Teachers: ELT Webheads	51
Instruments.....	52
Questionnaire for the Tourism Students at Muğla University.....	52
Questionnaire for the English Instructors at Muğla University.....	53
Interview Questions for ELT Webheads.....	54
Data Collection Procedure.....	54
Data Analysis.....	55
Conclusion.....	56
CHAPTER IV: DATA ANALYSIS.....	57
Introduction.....	57
Data Analysis Procedure.....	58

Data Gathered From Students' Questionnaire.....	60
Students' Opinions about Their Language Skills.....	61
Students' Opinions about Speaking Skill in Language Learning...	64
Students' Computer Use and Attitudes towards the Use of CMC	
Voice / Text Chat.....	66
Data Gathered from Teachers' Questionnaire.....	68
Teachers' Computer Availability, Computer and Internet Use.....	69
Teachers' Attitudes towards the Use of CMC Voice / Text Chat....	72
Comparison of Data Gathered from Questionnaire of Students and	
Teachers for Computer Use and Attitudes towards CMC Voice /	
Text Chat.....	76
Data Gathered from Four Open-ended Questions (Muğla Teachers)	
and Interview Responses (ELT Webheads Teachers).....	79
Conclusion.....	95
CHAPTER V: CONCLUSION.....	96
Overview of the study.....	96
Discussion of the Results.....	98
Data Gathered from Students' Questionnaire.....	98
Data Gathered from Teachers' Questionnaire.....	101
Comparison of Data Gathered from Questionnaires of Students and	
Teachers for Computer Use and Attitudes towards CMC Voice / Text	
Chat.....	102
Data Gathered from Four Open-ended (Muğla Teachers) and	
Interview Responses (ELT Webheads Teachers).....	103

Pedagogical Implications.....	106
Limitations of the Study.....	108
Suggestions for Further Study.....	109
Conclusion.....	110
REFERENCE LIST.....	111
APPENDICES.....	
Appendix A: Students' Consent Form.....	119
Appendix B: Öğrenci Onay Formu.....	121
Appendix C: Students' Questionnaire.....	122
Appendix D: Öğrenci Anketi.....	125
Appendix E : Teachers' Questionnaire.....	129
Appendix F : Interview Questions.....	134
Appendix G: Interview Samples.....	135

LIST OF TABLES

Table		
1	Academic Status of Students.....	49
2	Departments of Students.....	49
3	Students' Studying Year of English.....	50
4	Teachers' Teaching Year of English.....	51
5	Teachers' Gender.....	51
6	Students' Opinions about Their Language Skills.....	61
7	Students' Opinions about Their English Classes.....	62
8	Language Skills to Be Improved according to the Students.....	62
9	Areas that Students Use English.....	63
10	Students' Opinions about Speaking Skill.....	65
11	Students' Major Computer Use.....	66
12	Students' Attitude towards the use of CMC voice / text chat.....	67
13	Computer Availability of Teachers at Muğla University.....	69
14	Personal and Professional Communication of Teachers at Muğla University.....	70
15	Purposes and Frequency of Computer Use of Teachers.....	71
16	Attitude of Teachers towards the Use of CMC voice chat in Language Instruction.....	73
17	Potential Problem Areas Foreseen by teachers at Muğla University....	75

18	Comparison of Computer Use and Attitudes towards the Use of CMC Voice Chat of Teachers and Students at Muğla university.....	78
19	Negative and Positive Aspects of CMC Voice Chat according to Teachers at Muğla University and ELT Webheads.....	82

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Introduction

The study investigates attitudes and perceptions about the use of computer-mediated communication in support of second language learning, especially in the speaking skills. The attitude studies involve three groups of respondents:

- a- students in EFL classes in Tourism department of Muğla University
- b- teachers of EFL at Muğla University, without experience in EFL instruction using computer-mediated communication(-CMC teachers)
- c- international teachers experienced in use of in EFL instruction using computer-mediated communication (+ CMC teachers).

The primary focus on communication in teaching speaking in a second language has brought a new communicative, authentic and interactive perspective to language education. This perspective is emerging with a shift from a highly structured, teacher-controlled environment to a student-centered and interactive environment. However, for many language teachers, it is still difficult to provide authentic, interactive opportunities for their students to improve their speaking ability, especially in an EFL classroom environment. Hence, technology is sought as a linking resource. Salaberry (1996) points out that computer-based communications, including Internet facilities, can offer language teachers effective tools to create learning environments that encourage purposeful interaction and communication among L2 learners, or between L2 learners and L2 teachers.

Different Internet technologies can strengthen learning of language skills (Warschauer, 2000). d'Eça (2003) suggests that synchronous communication tools such as voice / text based chat platforms are useful tools to improve the use of written and oral communications in an authentic way. L2 learners can meet with communicative international partners, such as native speakers or non-native speakers of English, other EFL learners, English instructors from around the world in authentic, real time, person to person or many to many communication. They can use their own voices and hear their partners' voices. Regarding my experience with my own students, I note that hearing others' voice while making conversation in L2 plays an important role in their motivation and development in oral communications inside and outside the class environment.

If computers are to be used in teaching language, it is advisable for both teachers and students to feel comfortable with the tool and its capacities that will be used in classroom activities. The technology needs to become a natural partner to be successful in curriculum integration of language teaching and computerized communication. Knowing students and teachers' perceptions about the use of computer-mediated communication may contribute to develop the successful integration of communication technology in schools and universities.

Studies including the effect of computer-based instruction on language skills, and students' and teachers' perceptions regarding learning and teaching with Internet-based activities have been on the increase (Salaberry, 2001). However, most of these studies have focused on the use of computer-mediated communication via e-mail or networking to enhance writing and reading skills. They sometimes give

information about students' and teachers' attitudes towards e-mail or networking in terms of developing these two skills (Stepp-Greany, 2002).

This study reports on a descriptive study of attitudes of students and teachers, who have no chat-experience, about the potential use of computer-mediated communication (via text & voice- based chat) as an instructional resource to facilitate their speaking ability. Additionally, it investigates Tourism students' perceptions at Muğla University about language skills in general, particularly speaking ability. The study also tries to explore some similarities and differences between student and teacher computer use and opinions of students and teachers towards the use of voice & text-based chat with intercultural partners in language instruction. Finally, it reports experienced chat-use teachers' perceptions in respect to advantages and disadvantages of using CMC tools, especially voice / text chat as an instructional language teaching resource.

Background of the Study

Language learners in a foreign language environment have difficulties, especially in the acquisition of speaking and listening, and in finding opportunities to practice these two skills in a meaningful way. Computer Mediated Communication (CMC) has recently emerged in the foreign language field as one of the more promising instrumentalities (associated with Computer Assisted Language Learning: CALL) to facilitate the acquisition and practice of language skills. CMC is defined as 'communication that takes place between human beings via the instrumentality of computers' (Herring, 1996). Computer Mediated Communication can be either asynchronous (e.g. electronic mail, bulletin boards, websites...) or synchronous (e.g. real time voice and text-based chat, video conferencing). The asynchronous nature of CMC does not require participants to be on-line at the same time, thus, it gives them

time to think about the issues that will be talked about or discussed, to check their ideas with other people and to shape their own thinking before expressing their thoughts in written form (Baym, 1998; Selinger, 1998). Synchronous CMC operates much as a telephone does. In voice or text-based chat and video-conferencing, communication occurs as participants interact simultaneously and in real time (Warschauer & Meskil, 2000).

The goal of giving EFL learners' communicative competence involving international, inter-personal intelligibility has been documented widely. Nonetheless, Cheon (2003) claims that the lack of interpersonal interaction in language classes means that such communicative competence often fails to develop. He adds that instructional interaction should require learners to negotiate meaning, with either native speakers or non-native speakers of the target language. Lee and VanPatten (1995) explain negotiation of meaning as "the act of people working together to understand each other. Techniques used are clarification checks, confirmation checks and comprehension checks". For language interaction, students need to get comprehensible input by negotiating meaning (Krashen, 1985), and they have to produce comprehensible output (Swain, 1985). Negotiation of meaning, as a particular way of interaction, enables L2 learners to make input meaningful and improve their own output (Cheon, 2003). Recent studies in the field of second language acquisition (SLA) indicate that on-line free-chat or task-oriented chat via the Internet helps learners to become more proficient in various aspects of oral skills (Chun, 1994; Kern, 1995; Negretti, 1999; Pelletier, 2000; Sotillo, 2000; Warschauer, 1996), and produce a greater quantity of discourse than in oral classroom practice (Kern, 1995; Ortega, 1997). Beauvois, 1995; Meunier, 1996; Warschauer, 1996 claim

that Internet technology provides both improvement of L2 learners' motivation for learning L2 as well as development of their L2 writing and speaking skills. Thus, technology and the Internet are pushing traditional teacher-centered instruction to evolve quickly.

In traditional classrooms, the students may be afraid to speak, may be too shy to speak individually in class with other speakers, or may not like participating in a particular speaking activity. Hence, they may feel demotivated and their attitudes towards speaking courses may become negative. CMC allows learners the opportunity to speak in the target language on topics of their choice without being graded by teachers and being made to speak face to face in front of friends. This is especially significant for second language learners who have little chance to find an authentic setting for L2 communication in their own countries (Warschauer, 1996). Warschauer (1999) also notes that learners have opportunities to use the second language outside the classroom environment by connecting to international partners via Internet at home. Tsui (2001) suggests that CMC, including text and voice chat, is a useful tool to create a community in which second language learners can share feelings, thoughts, and opinions with intercultural chat partners

Finally, communication with intercultural partners can be an effective way not only for students to practice required skills communicatively, but also can play an important role in positively influencing the student's attitudes towards the target language and culture. Warschauer (2000) explains that L2 learners can find partners individually, or teachers can provide partner chat as part of class instruction. A vital issue in setting up intercultural chat classes is locating appropriate collaborating

classes in which students' language levels and interests are similar. Teachers also need to clarify timing, topics, and number of students (Choi, 1999; Robb, 1996).

However, use of Internet-based activities in EFL environments turns critically on the positive or negative attitudes of students and teachers, and these play a central role in determining if these activities can be integrated into the school curriculum. Their positive attitudes towards voice / text-based chat activities may be the basic component of successfully integrating CMC tools into EFL classes. Perceptions of some chat-experienced EFL teachers from different countries will help students and teachers at Muğla University make best use of CMC capacities as well as cope with the future problems they may face in learning and teaching speaking through use of technology. For the purpose of this study, the researcher plans to explore all the issues mentioned above.

Statement of the Problem

Of the four language skills, teaching speaking poses different issues than do teaching writing, listening, and reading. Getting learners in an EFL environment to speak meaningfully in a foreign language is notoriously difficult. Speaking while being observed and evaluated is threatening to many, even in native language situations. L1 speaking shyness may add to L2 speaking anxiety. Self-consciousness about pronunciation, grammatical correctness, uncertainties as to appropriate styles, and lexical insufficiencies all inhibit fluent L2 speaking performance. Moreover, students may have specific needs and interests in terms of speaking in the target language. For example, students may need to talk socially to native speakers, they may need to discuss their studies in institutions where the target language is the medium of instruction, or they may need to use the target language for business or

professional purposes, such as doctors in towns or cities visited by foreign tourists, as engineers working with foreign colleagues, or as receptionists welcoming international tourists. They may require only a simple or casual use of the second language, for example as short-time tourists. These uncertainties add to the instructional challenges that speaking teachers face in determining the approach and activities essential to the development of oral skills in their students.

Innovations in educational technology enable teachers and students to facilitate teaching and learning speaking skills. Research studies have demonstrated the effectiveness of computer applications with Internet to improve L2 learners' proficiency in reading, writing and listening. Such classroom support has been determined over a decade of experience (Warschauer, 2000). However, little research has been carried out investigating development of L2 speaking by using CMC applications, such as video conferencing and voice chat, in an intercultural environment.

For students in the Tourism Department at Muğla University, speaking is considered one of the most important skills. The students are expected to speak English well while working in summer training jobs and in their future jobs as receptionists, tour guides, waiters or waitresses. Some students enter the Tourism Department after they have completed the preparatory school at Muğla University. Hence, they have general English knowledge to enable them to use English. However, they are often unwilling to participate in class speaking activities, even though Tourism students, in particular, are increasingly in need of oral English skills for their work in the international tourism sector. The reason for their unwillingness may be the result of fear of speaking in front of friends, negative attitudes towards activities used for developing oral skills, or perhaps their perceptions about their teachers' approach and instruction in the class environment.

Therefore, investigating Tourism students' attitudes towards the use of voice chat in developing their speaking skills may be seen as providing useful information about effective ways to decrease anxiety and increase fluency in speaking English.

While investigating students' attitudes, there may be a number of obstacles that hinder L2 teachers who intend to use CMC tools for improving students' language abilities. Teachers may be uncertain about the integration of new technologies in the existing class curricula, just as are L2 learners. Thus, we need to know what Muğla teachers' own perceptions are towards use of CMC tools. It is EFL teachers who have the central role in introducing these new teaching tools. It will be necessary to determine teachers' attitudes towards uses of computer technology and especially attitudes towards the use of voice chat activities with intercultural partners. As background, it is also necessary to determine teachers' and students' previous experience with personal and professional use of computers.

Insights from chat-experienced teachers will be useful for Muğla teachers considering CMC applications for Tourism students to improve their oral fluency. In order to gain these insights, the researcher will interview a group of international English instructors from an online Internet EFL community called Webheads.

Research Questions

- 1- What are the Tourism students' opinions about relative usefulness and difficulty of mastering of the four language skills, particularly speaking?
- 2- What are the Tourism students' attitudes towards possibilities for using CMC international voice / text chat partnerships for improving their speaking ability?

- 3- What are the attitudes of Muğla teachers (who have no chat experience in educational settings) towards the use of CMC international voice /text chat partnerships as instructional resources for developing their students' speaking ability?
- 4- What similarities and differences are there between the Tourism students' and Muğla teachers' computer use and their attitudes towards the use of CMC tools?
- 5- What are the experienced chat-using teachers' perceptions in respect to advantages and disadvantages of using CMC tools, especially as instructional language teaching resources?

Significance of the Problem

Because of the lack of research on speaking development by using voice and text-based chat CMC in the field of second language acquisition, the results of this study will contribute to the literature by investigating students' and teachers' attitudes towards use of voice chat for speaking development. It will also supply planning information as to how voice chat might best be integrated into the school curriculum as an instructional activity involving Tourism students and L2 instructors at Muğla University.

This study may be an example for other departments in which speaking is considered as a critical skill. Departments at Muğla University and in other universities in Turkey may consider design of their curricula to include voice chatting as an activity to promote authentic speaking interaction as an integral element in speaking courses.

Definitions of Key Terms

CMC:	Computer-mediated communication. In this study, use of computers with internet applications to facilitate language learning based on communication technology.
CALL:	Computer-assisted language learning. Any use of computers to facilitate language learning
CLT:	Communicative language teaching
-CMC teachers:	Inexperienced teachers in computer communication technology
+CMC teachers:	Experienced teachers in computer communication technology
Asynchronous CMC:	Communication that is not instantaneous via Internet
Synchronous CMC:	Communication that is instantaneous via Internet
Chat group	A group of people who engage in real-time talk via Internet according to their interests
Webheads:	Members of an online community of language teachers worldwide (Webheads in Action) who meet as a chat group.
Tappedin:	The online workplace of an international community of education professionals.K-12 teachers, librarians, administrators, and professional

development staff, as well as university faculty, students, and researchers gather to learn, collaborate, share, and support one another.

Conclusion

This chapter introduced the study by explaining its purpose and significance, and providing background information and explanation of the key terms. The second chapter is a review of the literature on teaching speaking and the role of speaking in a communicative and cooperative framework. This review also provides an overview of studies of students' attitudes and teachers' attitudes towards the use of CMC tools in language instruction. Finally, I review the nature of CMC tools, focusing on voice and text chat, and advantages and disadvantages of CMC use in LT settings. The third chapter presents information about the context of the study, the participants, instruments and procedures followed to compile data and analyze the data. Chapter four gives specific information about the data analysis and the results of the findings. The last chapter presents the discussion of the findings in respect to the research questions, pedagogical implications, limitations and suggestions for further research.

CHAPTER II: LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

The study investigates attitudes and perceptions about the use of computer-mediated communication in support of second language learning, especially in the speaking skills. The attitude studies involve three groups of respondents:

- a- students in EFL classes in Tourism Department of Muğla University
- b- teachers of EFL at Muğla University, without experience in EFL instruction using computer-mediated communication (-CMC teachers)
- c- International teachers experienced in use of in EFL instruction using computer-mediated communication (+ CMC teachers).

The results of the study will supply curriculum information as to whether and how voice chat might be integrated into the school curriculum as an instructional activity involving Tourism students and L2 instructors at Muğla University.

Over the course of the last few decades, the focus for teaching second language speaking has moved from a single person, one-way, staged lesson perspective to a more communicative, authentic, interactive perspective. Various instructional pursuits with these common goals have been grouped as Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) approaches (Richards & Rodgers, 2001). Many of the proponents of CLT searched for more authentic, interactive situations in

which students might participate, in support of the principles of CLT. One of these communicative approaches, Cooperative Language Learning, sought to link learners in partnerships or small groups with the goal of solving a problem or jointly exploring a topic of currency and interest (Richards & Rodgers, 2001).

In the professional language teaching community, there was also a growing awareness of the need to find authentic interactive opportunities for students working to improve their speaking and other language abilities, especially in EFL contexts. In EFL contexts, there are relatively few classroom opportunities for students to be involved in person to person, authentic, interactive, culturally rich communication requiring use of a second language. A very promising prospect supporting the CLT philosophy involved the use of telecommunications, especially computer-based telecommunications (or Computer-Mediated Communication – CMC) to link EFL language learners with collaborating partners from around the world in authentic, real time, person to person communication. A particular focus for such links was the idea of joining language learners from different international communities to work cooperatively on topical discussions, problem solving and project explorations as proposed in the communicative-cooperative approaches mentioned above.

Thus, the interactive-learner principles of Communicative Language Teaching, the instructional needs of international EFL students and the technologies of Computer Mediated Communication (CMC) seemed to represent a natural partnership. CMC, tailored to the communicative needs of EFL second language learning, appears to be gaining increasing international interest and support from language teachers and language learners. While emphasizing different facilities and benefits of using CMC in language teaching, attitudes of language learners and

teachers toward use of CMC within an educational environment are vital and often disregarded components of successful curriculum integration of CMC (Dooling, 2000). Much of the research done on integration of CMC or Internet facilities is related to pedagogical implications and the strengths and weaknesses of CMC to support these. However, it is the teachers' and students' beliefs about teaching and learning, and their understanding of changes ongoing in their school which determine whether the integration of Internet facilities in school programs will be successful (Egbert et al, 2002)

Since the study will focus on attitudes towards use of CMC tools for improving speaking skills, this chapter briefly reviews the evolution of the teaching of second language "speaking", the changing views of speaking instruction within communicative language teaching methodology, the emergence of cooperative language learning as an off-shoot of communicative language teaching philosophy, the changing roles of technology in support of language education and the emergence of computer mediated communication as a technological resource in support of communicative language teaching and international cooperative learning projects . Finally, previous studies of teacher and student attitudes towards the use of computers (esp. CMC as feature of second language learning) are reviewed.

Teaching Speaking

Speech is universal in the human species. It is the prime mode of human communication. Speaking implies an interactive process of structuring meaning that involves not only producing but receiving oral information (Florez, 1999). Particular talent in oral presentation is honored in all human societies and is often the mark of

leadership in these societies. Famous speeches and speakers become models for school instruction in the mother tongue.

Despite the primacy of speech in these various respects, speaking has, historically, not had a central role in study of a foreign language. Historically, foreign language teaching approaches have given primary importance to learning grammatical rules, description of sentence patterns, rote memorization of vocabulary, and translation of literary sources (Thanasoulas, 2002). Despite the significance given to oratory and debate in the mother tongue, little attention was paid to speaking in a second or foreign tongue. Well into the mid-twentieth century, language learning was broadly seen as a set of rules acquired by L2 learners for the sake of learning foreign language principles as these applied to written translation.

However, reactions to exclusive focus on grammar-translation as applied to written texts had emerged a century earlier. Increasing opportunities for communication among Europeans created a market for texts and instruction in foreign language oral communication. The Frenchman, F. Gouin (1831-1896) is often credited with creating a demand and a resource for study of speaking skills with the publication of the Gouin text series and the creation of the Gouin language schools. (Richards & Rodgers, 2001).

It was not really until the mid-1950s that oral skills became a prime focus for second language instruction with the ascendancy of audio-lingualism as the dominant method for second language teaching. Audio-lingualism was notable for offering a first “clear perspective on the teaching of oral skills.” (Bygate, 2001). It is interesting to note in the context of my own research, that audio-lingualism was able to attain its prominence with the huge support of technology. The technology was tape-

recording, which provided for the first time a medium that was “sufficiently cheap and practical to enable the wide-spread study of talk.” (Bygate 2001:14).

Other contemporary methodologies – Silent Way, Community Language Learning, Suggestopedia, etc. – also had oral communication as their primary focus. These approaches, like audio-lingualism, stressed native-like pronunciation, habit formation and memorization as their targets, with interaction in speaking being seen as a minor focus.

These teaching approaches saw the teacher as a language model and commander of classroom activities (Richards and Rodgers, 2001). Oral skills were practiced in the language lab that aimed to create error-free learners’ speech in order to reinforce correct habit formation. Ongoing error correction was the norm. Accuracy in spoken language was a sign of being proficient in target language.

In the 1970’s language teaching became influenced by cognitive and sociolinguistic theories of language and language learning. These put greater stress on meaning in language use, indicating that learners need to know how a message is expressed and understood, how to express themselves clearly and how to listen to what others are trying to communicate. They also need to understand how language is used in relation to the structure of society in which they use the target language (Riverse, 1983).

In light of these influences and a new attention to meeting L2 learners’ needs, language teaching turned its attention to communication involving the expression, interpretation, and negotiation of meaning in a given context (Lee and Van Patten, 1995). This attention became formalized under the title of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT). CLT “emphasizes speaking and listening in real settings”

and...”tends to encourage active learner involvement in a wide range of activities and tasks and strategies for communication.” (Warschauer, 2001: 217). In this period teaching speaking has gained increasing importance with the growing popularity of communicative approaches (Pica et al 1996).

Initial interpretations of a communicative approach put much emphasis on “communicative competence” as the goal and speaking fluency as the pathway. When speaking, the focus is on meaning and its negotiation, the use of speaking strategies are used, and errors are considered stepping stones to learning and are not immediately corrected if such corrections impede fluency..

In current communicative instruction, English teachers try to balance accuracy (grammatical structure / linguistic rules) and fluency (natural language use) (Hedge, 1993). As stated by Lightbown and Spada (1993:105) “Classroom data from a number of studies offer support for the view that form-focused instruction and corrective feedback provided within the context of a communicative program are more effective in promoting second language learning than programs which are limited to an exclusive emphasis on accuracy on the one hand or an exclusive emphasis on fluency on the other hand.” In addition, current communicative approaches propose that speaking instruction be integrated with instruction in other skill areas. Murphy (1991) notes that language teachers should connect speaking and listening and pronunciation teaching, and reading and writing activities should be used as follow-up activities for strengthening speaking abilities.

So far, we can conclude that the communicative approach encourages attention to oral skills in an integrated framework. Examining the communicative

approach with its theoretical bases can help demonstrate how speaking can be taught within a communicative approach.

Teaching Speaking within Communicative Language Teaching

From the preceding, we can evaluate that speaking ability is needed as an important link in the process of L2 learners' general language development. At the most basic level speaking means communicating with other people. The notion of building students' "communicative competence" was taken as a goal for communicative language teaching (Hymes, 1972). Hymes' theory of communicative competence is seen as providing guidelines for "what a speaker needs to know in order to be communicatively competent in a speech community" (Richards and Rodgers, 2001). The four elements comprising communicative competence assumes procedural knowledge

1. Of what is formally possible (grammaticality)
2. Of what is physically possible (feasibility)
3. Of what is contextually appropriate (appropriateness)
4. Of what is actually done by language users (incidence)

Communicative Language Teaching arose from changes in pedagogical philosophy owing much to British linguists, such as Firth and Halliday (Richards and Rodgers, 2001), British applied linguists, such as Candlin and Widdowson (Richards and Rodgers, 2001), and American sociolinguists, such as Hymes and Labov (Richards and Rodgers, 2001), who were exploring new ideas in language pedagogy and socio-linguistics. Their collective work "emphasized another fundamental dimension of language that was inadequately addressed in approaches to language teaching at that time - the functional and communicative potential of language" This

perspective highlighted a “need to focus in language teaching on communicative proficiency rather than on mere mastery of structures” (Richards & Rodgers, 2001).

At the same time, the increasing interdependence of European countries highlighted a need for concerted efforts to teach citizens of Europe the major languages of Europe. The Council of Europe undertook to propose alternative methods of language teaching aimed at responding to this new awareness. Its recommendations paralleled and/or adopted many of the proposals coming from applied linguists urging a more functional/communicative approach to second language teaching (Van Ek and Alexander, 1980). In the 1970’s, developments gave encouragement to authentic language use and classroom exchanges where students engaged in real communication with one another (Clark, 1987).

While Krashen (1981) took the view that comprehensible input is a necessary component for second language acquisition, Swain (1985) claimed that “comprehensible output”, was equally important for learners “to provide opportunities for contextualized, meaningful use, to test hypothesis about the target language, and to move the learner from a purely semantic analysis of the language to a syntactic analysis of it.” Practitioners saw input and output as necessarily integrated and equally important in conversation and in communication, generally.

From all theoretical perspectives, the communicative approach can only be implemented effectively in a class environment where teachers help L2 learners to develop speaking ability through communicative activities. Cheon (2003) notes that teachers should see use of communication tasks as an effective way to assist speaking development.

The theoretical perspective supporting the use of communication tasks in classroom is based on the premise that language is best learned and taught through interaction (Nunan, 1987; Rivers, 1987). Researchers (Cohen, Weaver and Li, 1996) reported an “interaction study” conducted with what were considered “passive” Japanese learners of English. They undertook to engage 50 students working in pairs on collaborative, interactive learning tasks by providing a context in which they felt at ease to express their ideas. They observed that students were less threatened about answering questions when they were representing their group instead of responding individually. Pairing gradually developed their self-confidence. The major change was observed at the end of the term when many students began volunteering in full-class oral discussions.

A variety of techniques and approaches have been labeled as “communicative language teaching”. Despite differences in labeling, these all share similar characteristics. Some of the characteristics of the communicative view of language are that:

1. Language is a system for the expression of meaning
2. The primary function of language is to allow interaction and communication.
3. The structure of language reflects its functional and communicative uses.
4. The primary units of language are not merely its grammatical and structural features, but categories of functional and communicative meaning as exemplified in discourse.

(Richards and Rodgers, 2001:161)

As noted, the communicative approach, including more interactive views of language learning, has given rise to new approaches which have various alternative

forms of teaching practices “although all would claim to embody the same basic principles of CLT” (Richards and Rodgers, 2001). Among the better known of these CLT “spin-off” teaching practices are approaches such as Content-Based Language Teaching and Task-based Instruction. A somewhat lesser known but important “partner” of CLT is Cooperative Language Learning (CLL). Cooperative Language Learning has its roots in general education, outside of language teaching, but it is compatible with many of the assumptions of Communicative Language Teaching (McGroarty, 1989). As communicative language teaching is accepted as a way of developing interactional skills, L2 teachers to improve oral skills in a class environment also use collaborative / cooperative language teaching. Since the idea of cooperative projects involving international EFL students in CMC linkages is the foundation of my research project, I now consider the background of cooperative language learning as it supports this idea

Teaching Speaking within a Cooperative/Collaborative Language Learning Framework

Cooperative language learning, also called Collaborative language learning, is a practice, which clearly exemplifies communicative teaching and learning principles. Cooperative learning theory is based on theoretical work of Jean Piaget (e.g. 1965) and Lev Vygotsky (e.g. 1962), who support the importance of social interaction in learning and particularly the motivation to develop and share ideas through talk. These ideas have been adopted by general educators as well as by those who have particular interest in second language education (Richards and Rodgers 2001).

Rivers (1987) entitles her whole approach to language teaching as “Interactive Language Teaching” and bases her view of language learning on the idea that L2 learners grow in language ability by conveying and receiving authentic messages when they communicate. She opposes teacher-dominated teaching methods, instead encouraging students to learn together cooperatively.

For Nunan (1993), cooperative EFL learning involves students working together in pairs or small groups to achieve common goals. Working in collaborative groups provides a less threatening way to practice speaking than speaking in front of a whole class (Nunan, 1993). Kramsch (1986) states that language learning (and teaching) must include expressing, interpreting, and negotiating meaning, thus students need to be given opportunities to work cooperatively with both teacher and class-mates in turn-taking, giving feedback to speakers, asking for clarification, and starting and ending conversations. In this type of learning, students can correct each other, share personal opinions and professional knowledge, assuming responsibility for their own learning and leading them be self-confident communicators in the process. In her article “From language proficiency to interactional competence”, Kramsch outlines three phases in L2 teaching for communication. In this view, the first step is based on student-teacher interaction in which students practice the L2 with their teachers as a speaking partner. The second step comprises group-peer working interaction, during which students learn to negotiate meaning with their group or peers in class situations “as well as how to generate learning” (Kramsch, 1986). The final step involves cooperative interaction in which students engage in conversation-based tasks with partners observing the social and cultural boundaries that speakers meet in natural conversation.

Van den Branden (1997) studied how cooperative learning affects L2 learners' speaking. His research results showed that the participants interactionally and cooperatively modified their output. He argues that L2 learners improved speaking performance by "the frequency of negotiation routines that they are engaged in" (Van den Branden, 1997).

Cooperative language learning activities customarily involve two way exchanges with partners sharing information or opinions in the course of carrying out learning activities. Proponents of cooperative language learning have created or adapted a host of exchange activities. These include debate, jigsaw, information-gap, opinion gap, team practice, and round-table activities (e.g. Kessler, 1992; Kagan, 1992; Sharon, 1994). Most of these cooperative language learning activities were designed to be used in pair or group work in fixed classroom settings. However, the rapid expansion of in-school access to computer systems has introduced the possibility for cooperative projects to be considered in a much broader context.

A much-discussed idea in using computer technology to support language learning is that of linking ELT students in cooperative learning arrangements. This is a particularly promising strategy when the students are international students who do not share a common native language but are fellow learners of English as a foreign language. Cooperative EFL projects might include sharing information about their own countries and working on solutions to common problems.

Warschauer (2001) reports on collaborative projects carried out by participants working via computer mediated communication (CMC) links. Warschauer explains each of these project types and gives citations in which the

project types are documented and are described in greater detail. Warschauer (2001:211) documents five on-line, collaborative project types:

1. Interviews and surveys: Participants interview each other or share reports of surveys conducted in their own locale.
2. On-line research: Students explore research questions they nominate or are assigned by an instructor.
3. Comparative investigations: Students investigate local customs, economic conditions, etc. and compare results on-line.
4. Simulations: Students work as team-members to design a business, a international school or to work out potential solutions to international problems.
5. On-line publication: Students cooperate in preparing on-line newsletters, magazines, or reports.

A number of studies have documented the use of CMC-based cooperative learning involving international EFL students. (Johnson, 1991, p. 65) summarizes “a growing body of evidence (that) shows that computers can promote productive ways of working together, and that this interaction is related to higher levels of interest, motivation and achievement.” As well, parallel studies reviewed in Mydlarski, 1998, indicate that such international CMC-based cooperative studies not only motivate communication using English but that these “cooperative learning situations have been proven to promote more positive cross-ethnic relationships” (Mydlarski, 1998).

The bringing together of computer technology, cooperative learning and second language teaching has been explored in several sources. The next section gives information about changing roles of technology in support of language

education. Further detailed research on CMC international EFL projects is reported in a later section.

Technology in Language Education

Though speaking ability is viewed as an important skill “since speech is the most basic means of human communication” (Lazaraton, 1996), getting learners to speak a foreign language is a notoriously difficult element of L2 instruction. Learners are often shy speaking in front of a class, they may be hesitant in trying to assemble their thoughts and words, they feel they lack topics of interest and background knowledge to talk about and, most critically, they lack conversational partners of similar interests and language abilities.

As noted earlier, collaborative and communicative learning offer students “cognitive and socio-cognitive approaches” (Warschauer, 2000) in which L2 learners seek to form a language system based not on habit formation but rather on interaction with partners using comprehensible, meaningful language in meaningful social contexts. Warschauer (2000) claims that L2 learners need to be provided maximum opportunity for real-time social interaction, not only by exposure to comprehensible input, but also by involvement with the kinds of conversational usage similar to the conversation in a community outside the classroom. Unfortunately, this is a goal often beyond the reach of the normal EFL classroom. However, technology can be a powerful tool for creating a real-time social interaction community in which students can be motivated to communicate with fellow EFL learners in international contexts.

Technology has been used for many years in the field of language education. As I noted earlier, technology supported the audio-lingual instructional approach. Language labs in which students were typically equipped with tape decks,

microphones and headphones were considered critical to support ALM methodology. In language labs, interaction was limited, and lab activities based on drill practice were considered dull but necessary (Singhal, 1997). The availability of Computer Assisted Language Learning (CALL) opened new opportunities for various uses of technology in language education. CALL capabilities include building practice vocabulary, grammar, pronunciation tutoring, spell checking, writing and reading programs, as well as various authoring packages to allow instructors to create their own exercises to supplement existing language courses (Singhal, 1997). In that CALL offers one-to-one tutoring with immediate feedback on progress, computer assisted language instruction is held to motivate students in second language learning (Blake, 1987 cited in Singhal, 1997).

While the computer is used in some form or another in many language learning situations, Computer-Mediated Communication (CMC) with Internet usage has only recently emerged as a major EFL resource. In CMC applications, computer usage with an Internet connection enables person-to-person communication on a variety of subjects using electronic mail, news groups, chat rooms and professional on-line discussion groups (Selinger, 1998). These uses have involved both print and audio communication between participants.

The opportunities for person-to-person classroom communication are limited, and when students are requested in a classroom to communicate orally in a second language, they may be afraid of appearing foolish or of being negatively graded. Hence, they may feel de-motivated in speaking individually in class with their classmates or teachers. This handicap to classroom development of L2 speaking skills has led language educators to try to find alternative interactive and authentic

learning environments in which their students can communicate with others in the target language. CMC appears to offer such an opportunity for reasonably threat-free, person-to-person exchanges in a motivating environment (Tanian & James, 2000).

From the perspective of my own study, CMC offers the possibility for L2 learners to find intercultural voice/text based chat partners and to participate in distance-learning discussions based on topics of shared interest. Learning is no longer restrained in time and space; rather, through CMC, learners are offered opportunities to communicate and learn collaboratively with learners worldwide (Kern, 1996; Shield & Weininger, 2004). Fotos (1994) claims that CMC may change students' negative attitudes toward speaking lessons and toward learning the second language itself. Similar successes to those reported by Fotos (1994) above have been reported for international EFL voice-chat-based exchanges (e.g. Hubbard, 2004).

Since the study will investigate CMC voice and text based chat, the next section will describe some CMC tools such as e-mail, text-chat, voice-chat, and video or audio conferencing.

CMC Tools in Language Learning and Teaching

The first period of enthusiasm for computer use in LT, built around drill and practice exercises on terminals connected to large main frame computers, was followed by the availability of self-contained personal computer applications. While structural drill and practice material was (and is still) produced and promoted for PC's, attention has turned to more functionally and cognitively-motivated instructional use. The most recent application of computers to language instruction has exploited the networking capacities of computer technology which places greater emphasis on integrating skills in language learning and use, and more importantly,

on integrating learners in authentic language use environments. Kern and Warschauer (2000) label this most recent phase of computer application in language education, the Socio-cognitive Perspective. It is within this perspective that Computer Mediated Communication has developed. .

The use of computers in CMC language instruction serves as a tool for communicative interaction. Therefore, there is a close relation between computer mediated communication (CMC) and communicative approaches to foreign language teaching. In a communicative approach, comprehension of input - listening and reading - are necessary to the overall process of language acquisition. However, as Swain (1985) notes, input comprehension is not sufficient for language acquisition. Learner output - writing and speaking - is also an important aspect of language acquisition. The use of computers in computer-mediated communication activities provides input and output, which are both necessary for second language learners' progress (Sotillo, 2000). Hampel and Hawk (2004) conclude that Internet-based activities enable students to interact and to negotiate meaning with other learners, since they need to get and deliver information. In Hampel and Hawk's study learners had to understand inputs messages and produce comprehensible output through speaking and writing.

Computer mediated communication can be either synchronous (e.g. video conferencing, text-based chat or voice chat...) in which L2 learners can communicate with others spontaneously (or synchronously). The other form of CMC is asynchronous (e.g. electronic mail, e-cards, bulletin boards...) in which L2 learners can shape and process messages when they are not on-line. These are also

called real-time communications (Synchronous) and delayed-time (Asynchronous) communications.

Some language teachers who have used the Internet as a tool for teaching L2 have chosen e-mail or key pal (pen pal) exchanges for their students. For example, students can write e-mails to native or non-native intercultural partners. They can work in collaboration and use their exchange partner as a helper to provide correct information on vocabulary, grammar, or cultural points. Warschauer and Kern (2000), claim that socio-cultural contact is critical in language learning. Learning a language is not a process in which a learner can progress very far individually; it is a process that learners have to be involved in through social engagement. CMC provides the tools that make social engagement in language classes possible and productive.

In a well-designed e-mail curriculum, learners can develop their writing and reading ability, increase awareness or consciousness of the world around them, and activate communication. These are very essential points in a communicative/collaborative approach to language learning (Trokeloshvili and Jost, 1997). From this point of view, electronic pen pals can motivate students not only to improve specific skill areas, but it can also affect students' attitudes towards the target language and culture. Students have chances to use the foreign language outside the classroom environment with personal intercultural partners (Robb, 1996).

Using intercultural e-mail connections, students or teachers can find native or non-native key pals. For example; The Tapped In: After School Online Discussions provide a meaningful introduction to virtual learning environments as well as interactions and experiences within a community of learners. Teachers who join this

group can find links to other like interest groups. These groups are MOOS and MUDS in EDU which explores virtual environments and possible educational applications for students, WEBHEADS IN ACTION explores language learning through online participation, EFL COMMUNITY is a collaborative e-learning community for students to learn and share together, and ENGLISH POW WOW provides learning English experiences in a virtual environment. There are a growing number of Internet based groups aimed at serving the EFL community of students and teachers

In addition to e-mailing CMC (asynchronous), CMC provides the capability for real-time chat CMC (synchronous) via special discussion groups, chat rooms on specific topics, or tandem (cooperative) chat, that is the major focus of this study. “The term ‘chatting’, in the computer context, refers to the use of the synchronous or real-time text-based or voice-based communication tools such as freely available chat lines (Yahoo Messenger, Pal Talk, MSN Messenger) or commercial chatting software” (Tudini, 2002, p.40). Learners can communicate with native or non-native speakers of English or other languages via on-line chatting. It can be either text-based chat, which requires keyboards, or voice-based chat, which requires headphones and microphones. Sometimes a web camera is also employed.

Research on educational technology shows that the use of the Internet in teaching second languages has the potential to motivate students and teachers (Frizler, 1995; Warschauer & Whittaker, 1997), and increase students’ participation in classroom activities (Ortega, 1997; Signhal, 1997; Warschauer, 1996). Encouraging students’ participation in class activities is sometimes a big problem for teachers. Particularly, in a classroom situation, which is largely teacher-centered,

learners may hesitate to join the activities or communicate with other students to develop their second language abilities. Research into text-based chat environments for EFL has shown that online communications with intercultural chat partners have significantly different characteristics from conversation in the classroom.

In the study of Hudson and Bruckman (2002), research results show that communication with intercultural partners in online chat creates a student-centered learning environment in which students feel more free and comfortable and do not hesitate to interact with others. The study also finds that the “almost real time nature of chat” (Hudson & Bruckman, 2002, p.109) appears to offer a mix of advantages that arise in both face-to-face conversation and asynchronous (e-mail) interaction.

Language learners also benefit from interacting with actual members of the target language community. Interaction may provide an authentic environment which is very useful for improving language skills and helpful for creating a less stressful environment for second language practice (Chun, 1998 as cited in Smith, 2003). As in a conversation in real life, learners’ tolerance of errors is high, and this enables them to develop confidence in writing and speaking fluently (Hamilton, 2003), whereas the students in a class environment are highly conscious of accuracy in grammar and in pronunciation.

Since this study investigates CMC resources to improve speaking skills, I now consider the role of text-based chat in oral proficiency.

Research has shown that learner-to-learner interactions may improve learners’ communicative ability (Gass and Varonis, 1994). Current studies in SLA suggest that on-line chatting can help learners gain competence in some aspects of

face-to-face (f2f) oral interaction (Abrams, 2003; Chun 1994; Pelletieri, 2000). These aspects of oral interaction provide discourse for negotiation and corrective feedback.

Some studies have shown that in written forms of CMC in second language education - text-based chat - learners actually master a greater quantity of oral discourse forms than in an oral practice classroom. In the study of Negretti (1998), she observed that her participants showed improvements in oral proficiency after two months of text-based chat activities, although her main aim was to investigate improvements in writing proficiency. Indicators found in the study of Tudini (2003) also show text-based chat sessions are closer to spoken language than most written language. Tudini (2003) found feedback tokens, for example, ‘ ready’, ‘me too’, ‘ ah’; as well as also some useful discourse gambits for negotiation such as ‘ well’, ‘ I would like to say’ or ‘ I would like to tell everyone’. These are found in text-based chat in order to take turns or to offer an opinion. These are similar to speech signals as experienced in real-life conversation. In text-based chat, participants had time to think and felt more confident to express themselves. This was reflected in their willingness to speak L2 fluently, becoming more confident to speak in class discussions, as reported in Negretti (1998).

The language in chat is usually formed with short phrases and sentences, which also make communication closer to real-life f2f conversation. In f2f interactions, people may make mistakes; correct their sentences (self-repair) etc. In this sense, conversations in written-based chat are again very similar to f2f conversations. CMC has also advantages in providing an authentic environment to motivate students to speak in a virtual environment. “Giving the right conditions, the synchronous environment of the chat room can be successful medium for learning

and practice” (Poole, Axmann, Calonge& Cox (2003) cited in Tudini, 2003).

Warschauer (cited in Gonzalez, 2003), gives his own experience as a language learner of Hawaiian, and how CMC was useful for him: “During oral class discussions, it is not infrequent that I become lost, and thus receive no benefit.

However, during computer-mediated discussions, no matter how complex, I can always reread sentences, take out my dictionary, ask questions of the person next to me-in other words find some way to make the input comprehensible and thus benefit from it”

Hudson and Bruckman (2002) found that although students were not eager to speak in the classroom, they frequently attempted to speak and participate in conversations, without prompting, in an on-line environment. Students took control of the conversations and did not wait for the teacher’s help before replying. As can be seen from this and similar studies, CMC provides an authentic, student-centered environment, which allows students “to play a greater role in managing the discourse” (Chun, 1994).

The discussion to this point has focused on positive benefits of CMC in support of language learning and of increasing oral proficiency in particular. I now consider some of the limitations of CMC tools in these same functions.

Limitations of CMC Tools

While there has been research on the role of Internet in second language learning, most studies have focused on its benefits and its potential. However, there are number of challenges related to the use of the computer and the implementation of CMC in the class environment (West, 2002). One of the problems is that providing an effective online connection requires equipment availability and

reliability. Upgraded computers and Internet connection providers are often costly and in demand by other academic users.

Second, for the implementation of CMC in a class environment for real-time chat with intercultural partners, teachers need to find chat partners for their students. In this respect, teachers may have difficulty in finding a class, which parallels theirs in numbers, language level, topical interest, etc. Teachers need to agree on instructional goals and students' learning needs. Dialect and accent differences may create some interactional difficulties. Dialect and accent problems can sometimes be magnified by low-grade audio connections.

Third, international time differences and differing academic schedules and calendars can also create some difficulties in arranging conversational chat times.

Fourth, students might have differences in background, language, and experience, which may cause further complications in pedagogical partnering (Warschauer & Whittaker, 1997).

Fifth, implementing the full-set of CMC applications in classrooms seems to be problematical due to both their current cost and connection problems. Videoconferencing especially requires more complicated Internet technologies than are usually available to language departments (Wang, 2004).

Finally, to raise the effectiveness of chat in L2 teaching, chat activities have to be well-planned and carried out within the framework of a course syllabus.. Otherwise, CMC interchanges can become flat and pointless from the point of view students, teachers and administrators.

This present study investigates students' attitudes towards the use of voice and text-based chat with intercultural classroom chat partners as an activity to

promote positive attitudes towards speaking ability in classrooms. As in the introduction of any new educational technology, support and positive attitudes among students and teachers are also critical. Therefore this study aims to investigate student and teacher attitudes towards the use of CMC and voice chat activities in EFL instruction. Both experienced EFL chat users and inexperienced chat users are surveyed in this study.

Attitudes of Students and Teachers towards the Use of CMC in Language Learning

We know that beliefs and opinions play a critical role in human performance. Norman Cousins, in his book Healing and Belief, summarizes medical data showing that the power of medical treatment lies 25% in the medical treatment itself and 75% in the patient's belief in the drug or treatment (Cousins, 1989).

In teaching, Richards identifies, "two different kinds of knowledge [that] influence teachers' understanding and practice of teaching. One relates to subject matter and curricular issues, and to how the content of a lesson can be presented in an effective and coherent way. This is the aspect of teaching that has to do with curricular goals, lesson plans, instructional activities, materials, tasks, and teaching techniques. The other kind of knowledge relates to teachers' implicit theories of teaching that is, their personal and subjective philosophies and their understanding of what constitute good teaching." (Richards, 1998, p. 51) Further, Williams and Burden (1997) suggest that, for language teachers to come to grips with what it means to be a good teacher, it may be relatively unimportant for them to learn about particular methods. Instead, it may be crucial for them to understand what their own

beliefs are “about themselves, about learning and its educational relevance and about learners” (p. 63).

Similarly it is these attitudes and beliefs about educational innovations that will largely shape teachers’ success or failure in the classroom. Shifting from traditional ways of teaching to more communicative-based tools such as real-time or delayed-time on-line conversation should involve hearing the opinions of students and teachers, as they are the central figures in this evolution. This section provides information on the study of student and teacher attitudes and beliefs about the use of computer-based technology (especially CMC) to support instruction in EFL classes.

Student Attitude Studies

Instructional technology with CMC is held to be one of the tools that can help students become more effective and self-confident EFL learners. However, it is important to be aware that students’ self development and language development via CMC tools do not exist in isolation from students’ attitudes and perceptions. Hence, it is important to understand students’ attitudes towards the use of CMC tools such e-mail, bulletin boards, text / voice based chat, audio conferencing...etc. There are many reports and/or promotions of computer integration / implementation with educational aims using CMC in EFL classes. Unfortunately, there has been less empirical research considering students’ attitudes, perceptions and their reactions when introduced to the use of CMC technology in EFL classrooms. Altun (2005) claims that “Integrating CMC tools into educational settings (is a) new avenue for educators to explore for designing and delivering educational materials through CMC tools. The effectiveness of these emerging communities as a community of practice however is subject to participants’ approval and / or rejections. Therefore, it

is important to explore the participants' attitudes and reflections about using these tools in their learning process." In this respect, educators must pay attention to student feelings and student voices to make implementation of CMC tools successful as an instructional technology within language classes.

In addition to investigations of the theoretical strengths of CMC applications (tools) or how these tools may or may not motivate the students in EFL study (Roblyer & Edwards, 2000; Green, 1997), research needs to focus on the practical issues of what students think and the way they feel when anticipating or working with CMC as a resource in their EFL studies. Stevens and Altun (2002) investigated foreign language learners' experience in joining an online community (Webheads) from a distance education site. In their study, the researchers asked a group of students studying English as a foreign language to join an online community using synchronous CMC tools. The findings indicated that students showed considerable interest in repeating this event again and in meeting other EFL learners online to develop mutually their foreign language ability. Hertel (2003) reported that the responses to "post exchange" summary questions based on students' perceptions about e-mail exchanges with intercultural partners showed that all parties in their own language learning saw the exchange as beneficial. Altun (2005) investigated students' attitudes and reflections about the use of CMC tools in language teaching. He found that students' initial attitudes toward using CMC tools were significantly positive, and students said that using CMC tools had a positive influence in their professional development.

Most research reported investigates students' attitudes towards the use of ACMC (e-mailing) or asynchronous CMC tools, and reports positive feedback from

the participants. Abrams (2003) compared “the effect of synchronous and asynchronous CMC on oral performance in German”. One of the conclusions was that students who participated in asynchronous (e-mail) discussions were less motivated than the students in synchronous (on-line text chat) discussions. Subjects explained that they had to wait for replying to or receiving messages in APMC modes (asynchronous CMC such as e-mail, bulletin board...e.g.), however, in SCMC modes (synchronous CMC such as real time voice chat, text chat...e.g.), they could interact with intercultural partners as in a face to face conversation in real-life. These SCMC interactions enabled them to be more active in their regular classroom settings than as a result of APMC interactions. Abrams also added that learners who took part in SCMC discussions were able to produce significantly more language in two sessions than their friends who had participated in APMC sessions. He notes that this increasing fluency seemed to motivate learners and give them positive attitudes towards the exchanges and the CMC tools that supported these exchanges.

Hudson and Bruckman (2002) claim that real-time conversation via voice / text chat is a marker of increasing fluency and can help learners’ motivation and attitudes toward both the language task and the language itself. In their study, two teachers were trying to create an authentic, interactive learning environment in the class. Unfortunately, students still did not feel comfortable talking in the classroom. The teachers spoke 82 % of the time while their students only spoke 18 % of the time. These teachers promoted a trial on-line environment, using CMC exchanges (with short time delays between transmissions), and students took control of the conversation. It was reported that these conversations raised positive attitudes towards the use of SCMC as a tool to promote their language learning. It was found

that in voice exchanges, if there was a small delay, greater participation occurred. This suggests that different uses of CMC may be appropriate for different learners or at least in different phases of their learning. When students were also asked in which environment they felt they experienced most progress in their language skill, they said that on-line chat improved their speaking ability, and they believed that using SCMC tools are more useful than the class activities for their EFL development.

Wang (2004) observed students' attitudes toward using CMC by adding audio and visual CMC tools to the text-based CMC tool. The participants in her study said that audio-visual SCMC could make it possible to learn language through distance education and regarded it as a significant educational tool which influenced their speaking development positively. However, Wang also noted that some students who gave negative feedback about the use of CMC had problems with technical issues like hearing the voice, connecting on-line...etc. Like Wang, Tudini (2003) checked students' attitudes to CMC oral on-line discussions compared with classroom discussions. She stated that most of the students in the study said that they felt more confident in CMC mode. She mentioned that half of the participants were already good speakers in class activities.

Due to the lack of studies on the investigation of students' attitudes towards the use of voice chat CMC with international partners as a tool to promote speaking ability, the current study aims to analyze the attitudes of a group of Turkish university students towards the use SCMC. It will be also necessary to learn teachers' attitudes towards use of voice chat as an instructional tool. This investigation should include both EFL teachers highly familiar with instructional

CMC applications as well as those who are considering such applications but have had as yet no practical experience in use of such applications in language instruction.

Teacher Attitude Studies

Previously I suggested the great influence that participant attitudes can have on the success or failure of human activities. This is so in education as it is in other fields. It is equally so for teachers and students. Changes in educational technology, particularly, have caused great changes for educators and their students (Asan, 2002). Although it is helpful to understand the learner from psychological perspective, it is equally important to look at the other side of the desk *i.e.* the attitudes that teachers have towards such changes in education.

Program directors or administrative representatives most often introduce innovations in some aspect of the instructional system. These innovations are sometimes planned with instructional staff, and instructional staff is sometimes given training and lead time to adjust to innovations, but sometimes innovations appear suddenly in the educational setting without much warning or preparation. Such surprises often result in negative teacher response without much attention to the content or intent of the innovation (Asan, 2002).

Even when some sort of adequate groundwork is laid for educational change, differing administrative and teaching priorities often fail to be observed.

“Administrators control access and adoptions; therefore strategies for adoption and training include interaction with the formal system. Teachers control implementation; strategies must be used that involve and include the informal networks and ways of doing things that exist in each school.” (Parish and Arrends, 1983: 65).

Effective adoption of new technologies needs to acknowledge these institutional lines and work within and around them as necessary. One group of researchers who studied “changing instructional practice” found out that negative teachers’ attitudes most often resulted from “discomfort with the unknown” (Alexiou-Ray & Wilson & Wright and Peirano 2003).

Effective adoption of new Internet technologies involves teachers not only having experienced, personally, successful examples of Internet projects but also having positive and promotional attitudes towards such projects (McMeniman & Evans, 1998).

Different teacher attitudes and opinions about using computers can be based on their own teaching beliefs, perceived experience of fellow teachers, general educational background and specific application training, sense of involvement or non-involvement in planning and implementation and general positive or negative levels of comfort in respect to technology (Gorsuch, 2003). Gorsuch also points out that though teachers may have positive attitudes towards use of CMC tools such as e-mail and chat exchange projects, lack of confidence or knowledge, which are necessary to carry out the projects, may cause them to fail to implement such projects in their classes.

Additionally, having positive attitudes towards computer use does not imply that teachers will be able to use computers effectively in their courses (McManiman and Evans, 1998). Lack of advance information and lack of training appear to be key factors in teachers’ negative attitudes towards implementation of technological innovations. From this perspective, teachers’ perception of the usefulness of the Internet for teaching (O’Dowd, 2003) plays a big role in their attitudes. As well,

provision of adequate training preparation has also been shown to have a large impact on re-shaping teachers' negative attitudes towards computer-based instruction. (Hawkes, 1999) Lam (2000) adds that computer familiarity is a significant component in teacher attitudes towards instructional Internet use. Having a computer at home and/or in their institutions is viewed as a positive factor in shaping teacher attitudes.

Another reason for teachers' lack of positive support for new technical innovations can be related to the difficulty of access to computers in the school and lack of back-up support - both technical and administrative support (Johnson,1999). According to the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES 2000, cited in Park & Cramer & Ertmer 2000) nearly 100 % of teachers reported having computers in their schools. However, NCES reported that nearly 70 % of teachers still did not feel well prepared to use computers and the Internet in their teaching. The report adds that teachers' perceptions of and training in using technology is a key factor in implementing instructional use of Internet in the class environment.

Information and training are obviously key factors in building positive teacher attitudes towards computer-based technologies. Asan (2002) conducted a study to find out teachers' attitudes after they took an instructional materials preparation core course in a Computer Education Instructional Technology Program. The participants were 35 Turkish pre-service English teachers. They did not have strong backgrounds or training in computer use or experience in implementing Internet-based projects in their classrooms They did share an interest in learning to use technology in their curricula. During the course, they were assigned to complete,

cooperatively, a computer project, which was planned to support their class lessons. Before the study, several teachers felt anxious about the course and about implementing into their classroom activities what they would learn. However, as a result of the program, Asan concluded that all pre-service teachers gained motivation, and the teachers were able to plan computer-based lessons in their classes. Their positive attitudes helped contribute to more meaningful learning and greater appreciation of computer-based tasks in the teaching process. The researcher also found that participants could work collaboratively and negotiate towards a common expectation, helping each other solve tasks and master methods to be used. In sum, all teachers expressed eagerness to conduct a computer-based activity in their classes, for themselves - as professionals - and for their students - as learners. The combination of teacher collaboration, like student collaboration, appears to be a strong motivator for learning new skills.

If we understand what present teacher attitudes are in respect to integration of Internet-based activities into teaching situations, we can better provide guidelines for information and training sessions in respect to implementing CMC educational technology at Muğla University.

Conclusion

In this chapter teaching speaking and teaching speaking within communicative and cooperative methods were reviewed. Then, various aspects of the use of technology in language education were discussed. Particular applications of Computer Mediated Communication in support of teaching speaking proficiency and benefits and challenges were summarized. Finally, attitude studies of students and teachers in respect to using of CMC resources in instructional settings were

presented. The next chapter will discuss the methodology of the current study in terms of the participants of the study, instruments of the study and procedural steps followed during the course of the study.

CHAPTER III: METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This study investigates the attitudes of language teachers and attitudes of language students towards use of CMC voice / text chat as an instructional resource to promote oral communication.

However, the original intent of my thesis research study was to conduct an experimental study which aimed to investigate the effect of voice / text chat with international speaking partners on student speaking development in an EFL context. I had assembled two groups: a class of tourism students from Mugla University/Turkey and class of science students in Kuwait. The study was to begin in February, and four months of the fall had been taken up in making preparations for the Turkey/Kuwait student interchange. I was excited and ambitious in my hopes for the project and felt that the thesis study would be an important one. First, finding a partner class having the same number, similar English level, and parallel interests with my own students at Mugla University was very difficult. Negotiations for this were all conducted through the EFL Webheads network described previously. Gathering the students at Mugla Tourism Department, informing them about the study and guaranteeing their participation was almost as difficult as making the international arrangements. Second, I was not in Mugla but working on my MA

TEFL degree classes in Ankara. Tourism students do not attend class regularly, so finding a time and place to meet with them after they had agreed to take part in the study proved troublesome. My Mugla colleagues volunteered to help in finding, assembling and informing the Tourism students and did a good job with this. I returned to Mugla to inform the students about study details again and deliver the pre-study questionnaire I had prepared. Unfortunately, none of the students who had agreed to participate in the study appeared for this meeting although it had been announced several times in advance. Over the next day, I found five of the twenty students and decided to administer the questionnaire as a “pilot study”.

The following week I returned to Mugla and found the remaining 15 students. This somewhat revived my enthusiasm for the project. I conducted the questionnaire survey and collected the forms. I also obtained student background information, photos, individual yahoo mail addresses, and other materials for setting up a Yahoo group web page and address book. These were necessary for introducing the students to their international partners and confirming details about the chat project, such as timing, topics to be discussed, etc.

Since I had no previous experience in creating a website, my collaborating Kuwaiti teacher assisted in the web formation, distributed biographical information and drew up a plan for collaborative projects involving her students and mine. My partnering teacher was very busy with other aspects of educational technology, and direct real-time chat communication with her proved problematical. Finally, with supporting networks in place, the student exchanges were ready to start.

I returned to Mugla from Ankara again to find my students ready and the computer lab prepared to serve us. I communicated with my Kuwaiti partner that all

was ready at our end. There was shocking news in reply. My Kuwaiti partner was not given a class for this term and the university was having computer problems that made it impossible for a Kuwaiti team to participate in the project. This was in early March. My thesis study was ready to begin and time was too short to try to re-negotiate other partners, other countries, other classes for the study.

My Kuwaiti teaching partner agreed to personally set up some chat sessions with my students until I could find a new participating class. I agreed to this. On the Monday that these conversations were to begin, I arrived early at the lab to check on my students and lab facilities. Everything appeared to be in readiness.

At this point the maintenance engineer announced that the University server had been down for two days and it was unknown when it might be operational again. So once more our chat project was stymied. Rather than give up this topic altogether, my advisor suggested that I carryout a feasibility study looking to the future of computer-mediated communication in support of EFL speaking pedagogy. I changed my focus to a survey study involving three groups of participants. Thus, my investigation focused on Mugla teacher and student attitudes about international chat in support of EFL speaking classes and investigating the problems that might be faced in establishing and maintaining a pedagogically useful international chat system in support of the teaching of speaking in Mugla EFL classes. Besides being a Mugla University teacher and student attitude study, this study also investigates the views of experienced international ELT teachers who have used CMC capabilities in their language classes and for their own professional development. This group of chat professionals refers to themselves as “Webheads”. I now turn to consideration of the main focus of my study.

The answers to the following research questions are explored in the study.

- 1- What are the Tourism students' perceptions about relative usefulness and difficulty of mastering of the four language skills, particularly speaking?
- 2- What are the Tourism students' attitudes towards possibilities for using CMC international voice / text chat partnerships for improving their speaking ability?
- 3- What are the attitudes of Muğla teachers (who have no chat experience in educational settings) towards use of CMC international voice / text chat partnerships as instructional resource for developing their students' speaking ability?
- 4- What similarities and differences are there between the Tourism students' and Muğla teachers' computer use and their attitudes towards the use of CMC tools?
- 5- What are the internationally-experienced chat-using teachers' perceptions in respect to advantages and disadvantages of using CMC tools, especially as an EFL teaching resource?

The results of the study will supply curriculum information as to how voice chat might be integrated into the school curriculum as an instructional activity involving Tourism students and L2 instructors at Muğla University.

In this chapter, participants, instruments used to conduct the study, data collection procedures and data analysis techniques are discussed.

Participants

The data for this survey was gathered from two separate questionnaires that were given to Mugla teachers and students, email open-ended interview type

questions distributed to Mugla teachers, and three open-ended interview questions asked of international Webhead ELT teachers.

Students

The participants were 20 Tourism students studying at Muğla University. Tourism students are considered to have need of more developed oral communication skills than students from other departments such as physics, chemistry, and social science.

The students were volunteers, chosen without regard to their computer abilities or experiences or their level of English language proficiency.

Participants from the two-year Tourism school were all in their first year. Participants from the four year Tourism school were in various years. Tables 1, 2 and 3 display the information about the Tourism students who participated in the study:

Table 1

The academic Status of Students

Academic status	F	%
2 year program	13	65.0
4 year program	7	35.0
Total	20	100.0

Note: F: Frequency %: Percentages

Table 2

Departments of Students

Departments	F	%
Hospitality management	2	10.0
Travel Management	5	25.0
Travel and Tour Management	9	45.0
Tourism and Hotel Management	4	20.0
Total	20	100.0

Note: F: Frequency %: Percentages

Table 3

Students' Studying Year of English

Years of studying English	F	%
2	1	5.0
3	2	10.0
4	2	10.0
5	2	10.0
6	2	10.0
7	7	35.0
8	1	5.0
9	1	5.0
10	2	10.0
Total	20	100.0

Note: F: Frequency %: Percentages

Instructors

English instructors at Muğla University and Webhead ELT teachers from different parts of the world:

English Teachers

The teacher participants were teaching at Muğla University prep school and other departments. Before administrating the questionnaire, 65 English instructors at Muğla University were informed about the study and attended a workshop on language teaching Internet applications and were provided information CMC tools via e-mail.

60 of English instructors out of 65 responded to the questionnaire. Although all of the responding teachers had some computer experience, almost 70 % of them had little or no computer chat experience. Tables 4 and 5 give some information about the teacher participants.

Table 4

Teachers' Teaching Year of English

Teaching year of English	F	%
2	1	1.7
3	2	3.3
4	8	13.3
5	4	6.7
6	5	8.3
7	3	5.0
8	8	13.3
9	5	8.3
10	3	5.0
11	2	3.3
12	3	5.0
13	4	6.7
14	3	5.0
15	1	1.7
16	3	5.0
17	2	3.3
18	1	1.7
23	1	1.7
Total	59	98.3
Missing	1	1.7
Total	60	100.0

Note: F: Frequency %: Percentages

Table 5

Teachers' Gender

Gender	F	%
Male	15	25.0
Female	45	75.0
Total	60	100.0

Note: F: Frequency %: Percentages

Internationally experienced chat-using teachers: ELT Webheads

Webheads members are an online community called Webheads in Action.

Webheads in Action is a community of language teachers worldwide who has been meeting via CMC since January 2002. They explore Web communication tools and share the best ways of using them in their teaching practices, engage with students in

virtual classes, collaborate on projects, and participate in conferences. As a member of the community, I have experienced and contributed to a few online activities and have become a CMC enthusiast.

The Webhead participants interviewed are experienced in using CMC resources with their students. Interview data was gathered from 12 Webheads who are known as very active users of CMC voice-chat in ELT classes. Respondents were from USA, Brazil, Spain, Portugal, Syria, Colombia, Denmark, UAE, and Turkey.

Instruments

The data for this research was collected via two different questionnaires and open-ended interview questions.

Questionnaire for the Tourism Students at Muğla University

Prior to completion of the questionnaire, the participants were informed about the study and asked to sign an “informed consent” form for completing the questionnaire. In the first section of the questionnaire, all participants were requested to give personal information. The reason for this information was to plan an experimental study using CMC voice and text based chat. This personal information would be shared with international chat partners prior to carrying out a series of collaborative CMC projects with these partners. However, this plan had to be cancelled due to institutional and technical problems. This experimental study was then re-directed to the descriptive survey study. The researcher intends to conduct the experimental study with a similar design in the next year.

The student questionnaire was originally carried out to learn students’ perceptions about speaking in language learning and opinions about use of voice chat as a possible ELT activity. I decided that this student data would also be useful in

terms of the aims of the survey study, so these data are included in condensed form as part of the current study.

- a. The first section gave information about students' opinions about their own language skills and skill needs. There were four questions (with sub-questions), all requiring responses on Likert 1-5 point scales.
- b. Section two sampled students' opinions about the importance and role of speaking skills in language learning. There was one question (with six sub-questions), requiring responses on Likert 1-5 point scales.
- c. In section three, student computer use and attitudes towards the use of CMC voice / text chat were investigated. There were six questions (with sub-questions), requiring responses on Likert 1-5 point scales.

The Turkish versions of the questionnaire were given to two native speakers of Turkish who are also English instructors. They translated these back to English. After this process, necessary adjustments to the questions were made. (The student questionnaire is shown in full in App. C).

Questionnaire for the English Instructors at Muğla University

There are three sections in the questionnaire for Muğla teachers. The questions were created in a survey link and distributed to the teachers via their Internet email addresses.

- a. The first section gave information about computer availability, computer and Internet use of teachers at Muğla University. (There were six questions with sub-questions; the format was yes/no and Likert Scale responses)
- b. The second section questioned teachers' attitudes towards the possible use of CMC voice / text chat as instructional resource to improve students' speaking

- skill. (There was one question, with sub-questions, on possible uses and benefits of using CMC resources in ELT class. A second question, with sub-questions, was asked on perceived potential problems with use of CMC in ELT classes. Likert Scale responses were requested for all question items.)
- c. The third section contained 4 open-ended interview-type questions. The aim of these questions was to get more detailed data about teachers' expectations and comments in terms of using Internet resources in English language classes. (The teacher questionnaire is shown in full in App. E.)

Interview Questions for ELT Webheads

Three open-ended interview questions were created in a survey link and distributed to ELT Webheads via Internet. The purpose of the questions was;

- a. to define problems they experienced in teaching speaking in language teaching
- b. to gather data about their experience in using CMC voice chat as a resource in supporting speaking skills,
- c. to cite advantages and disadvantages they experienced in using CMC resources in language teaching

Responses to Muğla teacher questionnaires and Webhead Internet interviews were collected in 18 days.

Data Collection Procedure

On December 2, 2004, I sent a research study request to my administrator at Muğla University. I described an anticipated experimental study with another ELT class in a non-Turkish, international university. Arrangements were made through my own university and the participating university to initiate the experimental study. A student questionnaire was prepared in anticipation of beginning this study. Late in

my research leave, the study had to be cancelled due to institutional and technical problems, which could not quickly be overcome. This student questionnaire was then re-directed to serve as part of descriptive survey study.

By mid March, the teacher questionnaire was conducted with English instructors at Muğla University via an electronic survey link. Participants' e-mail addresses were provided between March 15 and March 17. The link which included the questionnaire and the interview questions was sent to e-mail addresses.

The reason for choosing to conduct the questionnaire by e-mail was in order to save time. Participants did not have to come together at a point in time or place. They could fill out the questionnaire whenever and wherever they wanted. The English teachers were informed that the questionnaire return date was April 18. I tried to make the questionnaire as user-friendly as possible, so the participants would have minimal problem in the process of completing and returning the survey.

By the end of March, interview questions were prepared to be distributed to the Webhead group address. The questions were designed again in the survey link. On April 1, the questions were posted to the ELT Webheads Yahoo group address with the information about the study and its expiry date.

I collected responses until April 18, 2005. I started entering the data using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) at the end of April.

Data Analysis

The data collected from two different questionnaires was statistically analyzed using SPSS version 11.5 except open-ended questions in the teachers' questionnaire. For the Likert-Scale questions, frequencies and percentages were

found. The responses given to open ended questions in the teachers' questionnaire were all noted, categorized and coded.

In order to analyze the data collected from the interviews with ELT Webheads, I read the e-mail returns. I highlighted the parts I found interesting and relevant to the study. A similar categorization and coding system was used as that for the Mugla teacher interview responses. This allowed comparisons in attitudes and expectations between inexperienced and experienced ELT teachers in CMC instructional use.

Conclusion

This chapter gives general information about the setting, participants, instruments and the procedures of the study. In the next chapter, the data analysis and the findings will be discussed.

CHAPTER IV: DATA ANALYSIS

Introduction

The study investigated the attitudes and perceptions about the use of computer-mediated communication in support of second language learning, especially in the speaking skills. This study involved three groups of respondents:

- a- students in EFL classes in Tourism Department of Muğla University
- b- teachers of EFL at Muğla University, without experience in EFL instruction using computer-mediated communication (-CMC teachers)
- c- International teachers experienced in use of in EFL instruction using computer-mediated communication (+ CMC teachers).

The answers to the following research questions were investigated in the study.

- 1- What are the Tourism students' opinions about relative usefulness and difficulty of mastering of the four language skills, particularly speaking?
- 2- What are the Tourism students' attitudes towards possibilities for using CMC international voice / text chat partnerships for improving their speaking ability?
- 3- What are the attitudes of Muğla teachers (who have no chat experience in educational settings) towards use of CMC international voice / text chat

partnerships as an instructional resource for developing their students' speaking ability?

4- What similarities and differences are there between the Tourism students' and Muğla teachers' computer use and their attitudes towards the use of CMC tools?

5- What are the internationally experienced chat-using teachers' perceptions in respect to advantages and disadvantages of using CMC tools, especially as instructional language teaching resources?

The results of the study will supply curriculum information as to how voice chat might be integrated into the school curriculum as an instructional activity involving Tourism students and L2 instructors at Muğla University.

Data Analysis Procedure

There are two different questionnaires and twelve interviews comprising the study. The researcher used the following order to analyze the data collected for the study:

1. Data gathered from students' questionnaire (twenty Tourism students at Muğla University)
2. Data gathered from teachers' questionnaire (sixty ELT teachers at Muğla University)
3. Data gathered from comparison of students' and teachers' attitudes and perceptions to investigate their differences and similarities
4. Data gathered from four open-ended questions from the Muğla teachers' questionnaire and from interviews with twelve international teachers (ELT Webheads)

All the questions in the questionnaire were analyzed using the Statistical

Packages for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 11.5, except the four open-ended questions in the last section of the teacher questionnaire. These four questions were analyzed through the categorization and coding of the responses. The researcher first analyzed the questionnaire calculating frequencies, percentages and means for each item in the questionnaire. I investigated whether there were any significant differences between the computer use experience of students and teachers and whether there were differences between the attitudes of students and teachers towards the EFL instructional use of CMC voice chat.

The e-mail interview data gathered from the experienced EFL CMC users (Webheads) considered responses:

- a. to define problems they experienced in teaching speaking in language teaching
- b. to gather data about their experience in using CMC voice chat as a resource in supporting speaking skills,
- c. to cite advantages and disadvantages they experienced in using CMC resources in language teaching

To compare student and teacher questionnaire responses, the results gathered from the analysis of the two questionnaires were analyzed by considering the three sections in the students' questionnaire and three sections in the teachers' questionnaire. These sections were:

For students:

- a- students' opinions about their own language skills
- b- students' opinions about the relative importance speaking in language learning

- c- students' computer use and students' attitudes towards the use of CMC voice / text chat in EFL classes

For teachers:

- a- computer availability, computer and Internet use
for teachers at Muğla University
- b- teachers' attitudes towards the use of CMC voice & text chat and
teachers' opinions about potential problem areas of computer use chat
facilities with their students
- c- four open-ended questions dealing with the issues detailed above in more
general terms

After the relevant issues in each questionnaire had been evaluated separately, a comparison was made between the results of students' and teachers' questionnaire responses in order to discover the similarities and differences in terms of their respective use of computers and their attitudes towards the use of CMC voice chat. The teachers' four open-ended question responses and the interview data gathered from 12 EFL chat experienced teachers from the Webheads online community were also analyzed jointly.

Data Gathered From Students' Questionnaire

For the data collected from the students' questionnaire, the researcher determined frequencies, percentages and means to the Likert-scale items for each response item. The results gathered from students' questionnaire were analyzed in three sections.

Section 1: Students' Opinions about Their Language Skills

The questions in section one of the questionnaire investigated students' opinions towards their language skills. There were four questions in this section. Question 1 aimed to investigate how the students would rate their writing, listening, reading, and speaking skills in general. In Table 6 means and standard deviations for this question are presented.

Table 6

Students' Opinions about Their Language Skill

Q1	N	M	Std.
Writing	20	4.35	0.87
Listening	20	3.40	0.99
Reading	20	3.05	0.82
Speaking	20	2.85	1.08
Total	20	3.41	0.94

Note: N: Number of students M: Mean Std.: Standard Deviation
Q 1: How would you rate your English?

The responses given to Q1 indicate that most students think that their writing skill (4, 35) rates first among the four skills. According to the means of the results, students rate their listening skill (3.40) as their second best skill, reading skill (3.05) as third, and speaking (2.85) as their least proficient skill. According to these results, students' speaking skill most needs to be improved.

The results of second question in section 1 are presented in Table 7. This question aimed to find out students' rating of their English classes in terms of usefulness.

Table 7

Students' Opinions about Their English Classes

Q2	N	M	Std.
Writing	20	4.00	0.72
Listening	20	3.25	1.25
Speaking	20	3.25	1.01
Reading	20	3.05	1.19
Total	20	3.38	1.04

Note: N: Number of students M: Mean Std.: Standard Deviation

Q 2: How would you rate your English classes in terms of usefulness?

According to the means of the results, instruction in writing was rated as best and instruction in reading was rated as least useful, with instruction in listening and speaking being rated as equal and in the mid-range.

The third question in section 1 aimed to investigate what English areas students would most like to improve. In Table 8 the results are displayed.

Table 8

Language Skills to Be Improved according to the Students

Item 3	N	M	Std.
Speaking	20	4.50	0.60*
Reading	20	3.95	0.94
Writing	20	3.90	0.96
Listening	20	3.85	1.22
Total	20	4.05	0.93

Note: N: Number of students M: Means Std.: Standard Deviations

* Significant at $p < .05$

Q 3: What English areas would you most like to improve?

According to the means of the results, students would most like to improve their speaking skill (4.50). Improvement of reading (3.95) writing (3.90) and listening skills (3.85) followed in that order. A two-tailed t – test comparison of means between the mean for speaking and the next nearest mean for writing, yields $t = 2.21$; $p < .05$. This indicates that students put a high priority on improving their

English speaking ability. To a lesser extent participants would also like to improve reading, writing, and listening skills as well as their speaking skill.

The results given in this question support the results in question 1. The participants said that they were weak in speaking in the first question and, in this question, which they would most like to improve their speaking skill.

The fourth question in section one investigated in what situations the students use English. The results are presented in Table 9.

Table 9

Areas That Students Use English

Q4	Never		Rarely		Average		Sometimes		Often		M
	F	%	F	%	F	%			F	%	
Q4a	7	35.0	7	35.0	3	15.0	3	15.0	0	00.0	2.10
Q4b	1	5.0	8	40.0	4	20.0	3	15.0	4	20.0	3.05
Q4c	1	5.0	3	15.0	0	00.0	5	25.0	11	55.0	4.10
Q4d	1	5.0	3	15.0	5	25.0	8	40.0	3	15.0	3.45
Q4e	3	15.0	3	15.0	1	5.0	10	50.0	3	15.0	3.35
Q4f	6	30.0	2	10.0	4	20.0	6	30.0	2	10.0	2.80

Note: F: Frequency %: Percentage M: Mean Number of students: 20
SD: Strongly Disagree D: Disagree U: Undecided A: Agree SA: Strongly Agree
Q 4: Where do you use English?
Q4a: Watching TV
Q4b: Watching movies
Q4c: Talking with foreign friends
Q4d: Reading
Q4e: Using computers to communicate
Q4f: Using computer to study

According to the table above 55 % of the students say that they often use English in talking with foreign friends and 25 % of the participants state that they sometimes use English in talking with foreign friends. The table also shows that 50 % of the participants sometimes employ English in using computers to communicate. For Q4a, the answers were equally distributed between the scales

never (35%) and rarely (35%). Thus, 70% of the students say that they never or rarely use English in watching TV. The researcher thinks that why so few of the students never or rarely use English in watching TV may arise from lack of English TV programs and difficulty of understanding the accents that actors speak on the few English TV programs broadcast. . A similar result can be seen in Q4b. 35% of the students sometimes or often watch English movies. However, 45% of the students rarely or never use English in watching movies. The researcher thinks that the same reasons mentioned for Q4a may apply to responses to Q4b. Another negative response given to Q4f indicated that 40 % of the students never or rarely use English with computers to study. It shows that students use English in computer applications but do not use computers to improve their language skills in language instruction.

Section 2: Students' Opinions about Speaking Skills in Language Learning

The question in section 1 of the students' questionnaire aimed to investigate students' opinions about speaking skills in language learning. The researcher further pursued this issue in the second section of the questionnaire. The results are displayed in Table 10.

Table 10

Students' Opinions about Speaking Skill

Q5	SD		D		U		A		SA		M
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	
Q5a	0	00.0	1	5.0	0	00.0	4	20.0	15	75.0	4.65
Q5b	0	00.0	1	5.0	6	30.0	8	40.0	5	25.0	3.85
Q5c	6	30.0	10	50.0	3	15.0	1	5.0	0	00.0	1.95
Q5d	0	00.0	0	00.0	3	15.0	11	55.0	6	30.0	4.15
Q5e	1	5.0	4	20.0	7	35.0	4	20.0	4	20.0	3.30
Q5f	0	00.0	0	00.0	2	10.0	12	60.0	6	30.0	4.20
Q5g	0	00.0	4	20.0	11	55.0	5	25.0	0	00.0	3.05

Note: F: Frequency %: Percentage M: Mean Number of students: 20

SD: Strongly Disagree D: Disagree U: Undecided A: Agree SA: Strongly Agree

Q5a: Speaking is the most important skill

Q5b: Speaking English is very difficult for me

Q5c: The activities in my English class give me opportunities to improve my speaking skills

Q5d: I am afraid of making mistakes

Q5e: I look forward to coming to my speaking class

Q5 f: I often feel anxious about answering a question in English class

Q5g: I like speaking in class

The responses given to Q5a indicate that most students think that speaking is the most important skill. The data collected from Q5c show that 80 % of the participants reported that the activities in their English class do not give them opportunities to improve their speaking skills. In addition, in Q5d and Q5f, most students state that they are afraid of making mistakes and often feel anxious about answering a question in English class. On the other hand, the answers given to Q5e indicate that 40 % students look forward to coming to their speaking class while 35 % of them were undecided about this issue. 90% of students are afraid of making mistakes or feel anxious about answering a question in class. In Q5g, about an equal number of students reported that they “agree” or “disagree” with the statement “I like speaking in class”.

Section 3: Students' Computer Use and Attitudes towards the Use of CMC Voice /

Text Chat

There were six questions in section 3 that aimed to find out what the participants' major computer uses and attitudes towards use of CMC voice / text chat in language instruction are.

The first question was composed of 8 items questioning students' computer uses. Table 11 presents answers to these questions.

Table 11

Students' Major Computer Uses

Q6	never		a few times a year		several times a month		once or twice a week		daily		M
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	
Q6a	3	15.0	7	35.0	3	15.0	5	25.0	2	10.0	2.80
Q6b	1	5.0	2	10.0	0	00.0	5	25.0	12	60.0	4.25
Q6c	3	15.0	5	25.0	2	10.0	5	25.0	5	25.0	3.20
Q6d	1	5.0	1	5.0	3	15.0	4	20.0	11	55.0	4.15
Q6e	1	5.0	1	5.0	0	00.0	4	20.0	14	70.0	4.45
Q6f	0	00.0	0	00.0	1	5.0	5	25.0	14	70.0	4.65
Q6g	3	15.0	3	15.0	4	20.0	1	5.0	9	45.0	3.50
Q6h	5	25.0	1	5.0	6	30.0	5	25.0	3	15.0	3.00

Note: F: Frequency %: Percentage M: Mean Number of students: 20

Question 6: If you computers, what are your major uses?

Q6a: problem solving

Q6b: word processing

Q6c: pictures and movies

Q6d: games and music

Q6e: e-mail

Q6f: WWW (Information, research)

Q6g: Internet chat groups

Q6h: power point

According to the mean scores, WWW (4.65) and e-mail (4.45) are the most used (daily) computer facilities by the students at Muğla University. The popularity of these uses is followed by word processing (Q6b). 60 % of the participants report

that they use word processing daily. The results show that 55 % of the students use computers daily to play games and play music (Q6d). The answers given to Q6g indicate that Internet chat groups are used daily by 45 % of the students, while only 15% of students say they never use Internet chat groups. Daily use of problem solving (Q6a) by the participants is the least used computer function with a 2.80 mean score. It is interesting to note that all 8 functions are used daily by some 44% of the students, indicating a frequent and diverse use of computers by Mugla students.

Questions 7, 8, 9 and 10 in section 3 are very similar and had similar sort of response patterns. The results of these questions are shown with the results from Q11 in Table 12

Table 12

Students' Attitudes towards the Use of CMC Voice / text Chat

	SD		D		U		A		SA		M
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	
Q7	1	5.00	0	00.0	2	10.0	4	20.0	13	65.0	4.40
Q8	0	00.0	0	00.0	1	5.0	8	40.0	11	55.0	4.50
Q9	0	00.0	0	00.0	2	10.0	5	25.0	13	65.0	4.55
Q10	0	00.0	0	00.0	2	10.0	7	35.0	11	35.0	5.55
Q11a	5	25.0	1	5.0	1	5.0	7	35.0	6	30.0	3.40
Q11b	4	20.0	3	15.0	4	20.0	6	30.0	3	15.0	3.05

Notes: F: Frequency %: Percentage M: Mean Number of students: 20

SD: Strongly Disagree D: Disagree U: Undecided A: Agree SA: Strongly Agree

Q 7: I believe communication technologies are useful for language learning

Q 8 International voice & text chat groups can be used to teach speaking to support my learning

Q 9: My speaking abilities can improve by using voice & text chat with international chat partners

Q 10 My interest and motivation to speaking in class can increase by using international Internet chat groups

Q11. If you are familiar with real-time chat:

11a: I use Turkish

11b: I use English

The overall mean scores to responses to Q7, Q8, Q9, and Q10, reveal that 85 % of students have positive perceptions about the use of voice chat with international partners and believe their speaking ability can improve by using it. The results also show that students think that their interest and motivation for speaking in class can be made more positive by communicating with international chat partners. However, in question 4f, 30 % of the students ticked the option “never” and 10 % of them ticked the option “rarely” for “using computers to study”. In this question, as elsewhere, “belief” was often stronger than application.

The purpose of question 11 in section three was to investigate whether students presently have national or international chat partners by looking at their chat language. This item is unfortunately ambiguous. I interpreted the results to mean that about 50 % of the respondents have international chat partners with whom they chat occasionally in English.

The next section of the chapter will present the results and findings gathered from teachers’ data.

Data Gathered From Teachers Questionnaire

For the data collected from the teacher questionnaire, the researcher found frequencies and percentages in order to report teachers’ computer and Internet use and their attitudes towards the use of CMC voice / text chat in language teaching to improve learners’ speaking skill. The results gathered from teachers’ questionnaire were analyzed in three sections. The first section gives information about computer availability for and computer and Internet use by teachers at Muğla University. In the second section, teachers’ attitudes towards the use of CMC voice / text chat as an instructional resource to improve students’ speaking skill is investigated. Section

three consists of analysis of the 4 open-ended questions investigating teachers' opinions about the teaching of speaking using Internet based CMC instruction.

Section 1: Teachers' Computer Availability, Computer and Internet Use

The questions in section one of the teachers' questionnaire investigated whether teachers use computers and the Internet, and if so, what they use them for. There were six questions.

Q1, Q2, Q3, Q4 in section one aimed to learn whether departments or institutions that English teachers work at provide computers for them and if they use the Internet. The options were "yes / no". The results are presented in Table 13.

Table 13

Computer Availability

	Q1 Provided		Q2 Office		Q3 Home		Q4 Internet	
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
yes	41	68.3	47	78.3	52	86.7	58	96.7
no	18	30.0	12	20.0	7	11.7	0	00.0
Total	59	98.3	59	98.3	59	98.3	58	96.7
M	1	1.7	1	1.7	1	1.7	2	3.3
Total	60	100.0	60	100.0	60	100.0	60	100.0

Note: F: Frequency %: Percentage M: Missing Total: Number of Teachers

Q1: Does your institution provide computers for you?

Q2: Do you have a computer in your office?

Q3: Do you have a computer at home?

Q4: Do you use Internet?

Table 13 summarizes the results of the teachers' responses for questions 1,2,3,4. The results for Q1 indicate that 68.3 % of the participants at Muğla University say that their institution or departments provide computers for teachers. Responses to Q2 show that 78.3 % of the teachers have computers in their offices. In addition most teachers (86.7 %) report that they have computers at home. It is also

seen that 96.7 % of the participants use the Internet.

Question 5 in section one consisted of four items, and identified purposes of Internet use of teachers at Muğla University. The options were “yes / no”. Table 18 provides information concerning purposes of Internet by the teachers.

Table 14

Personal and Professional Communication of Teachers at Mugla University

	Q5a		Q5b		Q5c		Q5d	
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
yes	54	90.0	50	83.3	58	96.7	39	65.0
no	0	00.0	2	3.3	0	00.0	14	23.3
Total	54	90.0	52	86.7	58	96.7	53	88.3
M	6	10.0	8	13.3	2	3.3	7	11.7
Total	60	100.0	60	100.0	60	100.0	60	100.0

Note: F: Frequency %: Percentage M: Missing Total: Number of Teachers

Q5: If you use Internet, do you use it for?

Q5a: Personal communication

Q5b: Professional communication

Q5c: Information

Q5d: Entertainment

Question 5 asked the participants to state what they use Internet for. Given the responses on Question 4, we assumed that 100% of the teachers used the Internet on a somewhat regular basis. According to the results of the responses indicated in table 18, teachers at Muğla University mainly use Internet for information (96.7 %). 90 % of them use the Internet for personal communication while 83.3 % of the participants use it for professional communication. Q5d “Entertainment” is the least used Internet facility, used by 65.0 % of the teachers.

Question 6 in section one investigated how often the teachers use computer resources. The question was composed of seven items with responses ranging from “never=1” to “daily=5”. The results are presented in Table 15.

Table 15

Purposes and Frequency of Computer Use of teachers

Q6	P	M	T	N		AFY		STM		OTW		D		M
				F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	
Q6a	60	3	57	1	1.7	2	3.3	4	6.7	7	11.7	43	71.7	4.56
Q6b	60	1	59	1	1.7	0	00.0	2	3.3	7	11.7	49	81.83	4.74
Q6c	60	7	53	21	35.0	12	20.0	8	13.3	6	10.0	6	10.0	2.32
Q6d	60	1	59	1	1.7	0	00.0	3	5.0	11	18.3	44	73.3	4.64
Q6e	60	2	58	28	46.0	12	20.0	4	6.7	5	8.3	9	15.0	2.22
Q6f	60	5	55	19	31.7	10	16.7	8	13.3	6	10.0	12	20.0	2.67
Q6g	60	2	58	5	8.3	9	15.0	14	23.3	11	18.3	19	31.7	3.51

Notes: P: Participant M: Missing F: frequency %: Percentage M: Mean
T: Total Number of Teachers

N: Never AFY: A few times a year STM: Several times a month OTW: Once or twice a week D: Daily

Question 6: What do you use computers for? Indicate your frequency of use

Q6a: Word processing

Q6b: E-mail

Q6c: Discussion list

Q6d: World Wide Web (www; information, search)

Q6e: Internet chat groups

Q6f: Use net newsgroups

Q6g: Electronic journals

According to the Table15 above, e-mail is the most used (daily) resource by teachers at Muğla University. 81.83 % of the teachers state that they use e-mail daily and another 11.7 % once or twice a week. This is followed by WWW (search, information) and word processing. 73.3 % of the participants use computers for WWW contact daily and 72 % of them say that they use computers daily for word processing. However, nearly 50 % of the teachers report that they never use Internet chat groups, and only 15 % of them use Internet chat daily. Interestingly, electronic journals are daily used by 32 % of the teachers, and 18 % of them state that they use electronic journals once or twice a week, whereas 32 % of the participants say that they never use net news groups. The table also indicates that 35 % of the teachers at Muğla University never use discussion lists. Thus, it is seen that e-mail, WWW,

word processing and electronic journals are the most used Internet resources (daily), and that newsgroups, discussion lists and Internet chat groups are the least used resources by the teachers at Muğla University.

Section 2: Teachers' Attitudes towards the Use of CMC Voice / Text Chat

There are two questions in section 2: question 7 and question 8. Question 7 aimed to investigate what the teachers think about CMC voice / text chat as an instructional resource to improve students' speaking skill. The question was composed of 11 items which include response scales ranging from "strongly disagree=1" to "strongly agree=5". The results are presented in table 16.

Table 16

Attitudes of Teachers towards the Use of CMC Voice / Text chat in LanguageInstruction

Q7	P	M	T	SD		D		U		A		SA		M
				F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%		%	
Q7a	60	4	56	1	1.7	0	00.0	1	1.7	22	36.7	32	53.3	4.50
Q7b	60	4	56	1	1.7	0	00.0	5	8.3	26	43.3	23	38.3	4.27
Q7c	60	4	56	1	1.7	0	20.0	11	26	24	40.0	20	33.3	4.10
Q7d	60	4	56	1	1.7	0	00.0	5	8.3	27	45.0	23	38.3	4.26
Q7e	60	4	56	1	1.7	0	00.0	8	13.3	23	38.3	24	40.0	4.23
Q7f	60	4	56	1	1.7	0	00.0	4	6.7	32	53.3	19	31.7	4.21
Q7g	60	4	56	1	1.7	1	1.7	4	6.7	19	31.7	31	51.7	4.29
Q7h	60	4	56	1	1.7	0	00.0	4	6.7	24	40.0	27	45.0	4.35
Q7j	60	4	56	1	1.7	1	1.7	7	11.7	19	31.7	28	46.7	4.28
Q7i	60	4	56	1	1.7	1	1.7	11	18.3	25	41.7	18	30.0	4.03
Q7k	60	4	56	1	1.7	2	3.3	14	23.3	20	33.3	19	31.7	3.96

Notes: P: Participants M: Missing T: Total F: frequency %: Percentage
M: Mean

SD: Strongly Disagree D: Disagree U: Undecided A: Agree

SA: Strongly Agree

Question item:

Q7a: I believe Internet technologies are useful for language learning.

Q7b: I should use the Internet in our department for teaching English language.

Q7c: I would like to teach some classes in the computer lab with Internet connection.

Q7d: The Internet can be used to teach listening to support students' learning.

Q7e: International voice & text chat groups can be used to teach speaking to support students' learning.

Q7f: Students' speaking abilities can improve by using voice & text chat with international partners

Q7g: Hearing the voice of English speaker can provide L2 students an authentic learning environment.

Q7h: Students' interest and motivation for speaking can increase by using international chat groups.

Q7i: Internet chat group participation can provide collaborative work on assignments.

Q7j: Practicing with international voice & text chat partners can make L2 learners feel comfortable in speaking.

Q7k: L2 learners can have high motivation and low anxiety for speaking after practicing a target language with chat partners.

Mean scores of the responses that were given to all items in question 7 were between 3.96 and 4.50, indicating that the teachers at Muğla University have positive attitudes about the use of communication technologies and voice chat in language

instruction. It is clear that an overwhelming majority of the teachers at Muğla University agree that chat can be used to improve learners' speaking skill. The most interesting result is that just 15 % of teachers reported that they use Internet chat groups daily (in Q6e), whereas most teachers believe that Internet chat possibilities are highly useful for language learning (Q7e, Q7f, Q7h, Q7i, Q7j, and Q7k).

The results also show that the "hesitation" areas for Muğla teachers are represented by the following questions: Q7c "I would like to teach some classes in the computer lab with Internet connection" (18.3% Undecided); Q7j "Practicing with international voice & text chat partners can make L2 learners feel comfortable in speaking." (18.3% Undecided); Q7k "L2 learners can have high motivation and low anxiety for speaking after practicing a target language with chat partners" (23.3% Undecided). One teacher strongly disagrees about any possible benefit deriving from Internet technologies or web-interactions.

The last question (Q8) of section 2 aimed to find out potential problem areas that teachers might confront in using Internet resources in language teaching. Question 8 includes 11 items ranging from "strongly disagree=1" to "strongly agree=5". Table 17 displays the results of the findings.

Table 17

Potential Problem Areas Foreseen by Teachers at Muğla University

Q8	P	M	T	SD		D		U		A		SA		M
				F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%		%	
Q8a	60	6	54	2	3.3	5	8.3	3	5.0	19	31.7	25	41.7	4.11
Q8b	60	6	54	4	6.7	7	11.7	4	6.7	19	31.7	20	33.3	3.81
Q8c	60	6	54	1	1.7	0	0.00	8	13.3	22	36.7	23	38.3	4.24
Q8d	60	6	54	1	1.7	4	6.7	6	10.0	26	43.3	17	28.3	4.00
Q8e	60	6	54	9	15.0	7	11.7	8	13.3	16	26.7	14	23.3	3.35
Q8f	60	6	54	7	11.7	5	8.3	2	3.3	20	33.3	20	33.3	3.51
Q8g	60	6	54	9	15.0	4	6.7	4	6.7	24	40.0	13	21.7	3.51
Q8h	60	8	52	1	1.17	5	8.3	7	11.7	25	41.7	14	23.3	3.88
Q8i	60	7	53	1	1.7	7	11.7	7	11.7	27	45.0	11	18.3	3.75
Q8j	60	6	54	1	1.7	5	8.3	13	21.7	19	26.7	16	26.7	3.81
Q8k	60	6	54	2	3.3	7	11.7	9	15.0	15	25.0	21	35.0	3.85

Notes: P: Participants M: Missing T: Total F: frequency %: Percentage

M: Mean

SD: Strongly Disagree D: Disagree U: Undecided A: Agree

SA: Strongly Agree

Question item: Potential problem areas for you in considering use of chat resources with your students.

Q8a: adequate access to computers

Q8b: maintain reliable connections to the Internet

Q8c: time to schedule chat sessions with international chat groups in ELT

Q8d: fitting chat sessions to the standard ELT curriculum

Q8e: my lack of familiarity with use of computer chat facilities

Q8f: teacher training in general use of computers in language teaching

Q8g: specific training for me in use of computers chat facilities, particularly real-time chat

Q8h: finding appropriate international students as chat partners for my students

Q8i: training students in use of chat facilities for language exchanges

Q8j: maintaining students' focus on ELT course goals while chatting with partners

Q8k: obtaining adequate support from administration for using computers in ELT

Table 17 shows the most problematic areas that the participants feel that they might face in using chat as an instructional resource. Teacher respondents were almost as concerned about potential problems with communication technologies and use of voice chat in language instruction as they were enthusiastic about its potential success (Q7). On average 63% of the teachers responding anticipated problems in all 11 areas investigated These ranged from (most problematic): time to schedule chat groups (4.24), adequate computer access (4.11), fitting “chat” to standard curriculum

(4.00), finding appropriate international chat partners (3.88), obtaining adequate administrative support (3.85), maintaining reliable connections to Internet (3.81), maintaining students' focus on ELT course goals while chatting with partners (3.81), training students in use of chat facilities for language exchanges (3.75), teacher training in general use of computers in language teaching 3.51), specific training for me in use of computers chat facilities (3.51) and my lack of familiarity with use of computer chat facilities (3.35).

In sum, the overall results of all items in Q8 are fairly similar with mean item scores between 3.35 and 4.24 indicating that teachers have concerns about a number of issues related to use of CMC in their classrooms.

Section 3 in the teachers' questionnaire presented open-ended questions. The aim of these questions was to get more detailed data about teachers' expectations and comments in respect to CMC Internet use in English language classes. However, the responses to these items as well as to responses to interview questions put to +CMC ELT Webheads were very similar, thus the researcher analyzed the responses of two groups together according to four categories. This analysis will be presented in the last section of this chapter.

The next section will give information about comparisons of students' and teachers' responses to their respective questionnaires.

Comparison of Data Gathered from Questionnaire of Students and Teachers for Computer Use and Attitudes towards CMC Voice / Text Chat

Eight items from the teachers' questionnaire and eight items from the students' questionnaire were compared to investigate similarities and differences of teachers and students in respect to computer use and in their attitudes about the EFL

use of CMC voice chat. These eight items had different orders of presentation in teachers' and students' questionnaires, though they were the same questions. Thus, the researcher gave different numbers for each item to present the results in Table18. The items Q1, Q2, Q3, and Q4 in table18 report how frequently students and teachers use computer and Internet resources in daily tasks. The items Q5, Q6, Q7 and Q8 in Table 18 present information about students' and teachers' attitudes towards the use of CMC voice chat in language instruction.

Table 18

Comparison of Computer use and Attitudes towards Use of CMC Voice Chat of Teachers and Students at Muğla University

	ST / T	N	Never		A few times a year		several times a month		once or twice a week		Daily		M
			F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	
Q1	S	20	1	5.0	2	10.0	0	00.0	5	25.0	12	60.0	4.25
	T	57	1	1.7	2	3.3	4	6.7	7	11.7	43	71.7	4.56
Q2	S	20	1	5.0	1	5.0	0	00.0	4	20.0	14	70.0	4.45
	T	59	1	1.7	0	00.0	2	3.3	7	11.7	49	81.8	4.74
Q3	S	20	0	00.0	0	00.0	1	5.0	5	25.0	14	70.0	4.65
	T	59	1	1.7	0	00.0	3	5.0	11	18.3	44	73.3	4.64
Q4	S	20	3	15.0	3	15.0	4	20.0	1	5.0	9	45.0	3.50*
	T	58	8	46.0	12	20.0	4	6.7	5	8.3	9	15.0	2.22

	ST / T	N	Strongly Disag.		Disagree		Undecided		Agree		Str. Agree		M
			F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	
Q5	S	20	1	5.0	0	00.0	2	10.0	4	20.0	13	65.0	4,40
	T	56	1	1.7	0	00.0	1	1.7	22	36.7	32	53.3	4,50
Q6	S	20	0	00.0	0	00.0	1	5.0	8	40.0	11	55.0	4,50
	T	56	1	1.7	0	00.0	8	13.3	23	38.3	24	40.0	4,23
Q7	S	20	0	00.0	0	00.0	2	10.0	5	25.0	13	65.0	4,55
	T	56	1	1.7	0	00.0	4	6.7	32	53.3	19	31.7	4,21
Q8	S	20	0	00.0	0	00.0	2	10.0	7	35.0	7	35.0	4,45
	T	56	1	1.7	0	00.0	4	6.7	24	40.0	27	45.0	4,35

Notes: ST/T= S: Students T: Teachers N: participant numbers F: Frequency
 %: Percentage M: Mean * $p < .05$

Q1: word processing

Q2: e-mail

Q3: WWW (Information, research)

Q4: Internet chat groups

Q5: I believe communication technologies are useful for language learning

Q6: International voice & text chat groups can be used to teach speaking to support my (students') learning.

Q7: My (Students') speaking abilities can improve by using voice & text chat with international chat partners

Q8: My (Students') interest and motivation for speaking in class can increase by using international Internet chat groups

According to the mean scores there was no significant difference between students' and teachers' responses except in respect to Q4. This question dealt with

frequencies of use of Internet for chat groups. The student mean was 3.50 (frequently); the teachers mean was 2.22 (rarely), the mean difference was 1.28, significant at $p < .05$. The responses given to Q1, Q2, Q3 and Q4 indicate that e-mail is the most used computer resource both by teachers and students. The results indicate that 70 % of the students and 81.8 % of the teachers use e-mail daily. 73.3 % of the teachers and 70 % of the students use the computer for WWW (Q3) daily. Additionally, 72 % of the teachers and 60 % of the students say that they use computer daily for word processing (Q1). Overall results for Q1, Q2, Q3 and Q4 indicate that e-mail is the most used and Internet chat is the least used Internet resource by both teachers and students.

Table 18 also shows the responses given to items (Q5, Q6, Q7, Q8) that investigate students' and teachers' attitudes towards the use of CMC voice chat in language instruction. The responses indicate that most students and teachers generally have positive attitudes towards the use of CMC voice / text chat in supporting speaking skill in language instruction. The next section will give information about the four open-ended questions (Muğla Teachers) and the interview responses (Webheads).

Data Gathered from Four Open-ended Questions (Muğla Teachers) and Interview Responses (Webheads Teachers)

Both responses of Muğla teachers and ELT Webhead teachers generally fell into one of four categories. As well, these responses tended to be positively directed to CMC potential value (positive aspect) or negatively directed towards CMC potential problems (negative aspect). The responses thus fell into one of 8 cells formed by the four categories on one axis and whether these responses were positive

(+) or negative (-) on the other axis. Responses given to open-ended questions by Muğla teachers and responses given to interview questions by ELT Webheads were analyzed jointly using the categories discussed above. These four categories of response were:

- a. Administrative Considerations (A+ or A-)
- b. Technical Considerations (T+ or T-)
- c. Pedagogical Considerations (P+ or P-)
- d. Interactional Considerations (I+ or I-)

The open-ended question section for Muğla teachers was composed of four questions. These were:

1. I would welcome any additional comments you would like to make
(replied to by 16 out of 60 Mugla ELT teachers).
2. Do you think the Internet resources such as WWW, e-mail, electronic discussion groups, Internet chat groups, and so forth, can add enough to classroom English language learning to justify their expenses? (replied to by 34 out of 60 Mugla ELT teachers).
3. What are your future expectations for the use of Internet resources in language learning and teaching, particularly in speaking skills? (replied to by 35 out of 60 Mugla ELT teachers).
4. Please add any comment you may have about Internet voice chat technology for supporting speaking skills (replied to by 25 out of 60 Mugla ELT teachers).

The interviews with ELT Webheads consisted of three general questions.

These were:

“What do you think are the most important issues ESL / EFL teachers face in teaching speaking?”

“What is the role of using voice & text based chat in teaching speaking?”

“What are the advantages and disadvantages of using real-time voice chat in terms of teaching speaking?”

A sample set of responses from both Mugla teachers and Webheads is shown in the Table 19. Further commentary and examples of responses in these categories are given in the text following the table.

Table 19

Negative and Positive Aspects of EFL CMC Voice Chat according to ELT Teachers at Muğla University and ELT Webheads

ADMINISTRATIVE (+)	ADMINISTRATIVE (-)
...MOE in Turkey has started to provide laptop computers for teachers with less money and free Internet access...would create opportunities for ELT teachers to use Internet, web, chat and discussion groups for teaching English (MT)	...our university administration is quite unwilling as well as clumsy to offer any adequate support in the area. (MT)
PEDAGOGICAL (+)	PEDAGOGICAL (-)
The use of voice mail and other tools as text to speech, help the 2L learning to fix and practice the speaking and listening (MT), (WH)	...covering the goals and objectives may be a bit difficult. (MT) Must cover a place in the curriculum (MT)
INTERACTIONAL (+)	INTERACTIONAL (-)
Students are thrilled to communicate with another person in English over the Internet. (WH) Real time webcam and voice chats will make students be familiar with native speakers and even different accents (MT)	...maintenance of such a contact with foreign partners abroad. what if the other party fails to communicate with our students or gives up the connection altogether...frustration for our learners (MT) I'm not sure about the effects on real f2f situations (WH)
TECHNICAL (+)	TECHNICAL (-)
Internet is in the future of all areas of teaching (MT) In the near future, the education will be based on computer and the students will sit at home and do their courses (MT), (WH)	Internet connection slowly, computer crash, virus and bugs of software (WH) Less than ideal interface, bandwidth issues (WH)

MT = Mugla Teachers (-CMC experience) WH = Webheads (+CMC experience)
MOE= Ministry of Education

I first consider in more detail, positive aspects (advantages) of EFL CMC use as commented on by both Muğla Teachers and ELT Webhead teachers. Comments on the negative aspects (disadvantages) of EFL CMC use will be presented in the following section.

Positive Aspects of Using CMC Tools in Language Instruction

Administrative Considerations (A+).

Some teachers from Muğla University stated that Ministry of Education has started to provide laptop computers for teachers with less money and free Internet access. This may enable ELT teachers to be more familiar with use Internet, web, chat and discussion groups for teaching English.

“Because supporting the language learning with Int.resources is going to be helpful, beneficial for the students, they can add enough to classroom ELL to justify their expense.” (MT)

MOE in Turkey has started to provide laptop computers for teachers with less money and free Internet access... (MT)

Technical Considerations (T+).

Muğla and Webheads teachers gave their ideas about technical considerations, pointing out that voice chat is cost-effective, and students can interact with the appropriate speed which is needed in real life-like oral communication.

“I think nowadays the computerized English teaching is indispensable. the fastest, cheapest and most effective way to teach and learn English in the shortest time possible.” (MT)

“Trying to get that spontaneity that students need to be able to speak and interact with the right speed.” (WH)

Besides, our learners are all efficient users of the computer and Internet facilities so they will feel more self-confident in actively participating in their own learning process.” (MT)

Teachers from Muğla talked about the future of Internet facilities in language instruction. They believe that using computers with Internet connections will be very common in language instruction and will be useful for students to improve speaking:

“Internet is in the future of all areas of teaching” (MT)

“All the students will have had their computers personally with Internet-free of charge and so all the pupils will have been familiar with such kind of studies, in the very near future. Therefore we won't have to worry about it.”

(MT)

“in the near future, the education will be based on computer and the students will sit at home and do their courses. Especially y in terms of speaking it will provide the environment they have been looking for.” (MT)

“I hope that one day there will be enough facilities in public universities to make use of these resources” (MT)

Pedagogical Considerations (P+).

Teachers stated that students could be exposed to a variety of dialects and accents in the target language and have opportunities to develop language spontaneity. They said that chat has pedagogical benefits for speaking. Students who are not courageous in speaking in class like having a computer screen as a shield. CMC prevents the psychological restrictions of f2f interaction in a class environment. Students can freely communicate without being worried about being corrected by teachers:

“It can solve some problems: having a screen as a shield can help you overcome the fear / anxiety you might feel when you have to talk to an audience. In this context you aren't actually face to face with the rest of the class and it brings you some comfort.” (WH)

“Ss are not in a f2f interaction, so their affective filter might lower, they produce more, which results in real and meaningful communication.”(WH)

“I have never tried utilizing these facilities in my classes, but I think it could be helpful for students in improving their listening and speaking skills. Above all, I believe such facilities can lower student anxiety especially towards speaking in English.” (MT)

One of the teachers cited an experience related to improvement of one student's speaking skill:

“One of my students had some difficulties at learning English at the beginning of the academic year. He couldn't understand and of course he couldn't speak .We never expected him to speak English because he didn't understand even the easiest things. But later he improved his English and the improvement was incredibly noticeable. I asked him how he succeeded. He

told me he chatted with some international friends and he also studied regularly. I think chatting has an important role and it is a good example I have observed”. (MT)

Some interviewees stated that students share their knowledge, get specific information in chat activities, and they also negotiate meaning as they collaboratively work on an assignment. This is very significant in respect to the literature of this study. CMC tools can provide students with work in collaboration with their partners. Thus, they do feel more comfortable with their chat partners than with their teachers, so learning a language may more easily occur:

“I believe it enables students to be more motivated for speaking. It is a fun also, speaking and hearing English speakers can encourage them. They can share their knowledge, collaboratively study on an assignment.” (WH)

“Real communication. Students have a conversation with another person or people to find out specific information.” (WH)

“Using computers in ELT can be useful for students. It is a good alternative and students can be motivated in an easy way. Sometimes course books, hand-outs or worksheets demotivate students during the lessons. Using computers, doing chat with international chat partners can encourage students to use the language (English); in other words, they feel freer to speak and share their ideas without so much pressure on them. Students would also feel safe when they communicate with their international chat partners because their relationship among themselves is more intimate. It is a kind of collaborative learning.” (MT)

“I believe being exposed to the language in its native-speaking environment is a great contribution to improving one's language abilities, particularly in speaking and pronunciation. If the students can't go abroad, then the Internet can bring the world to them. Internet voice chat can help students to be exposed to and use the language in a native-like environment.” (MT)

Teachers' evaluation of voice chat in its pedagogical value also involves motivational factors. Respondents stated that real-time voice chat inspires motivation and confidence in students' speaking and so improves their speaking skills.

“In general, I think that it can be a wonderful motivating tool and gives students the opportunity to practice with peers as well as with NS of English. I think that chat can be considered "authentic speech".” (WH)

“All the Internet resources mentioned above might be effective factors to motivate the students, and attract their attention to the practicality of English. By using them, they might realize that English is not just limited with their books that they use in the classrooms. In order to change this (negative) attitude of the sts, using such things are worth trying in ELT classes in Turkey” (MT)

“When I first learned about it, I thought that it wouldn't be practical in our conditions. However, at the moment I believe its effectiveness in improving sts' listening and speaking skills and motivations.” (MT)

Participant teachers also mentioned the importance of purpose of CMC tools in the curriculum and necessary training for both students and teachers:

“As long as they are used with a purpose and both students and teachers are made aware of this purpose, they can be useful for language learning.”(MT)

“Firstly, we as instructors should get used to this type of communication in some chat or support groups about our professional area as an initial pilot study. We might cooperate with some foreign universities for this aim. Training or guiding both teachers and students might be helpful. Why not setting some kind of "computer based language classes" first? Many schools do not have any language or computer labs, though...” (MT)

“Must cover a place in the curriculum.” (MT)

Interactional Considerations (I+).

According to the teachers, the critical elements of verbal interaction can be observed in voice / text chat communication. Real-time voice chat encourages authentic conversation similar to f2f oral communication in which use of target language occurs.

“Real communication. Students have a conversation with another person or people to find out specific information.” (WH)

“Access to instant communication and interaction” (MT)

“Helps students communicate in authentic and truly communicative situations” (WH)

“Absolutely yes. Because creating authentic learning circumstances is of great importance for the students. They have to feel that the English they are learning worth learning and it works” (MT)

“The Internet environment will provide a medium in which our learners will be able to use the foreign language in a "natural" context.”(MT)

“I would like my institution to support voice chat activities in speaking classes. I believe it will be more useful than regular speaking courses since it is being authentic and livelier. In addition, voice chat may comfort students in the way it provides a real connection between students and native speakers.” (MT)

“Provide more authenticity and variety, more Internet-based lesson plans for speaking lessons” (MT)

Most teachers pointed out that students have opportunities for listening practice with international EFL peers as well as with native speakers of English. Learning a language requires communication and interaction. These teachers added that practicing with peers make students more interactive; sometimes several people can participate in a conversation at a time:

“I think that a principal role is making the way of learning more interactive and more people can participate. So the learning democratizations are the great role of using voce/text and video chat as instructional tool to improve speaking...” (WH)

“Learners can have the opportunity to practice a variety of language used by native speakers or non-native speakers of English” (MT)

“Real time webcam & voice chats will make students familiar with native speakers & even different accents of 2nd language speakers.” (WH)

Teachers at different universities can contact and have their students contact other language learners at other universities.” (MT)

“Learners will get the opportunities to hear the different Englishes spoken by the people from all the four corners of the world. They will get more and more self-confident to communicate orally.” (MT)

Teachers focused on the cultural role of real-time voice chat with international partners, regarding both pedagogical and interactional effects on speaking. Speaking with international partners provides an opportunity to explore

different cultures. It is useful for learning social skills. Improved social skills make students more interactive and communicative, and these are significant in improving speaking in both target and native languages.

“Learners will learn not only L2 but also its culture, which is crucial in learning.” (MT)

“Fast, cheap and best way to improve it penetrating deeply into its very culture.” (WH)

Muğla teachers and ELT Webhead teachers also emphasized disadvantages as well as advantages of using CMC voice / text chat in language instruction. Next I present some sample comments gathered from both Muğla ELT teachers and ELT Webheads detailing potential problems in using real-time voice chat in language classes.

Negative Aspects of Using CMC Tools in Language Instruction

Administrative Considerations (A-).

Some teachers at Muğla University stated that obtaining support from administrators is very critical issue for teachers as well as computer availability in schools

“Unfortunately our university administration is quite unwilling as well as clumsy to offer any adequate support in the area.” (MT)

“school administrations should support the Internet facilities over the institution” (MT)

“if my home institute provide me with the access to Internet, that would be awesome, the present situation is good enough but as I said I can't use Internet as the way I would like to” (MT)

Technical Considerations (T-).

In responses given to the interview and open-ended questions, most of the teachers had comments about the technical problems of using CMC Internet resources. Access to computer and Internet, instant Internet connections and

computer crash were predicted as problems that they might face or have already experienced in using communication technologies.

“I think it is a great idea to use computers in speaking classes, but as stated above the Internet access may be a problem for so many students in prep schools...” (MT)

“I believe that it will be of great help and support for all skills and, especially speaking skill, but overcoming the technical problems will be time consuming. However, it should be studied on and tried in every opportunity. (MT)

“In speaking skill (listening, too) I hope to use your experiment, that is voice chat, in my speaking classes. The aim under is to be able to show my students that they can really communicate if they try and pay attention to it. However, the basic expectation of mine is the access for Internet for each student in the classroom. There are labs at schools, but once a month lab session would not be effective as we expect.” (MT)

“Today there are some free software that increasing the voice chat communication. But some people until use the dial up connection and this is cause one delay in voice communication. These are a big problem. I think it is necessary the integration of keyboard and voice chat, and share file and presentation tools. If Internet is slowly the using of these tools is a problem. Other problems are when broke the connection or there is a bug or virus using all memory of computer. Crash is one Big problem” (MT)

“...less than ideal interface bandwidth issues.” (WH)

“...Internet connection slowly, computer crash, virus and bugs of software.” (WH)

“...though technology offers more useful ways in dealing with computer, there are still some problems in providing reliable connections, understanding voice...” (WH)

“We do not have adequate computer facilities in our department to support the extensive use of computers in language teaching. However, if facilities were available, I would very much like to spare some time each week to engage students in such an experience.” (MT)

“yes they can, however the language programs sometimes lack these facilities.” (MT)

“...and fewer people will have the equipment.” (WH)

Pedagogical Considerations (P-).

Teachers also gave some disadvantages in respect to pedagogical issues. A few teachers stated that they did not observe / or might not experience any improvement in speaking by using real-time text chat.

“Students use only daily language while chatting.. And mainly short forms of words.. no grammar or no structure or no tense at all.. So it doesn’t add the skill a lot...” (MT)

“...Speaking adds some to writing skills but not so much as writing text. Conversely--writing does not add much to speaking skills.” (WH)

Other teachers, especially from Muğla University, pointed out that objectives and goals of the Internet activities have to be well planned and determined in school curriculum:

“All the curriculum of speaking- listening lessons can not be based on this method since monitoring it might be difficult, but I'm firmly convinced that it can strongly contribute to language learning as supplementary source if scheduled, planned or supported well. Finding the correct sites and cooperating with them efficiently is also an important issue...” (MT)

“I haven't thought of it before. But it is obvious that it requires pre planning and good structuring before it is implemented. Most of the teachers and students use Internet but using Internet for language learning requires more careful planning.” (MT) P

“Probably. It depends on how the teacher exploits this kind of a task.” (MT)

“Unless they are not used for other irrelevant purposes, aims can be achieved.” (MT)

“...Also, covering the goals and objectives may be a bit difficult” (MT)

Some teachers wrote that students and teachers should be trained as to CMC purposes, otherwise lack of training may cause a problem and can create a negative attitude on the part of students and teachers.

“why not! I would say, what you suggest requires a change in the whole system, so would be quite difficult to establish in most terms (syllabus,

teacher training, purchase of new computer, etc, which sounds quite challenging...” (MT)

“When it is structured and designed in accordance with the objectives of the institution, they can be quite useful for both the teachers and students. However, training is a must for the teachers and the students.” (MT)

“Programs must be developed and pioneered by different institutions, maybe in that way people can see how effective can using Internet resources be in language learning and teaching.” (MT)

“I'm sorry. I haven't been following any technological improvements about it for along time.” (MT)

“Students should be introduced at the beginning of semester and trained if necessary.” (MT)

“...if their own teacher has not developed some personal user experience, this project may suffer from stressful situations deriving from technical anxiety.” (WH)

A few teachers talked negatively about motivational aspects of using

CMC tools:

“...It can, on the other hand, discourage some students to the same, as they may not find this method attractive or are not familiar with computers.” (WH)

“...CMC tools for speaking may be intimidating for some students who don't feel comfortable in front of a mike, especially knowing that their conversation will be recorded...” (WH)

A few teachers also said that chat with international partners can only be an additional activity to support speaking regular course instruction. ..

“I don't think students can benefit from these Internet facilities in the academic context, in fact in the context we want them to be at. Therefore, these activities can be additional, elective courses which students may prefer to stay after class and volunteer in self-development in an enjoyable way.” (MT)

Interactional Considerations (I-).

Additionally, teachers from both groups mentioned the organizational and monitoring problems, pointing out the difficulties of finding appropriate partners and

working with them cooperatively, fixing time with partners' class time for communicating on the computers, matching students' English levels in both classes, and matching equal numbers of students in two classes. I can confirm this negative aspect of using CMC tools, due to the fact I experienced some problems in finding an appropriate partner class, fixing times with the partner class and matching equal numbers of students in two classes. Partially because of these problems, the partner class quit the project, and I was not able to quickly replace the original partner class with another partner class.

“Another issue can be the maintenance of such a contact with foreign partners abroad--what if the other party fails to communicate with our students or gives up the connection altogether--would that be a frustration for our learners?” (MT)

“...students are thrilled to communicate with another person in English over the Internet.” (WH)

“...except technical problems, finding intercultural class partners, fixing time and matching students' numbers-levels, authentic tasks are highly required to be emphasized in an online intercultural chat project. But its' advantages more than disadvantages.” (WH)

A few teachers focused on variability of accents in chat language. They stated that non-standard English in chat may cause a problem in students' acquisition of speaking, whereas others believed that different accents or dialects are beneficial in terms of hearing natural voices:

“Reliability is very important. There are lots of people speaking English all around the world, so for this kind of study we need native speakers or at least some kind of standardization.” (MT)

“Improved fluency will often lead to "fossilization" of pronunciation errors, even though students will become communicatively adept. Speaking may also mean more formal presentation styles of communication, rather than pronunciation or informal fluency. CMC tools are especially appropriate for practicing presentation styles, as a record may be made of the live performance for later study.” (WH)

A few teachers pointed out the problem of scale in student numbers:

“In fact your questionnaire is quite detailed and there's nothing to add but I'd just like to mention the fact that written or voice chat is a great idea in theory but I can't imagine how it could be put in practice esp. in prep classes where there's a great number of students”.(MT)

“...Video adds nonverbal but few people at a time can be in the chat...”
(WH)

One of the interviewees stated that finding authentic tasks and projects were a problem for him / her while using CMC tools in language learning. Meanwhile, three of ELT Webhead teachers did not identify any disadvantages of real-time chat technology.

The first interview question put to Webheads was “What do you think are the most important issues ESL / EFL teachers face in teaching speaking?” Responses to this question were separately analyzed. However, the responses given to this question were again analyzed according to the four categories used for open-ended questions and other interview questions.

Most of the interviewees pointed out that they faced pedagogical and interactional problems in teaching speaking. They said that students do not feel comfortable with speaking; they are shy and afraid of speaking in front of class. Learners generally do not volunteer to speak in order to not to make grammatical mistakes. This leads to lack of self-confidence; as a result they do not feel motivated to speak in class.

The interviewees also talked about some pedagogical problems as important issues. For instance, they gave other reasons why students do not feel motivated to speak in class. First, one in three teachers stated that students lack practice of

everyday use of English language. Second, teachers mostly try to teach pronunciation or accurate language before fluent language, such as might be met with in f2f conversation in real-life. Third, course book tasks are not sufficiently interesting to motivate students to speak using these tasks in class activities. Two interviewees maintained that one of the important issues or problems in teaching speaking is teacher-dominated instruction. They also claimed that students are trained in a foreign language just to be tested in this language. One teacher stated that some non-native teachers of English are not satisfied with their own speaking skills. They prefer to speak their native language in class. So students are not familiar with hearing spoken English if they have no native teachers or English-speaking friends. This may result in lack of practice or lack of opportunity to practice.

“Overcoming shyness or fear of making a mistake in speaking”

“Students are often hesitant to open their mouth in the classroom when they feel shy and are afraid of using bad grammar, worry about a small vocabulary or simply do not like to stand up and present in front of class mates. They also may have only little experience.”

“First, getting students to feel motivated to speak and then confident to discuss a given topic in class and online with a guest, for example with listening to an international English accent.”

“Lack of opportunity to practice, teacher centered classes, teaching to the test--national test usually do not require speaking; NNS teachers sometimes doubt their speaking skills.”

The researcher found that many of the problems listed in response to the fixed interview question “What do you think are the most important issues ESL / EFL teachers face in teaching speaking?” had at least partial answers in advantages listed as responses to the third question. Briefly, it seems that many of the problems listed as responses to this first question might be solved with real-time voice chat with intercultural partners.

The next conclusion section completes the discussion of data analysis.

Conclusion

This chapter presented the data analysis of students' and teachers' questionnaires. Student opinions about speaking in language, summaries of students' and teachers' types of computer use, and students' and teachers' opinions and attitudes towards the use of real-time text and voice chat to improve speaking skills were presented. The chapter also discussed questionnaire responses in respect to potential problems foreseen by teachers at Muğla University considering use of computer EFL chat applications. Finally, open-ended questionnaire responses from Mugla teachers and e-mail responses from Webhead teacher interviews were jointly analyzed and summarized. The next chapter will discuss these results and present pedagogical implications, limitations of the study and suggestions for further research.

CHAPTER V: CONCLUSION

Overview of the Study

The study investigated attitudes towards the use of computer-mediated communication in support of second language learning, especially in support of speaking skills. The attitude studies involved three groups of respondents:

- a- 20 students in EFL classes in the Tourism department of Muğla University
- b- 60 teachers of EFL at Muğla University, without experience in EFL instruction using computer-mediated communication (-CMC teachers)
- c- 12 international teachers (Webhead people) experienced in use of in EFL instruction using computer-mediated communication (+ CMC teachers)

In this study, to collect data, two separate questionnaires and interviews were employed. The first questionnaire was conducted with students in the Mugla Tourism Department to learn students' ideas about their language skills, students' opinions about the speaking skill in language learning, students' computer use and their attitudes towards the use of CMC voice / text chat.

The second questionnaire was distributed to Muğla teachers by e-mail to investigate computer access for teachers and their computer and Internet use, their attitudes towards use of CMC voice and text chat, and potential problem areas they

foresee in computer use of chat facilities with their students. The questionnaire concluded with four open-ended questions addressed to the teachers of speaking.

I considered that insights from chat-experienced teachers would be useful for Muğla teachers considering CMC applications for Tourism students. In order to gain these insights, the researcher interviewed 12 international English instructors by e-mail from an online Internet community called Webheads

The research questions answered by the study were as follows:

- 1- What are the Tourism students' perceptions about the relative usefulness and difficulty of mastering of the four language skills, particularly speaking?
- 2- What are the Tourism students' opinions about possibilities for using CMC international voice / text chat partnerships for improving their speaking ability?
- 3- What are the opinions of Muğla teachers (who have no chat experience in educational settings) about use of CMC international voice / text chat partnerships as instructional resources for developing their students' speaking ability?
- 4- What similarities and differences are there between the Tourism students' and Muğla teachers' in their computer use and their attitudes towards the use of CMC tools.
- 5- What are the perceptions of internationally experienced chat-using teachers in respect to advantages and disadvantages of using CMC tools as instructional language teaching resources?

To answer these questions, the data were analyzed in four parts:

1. Data gathered from students' questionnaire (twenty Tourism students at Muğla University)

2. Data gathered from teachers' questionnaire (sixty ELT teachers at Muğla University)
3. Data gathered from comparison of students' and teachers' questionnaire responses to investigate differences and similarities in their responses
4. Data gathered from four open-ended questions in Muğla teachers' questionnaire and data gathered from email interviews with twelve international teachers (ELT Webheads)

This chapter will present and discuss the findings and implications drawn from the results of data analysis in relationship to the literature. After presenting and discussing the findings, pedagogical implications and limitations of the study will be clarified. Drawing conclusions from the study, suggestions for further research will be made. Finally, the major findings of the study will be summarized.

Discussion of the Results

The main purpose of this study was to find out how Tourism students and ELT teachers at Muğla University would accept CMC voice / text chat used as an instructional resource to support students' speaking skills. To answer this question, I will first review the results found in sub-sections of this study. To do this, the findings of the data analysis in Chapter IV are discussed in four subsequent sections. The sections below aim to summarize the findings that addressed the five research questions in the study.

Data Gathered from Students' Questionnaire

The students' questionnaire was designed to explore students' opinions about their own language skills (section1), their opinions about their own speaking skill in

language learning (section 2) and their computer use and perceptions about the use of CMC voice / text chat (section 3).

The results in section 1 indicated that students report that they are not good at speaking and that their speaking skills need to be improved. The responses given to the item questioning students' rating of their English classes in terms of usefulness showed that English classes are most useful in teaching writing. Listening and speaking instruction is considered next most useful. Reading instruction was considered to be the least useful skill focus in the Tourism Department classes.

The results in section 1 also show that students put highest priority on improving their speaking skill. Students' choice here for speaking skill improvement is significantly greater than that for the next nearest skill – reading. Students also reported that they often use English in talking with their foreign friends, however relatively few students use English regularly in using computer capacities in their studies. This result suggests that students do not use (or think of using) computers to improve their language skills. Other negative responses were made in regards to watching English movies and watching TV in English. The researcher thinks that why so few of the students rarely use English in watching TV or movies may arise from difficulty of understanding the accents that the actors / speakers speak or lack of access to English language TV or movies.

The findings gathered from section 2 in the students' questionnaire contain students' opinions about their speaking skill in language learning. Students think that speaking is the most important skill. Tourism students would most like to improve their speaking skills. Though some like speaking in class, they do not speak freely in order not to make mistakes in front of their friends and teachers. They also do not

think class instruction is particularly useful in improving their speaking ability. The findings of the questions in section 1 and section 2 directly refer to the first research question of the study.

Section 3 investigated students' computer use and their opinions about the use of CMC voice / text chat. The results of the first item in section 3 indicated that most used computer facilities for students ranked (highest to lowest) from WWW (information, research), e-mail, word processing, games and music, Internet chat groups, pictures and movies, Power Point and problem solving. Other findings indicate that most students believe that communication technologies are useful for language learning. However, many of the students previously indicated that the "never" or "rarely" used English on computers to study. This perhaps suggests that students recognize the potential for computer communication in language learning but rarely use that technology presently. Findings also suggest that most students were familiar with Internet chat and use it "sometimes" to "daily". However, students' uses of chat facilities did not seem to be "instructional" or contribute to their language learning. The responses given to the Q4 in students' questionnaire indicated that students use English in computers to communicate, but they rarely or never use English in computers to study. The researcher thinks that most students may be familiar with using computer and Internet resources, but do not think of using these resources to support their language learning. They need to be aware of these skills improvement aspects of computer communication, and they need to be trained on how to use these resources effectively in language learning.

The responses given to the items questioning students attitudes about CMC voice / text chat revealed that students have positive attitudes towards the use of

voice chat with international partners and believe their ability, motivation and willingness to speak can improve by using it. This seems to parallel findings in the literature. Many researchers have stated that voice / text chat might be beneficial in improving students' speaking skills (Chun, 1994; Kern, 1995; Negretti, 1999; Pelletier, 2000; Sotillo, 2000; Waschauer, 1996). Some of the researchers had chances to observe this improvement in L2 learners' speaking (e.g. Hudson and Bruckman, 2002). The results also show that chat activities can be an alternative to class activities, which are found ineffective by the students at Muğla University. The findings of section 3 directly refer to the second research question of the study.

Data Gathered from Teachers' Questionnaire

The first part of the teachers' questionnaire was designed to investigate computer availability for teachers, computer and Internet use, and teachers' opinions about use of CMC voice / text chat in EFL instruction. The last part contained an open-ended question section to get more detailed data about teachers' thoughts and expectations in respect to Internet use in English language classes.

Section 1 gave information about computer availability for teachers and computer and Internet use. The results from this section indicated that most teachers have computers in their offices and 85 % of them have computers at home. In addition, 100 % reported use of the Internet.

The other item in section 1 questioned what teachers use the Internet for. They mainly use Internet for (ranked from most to least); "information", "personal communication", "professional communication" and finally "entertainment". Moreover, most teachers report that they use computer for e-mail, www (information, search), word processing and electronic journals daily. Infrequently,

they use computers for net newsgroups, discussion lists and Internet chat groups. It is interesting in view of teacher enthusiasm about potential use of voice / text chat in ELT (discussed in the next section) that they rarely use these facilities themselves.

The results gathered from question 7 / 8 in section 2 from the Muğla teachers questionnaire indicated that though most teachers have positive attitudes about all aspects of use of CMC voice / text chat in language instruction, they also foresaw some potential problems in using CMC tools. Teachers foresaw significant potential problems in administrative, technical, instructional and interactional areas of CMC use in EFL instruction. These findings from section 2 directly refer to third research question of the study.

Comparison of Data Gathered from Questionnaire of Students and Teachers for Computer Use and Attitudes towards CMC Voice / Text Chat

The results of these comparisons indicate that there was only one significant difference between students' and teachers' responses. Most Tourism students and teachers at Muğla University have positive perceptions about use of CMC voice / text chat in support of speaking skill in language instruction. Findings indicated that e-mail is the most used and Internet group chat is the least used Internet resource by both teachers and students. On the other hand, results show that there is a significant difference between students and teachers use of Internet chat groups. Most students stated that they use Internet chat groups daily, while most teachers report that they never or rarely use Internet chat groups. The comparison findings from the students' and teachers' questionnaires directly relate to the fourth research question of the study.

Data Gathered from Four Open-Ended Questions (Muğla teachers) and Interview
Responses (ELT Webheads Teachers)

Webhead teachers and Muğla teachers detailed some “advantages of using CMC voice chat”. These advantages also indicated that most of the ELT Webheads teachers see that CMC voice chat can help solve some of the problems which ELT teachers face in teaching speaking. ELT Webhead and Muğla teachers report that CMC voice chat:

1. Improves students’ speaking skills, and promotes students’ motivation to learn language. The computer platform allows students to communicate with another person in a target language instantly.
2. Minimizes psychological restrictions of class such as error anxiety and fear of speaking in front of teachers and friends.
3. Brings student-centered instruction into ELT.
4. Gives a new, exciting, motivational perspective to EFL study
5. Enhances quality of students’ pronunciation and intonation through use of playback of CMC interchanges
6. Allows students to interact in an authentic context with native or non-native speakers of English.
7. Allows communication to take place in real time.
8. Promotes students’ active involvement in speaking.
9. Improves motivation and reduces anxiety to speaking in target language
10. Allows learners to improve their interactive competence skills (greeting, leaving, turn-taking, introducing, corrective feedback...etc.)

11. Allows learners to have the opportunity to realize the varieties of language used by native speakers and non-native speakers of English
12. Allows students to have an opportunity for skills development in practice with their partners (collaborative working)

These findings pointing out some advantages of using CMC tools parallel findings in the literature. Blending of computer technology, cooperative learning and second language teaching has been explored in several sources. A number of studies have documented the use of CMC-based cooperative learning involving international EFL students. (Johnson, 1991, p. 65) summarizes “a growing body of evidence shows that computers can promote productive ways of working together, and that this interaction is related to higher levels of interest, motivation and achievement.” As well, parallel studies reviewed in (Mydlarski, 1998) indicate that such international CMC-based cooperative studies not only motivate communication using English but that these “cooperative learning situations have been proven to promote more positive cross-ethnic relationships” (Mydlarski, 1998). A researcher found that L2 learners interactionally and cooperatively improved speaking performance by “the frequency of negotiation routines that they are engaged in” (Van den Branden, 1997). In a study by Hudson and Bruckman (2002), results show that communication with intercultural partners in online chat creates a student-centered learning environment in which students feel more free and comfortable and do not hesitate to interact with others.

The Webhead interviewees and Muğla teachers pointed out some potential and real disadvantages of CMC voice chat in teaching speaking and mentioned problems such as the following:

1. Irregular computer availability for classroom study
2. Limited specialized student computer skills
3. Students' lack of confidence in operating CMC components (microphones, headphones, etc....
4. Unreliable connections to the Internet
5. Poor Audio quality
6. Virus and software bugs
7. Time and training involved using CMC effectively
8. Technicians unavailability to work collaboratively with teachers
9. Problems fitting chat sessions to the standard ELT curriculum
10. Maintaining students' focus on ELT course goals while chatting with their partners
11. Finding international chat partners; matching students' numbers, levels, interests, time zones
12. Finding useful projects and authentic tasks for CMC collaboration

One of the interviewees from the Muğla teachers also mentioned that in order to implement CMC voice / text chat activities, objectives and goals would take time to develop and class use would have to be well planned. Findings also indicated that obtaining adequate and continuing support from administrators is a very critical issue for teachers at Muğla University. The above findings gathered from ELT Webhead teachers refer to the last research question of the study.

The first Webhead interview question was directed at finding out “the most important issues ESL / EFL teachers face in teaching speaking”. Webhead responses included comments regarding students' shyness in front of class, lack of

conversational partners and fear of making mistakes and general lack of motivation. These responses are similar to the responses gathered from Q5 in the student questionnaire. Though, speaking is the most important skill for Tourism students, they do not want to speak in their classes due to their lack of confidence / motivation for speaking, fear of speaking in front of their friends / teachers or fear of making mistakes when they speak. It appears that all of these issues are at least partially addressed in real-time voice chat with intercultural partners.

According to the findings gathered from Muğla teachers, the researcher thinks that it is difficult for teachers and administrators to accept changes in language instruction, and for most teachers CMC introduction in their classes represents a big change in their language instruction. Comments from both Mugla and Webhead teachers suggests that without training for using communication technology in language teaching, students and teachers might not implement CMC effectively in the learning and teaching process, even though they have positive feelings about CMC and computer technology in general.

Finally, before using communication technology as an instructional resource, administrators, ELT teachers and students should take precautionary steps to minimize the problems that Mugla teachers foresaw and Webhead teachers experienced in using CMC in language teaching situations.

Pedagogical Implications

The results of this study suggest that having positive attitudes are not enough to implement communication technology (especially voice / text chat) in language instruction. The research findings suggest that there is a need for training for both students and teachers at Muğla University. Lack of knowledge on how to use and

apply CMC capabilities in instruction and how to operate computers in respect to CMC can cause both students and teachers to have negative attitudes. Also, technical and administrative support needs to be increased and maintained for effective use of communication technology in language instruction. These seem to parallel the findings in the attitudes section presented in the review of the literature.

The findings also suggest that students should be made aware of the benefits of using voice / text chat in language instruction. They are familiar with computers and Internet resources such as e-mail, chat, WWW; however, they do not use them in terms of learning language. Thus, during the implementation of Internet CMC resources in the curriculum, students and teachers should be informed about how they can use communication technology in support of language learning and teaching. For this, guidance and assistance should be provided from experts and trainers. School administrators and ELT teachers can work on issues collaboratively with experienced teachers from around the world.

These are some of the lessons I learned from my own experience; First, planning an Internet-based CMC activity should begin as early as possible- six months to a year in advance of proposed implementation. Second, before implementing this kind of CMC-based activity, a website / page should be created very early in the project for practicing CMC routines and introducing participants to their partners in the CMC environment. Finally, e-mail should be the first CMC tool to be integrated into curriculum due to the fact that it is familiar to students and teachers and less problematic than other CMC tools. Text and voice chat can be further steps in implementation of CMC tools in language instruction.

Briefly, implications drawn from this study might be:

1. Having positive attitudes are not enough to implement voice / text chat in language instruction.
2. There is a need for thorough and well-planned training for both students and teachers
3. Strong and reliable technical and administrative support is critical
4. Raising students' and teachers' awareness on the benefits of using voice / text chat in language instruction should be part of pre-planning of a CMC project.
5. Several pilot trials should be built into implementation plan
6. A gradual approach will help gain staff and student support and lead to smoother implementation.

Finally, this study will help provide base line data for disseminating knowledge about ELT and Internet resources for those who want to integrate communication technology in language instruction in Turkey.

Limitations of the Study

The first limitation of the study was that ELT teachers at Muğla University resisted answering the questionnaire by email. They said that it was hard for them to follow the questions by email and that direct interviews were preferable.

Although most teachers know about communication technology, they do not have any information about using this technology in language instruction. The technical specifications available were insufficient to determine whether voice / text chat can be useful for supporting the teaching of speaking. Information about students' and teachers' attitudes , opinions and perceptions about communication technology should be gathered, and an experimental study aiming to test the

assumptions of using CMC in teaching speaking should be conducted before planning an international implementation. Implementation, as I personally have witnessed, should not go forward until these have been done.

Another issue is the number of students participating in the research study. Twenty students cannot represent all the students in the Muğla Tourism departments. To get more reliable data, questionnaires could be distributed to a larger number of Tourism students.

The study would have been strengthened by inclusion of example transcripts of CMC collaboration between international EFL students. I was not able to find examples of such interactions through my Webhead contacts or other Internet searches.

Suggestions for Further Study

This study investigated the attitudes of English teachers and Tourism students (at Muğla University) towards the use of CMC voice / text chat in language instruction. The study revealed that teachers and students at Muğla University have a positive attitude towards using CMC tools. Nevertheless, the study also indicated that teachers and students are not aware of how to use CMC tools and benefit from them, though most of them are familiar with using computers and Internet. Besides, Muğla teachers foresaw some potential problem in using CMC tools parallel to the problems that ELT Webhead (+ CMC teachers) experienced in using CMC tools in their English classes.

Since no sample chat sessions with international partners could be held, further research involving chat session observations need to be carried out. Specific examples of EFL CMC international student collaboration need to be collected and

analyzed. Further interactions with EFL Webheads could lead to sharing of data collection and analysis of such examples. These analyses would lead to a clearer understanding of how the issues brought forward in this study might be dealt with by students and teachers and how CMC chat sessions might best be used in language instruction. Before that, design of Internet chat courses or activities for Tourism departments should be investigated and curriculum design inquiries need to be made to indicate optimal ways to integrate CMC use with on-going or new departmental curriculum designs. .

Conclusion

The findings of the study indicated that students and teachers had positive perceptions about the use of voice / text chat with international partners to support speaking skills in language instruction. However, the findings also show that ELT teachers at Muğla University believe that Internet-based instruction has potential problems and needs to be well planned, with teachers and students trained in use of Internet resources in language instruction. Findings also pointed out the advantages and disadvantages that internationally experienced chat using ELT teachers have identified in CMC applications. These closely paralleled the questionnaire responses and open-ended question responses of Mugla teachers.

To effectively implement voice / text chat in the curriculum, we need to take into consideration the contributed thoughts of both experienced and inexperienced chat-using teachers as well as opinions and ideas of the students as stakeholders. A thoughtful interpretation of these findings can lead to promising innovations in use of computer chat resources to dramatically improve the teaching of speaking in international EFL situations.

REFERENCE LIST

- Abrams, Z. I. (2003). The effect of synchronous and asynchronous CMC on oral performance in German. *The Modern Language Journal*, 87(2).
- Alexiou-Ray, A. J. & Wilson, K. E. & Wright, H. V. & Peirano, Anne-Marrie (2003). Changing instructional Practice: the impact on technology integration on students, parents and school personnel. *Integration of Technology in Education*, 2 (2).
- Altun, A. (2005). Toward an effective integration of technology: message boards for strengthening communication. *The Turkish on-line Journal of Educational Technology- TOJET*, 4(1), 9.
- Asan, A. (2002). Pre-service teachers' use of technology to create instructional materials: a school-college partnership. *Journal of Information Technology for Teacher Education*, 11(2).
- Baym, N.K. (1998). The emergence of on-line community. In S.G. Jones (Ed.) *Cybersociety2.0- Revisiting computer mediated communication and community* (pp. 35-68). Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications.
- Beatty, K. (2003). Teaching and researching computer assisted language learning. In Christopher N. Candlin & David R. Hall (Eds.), *Applied Linguistics in Action Series*. London: Pearson Education Limited.
- Beauvois, M.H. (1995). E-Talk: Attitudes and motivation in computer-assisted classroom discussion. *Computers and the Humanities*, 28, pp.287-190.
- Brown, H. D. (1994). Teaching by principles: an interactive approach to language Pedagogy. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall Regents.
- Bygate, M. (2001). Effects of task repetition on the structure and control of oral language. In M. Bygate, P. Skehan & M., Swain (Eds), *Researching Pedagogic Tasks, Second Language Learning Teaching and Testing* (pp. 23-48) Harlow: Longman.
- Chapelle, Carol A. (2001). *Computer applications in second language acquisition (1st ed.)*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Chen, T. (2003). Reticence in class and on-line: two ESL students' experiences with communicative language teaching. *System*, 31 (2), pp. 259-281.
- Choen, H. (2003). The vialibilty of CMC in the Korean secondary EFL classroom. *Asian EFL Teaching Articles*.

- Choi, J. (1999). An account of a pilot key pal project for Korean children. *The Internet Test Journal*, 5 (3).
- Chun, D. (1994). Using computer networking to facilitate the acquisition of interactive competence. *System*, 22(1), pp.17-31.
- Clark, J. L. (1987). Classroom assessment in a communicative approach. *British Journal of Language Teaching*, 25 (1), pp. 9-19.
- Cohen, A. D., Weaver, S. J., & Li, T. Y. (1996). *The impact of strategy-based instruction on speaking a foreign language*. Unpublished manuscript, National Language Resource Center, University of Minnesota.
- Cousins, N. & Smith, W. (1989). *Healing and Belief*. Canada: Mosaic Press.
- D'Eça, T. A. (2003). The use of chat in EFL / ESL. *TESL-Journal*, 7(1).
- Dooling, J.(2000). What students want to learn about computers? *Educational Leadership*, 58 (2), pp.20-24.
- Egan, K.B. (1999). Speaking: A critical skill and a challenge. *CALICO Journal*, 16(3), pp. 277-293.
- Egbert, J., Paulus, T. & 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), pp. 108-126.
- Ek, J. A. van & Alexander, L. G. (1980). *The Threshold Level for Modern Language Learning in Schools*. London: Longman.
- Fidelman, C. G. (1996). A language professional's guide to the world wide web. *Calico Journal*, 13(283) available online at [http:// agoralang.com/calico/webarticle.html](http://agoralang.com/calico/webarticle.html).
- Florez, M. A. C. (1999). Improving adult English language learners' speaking skills. *National Clearinghouse for ESL Literacy Education*.
- Fotos, S. (1994) Integrating grammar instruction and communicative language use through conscious-raising tasks. *TESOL Quarterly* 28(2), pp.333-51.
- Frizler, K. (1995). *The Internet as an educational tool in ESOL writing instruction*. Unpublished master's thesis, San Francisco State University. USA. Available: <http://thecity.sfsu.edu/-funweb/thesis.htm>.
- Gass, S. M & Varonis, E. (1994). *Input, interaction, and second language production*. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 16, pp. 283-302.

- Gonzalez-Bueno, M. (1998). The effects of electronic mails on Spanish L2 discourse. *Language Learning & Technology*.1(2), pp.55-70.
- Gonzalez-Lloret, M. (2003). Designing Task-Based CALL To Promote Interaction: En busca de Esmeraldas. *Language Learning & Technology* 7(1), pp. 86-104.
- Gorsuch, J. G. (2003). Computer mediated communication tasks and K-12 ESL and bilingual education teachers. *NMABE Journal*.
- Green, A. (1997). A beginners to the Internet in the foreign language classroom with focus on the world wide web. *Foreign Language Annals*, 30, pp.253-64.
- Hamilton, M. (2003). Opening of the “chatroom” in the EFL classroom. *Modern English Teacher*, 12(4), pp. 52-57.
- Hampel, R. & Hauck, M. (2004) Towards an effective use of audio conferencing in distance language courses, *Language Learning and Technology* 8 (1), pp. 66-82, (online at: <http://llt.msu.edu/vol8num1/hampel/default.html>).
- Hedge, T. (1993) Talking shop: Second language acquisition research: how does it help teachers? *ELTJ* 47(1).
- Hertel, T. (1993). Key concepts in ELT fluency. *ELT Journal*, 47.
- Herring, S. (1996). *Computer-mediated communication: linguistic, social and cross cultural perspectives*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Hertel, T. J. (2003). Using E-mail exchange to promote cultural learning. *Foreign Language Annals*, 36(3), pp.386-396.
- Hubbard, P. (2004). Learner training for effective use of CALL. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 17(1), pp. 1-6
- Hudson, J. M. & Bruckman, A. S. (2002). IRC Français: The creation of an Internet-based SLA community. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 15 (2).
- Hymes, D. (1972). On communicative competence. In J.B. Pride & J. Holmes (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics*. City: Penguin.
- Johnson, D. M. (1991). Second language and content learning with computers. In P. Dunkel (ed.), *Computer Assisted Language Learning and Testing* (pp. 61-79) New York: Newbury House Publications.
- Kagan, S. (1992). *Cooperative learning*. San Juan Capistrano, CA: Resources for Teachers, Inc.

- Kern, R. G. (1996). Restructing classroom interaction with networked computers: Effects on quantity and characteristics of language production. *The Modern Language Journal*, 79(4), pp. 457-476.
- Kern, R. & Warschauer, M. (2000) Theory and practice of network-based language teaching. In M. Warschauer & R. Kerns (eds.) *Network-based Language Teaching: Concepts and Practice* (pp.1-19). Cambridge: CambridgeUniversity Press,
- Kessler, C. (ed.). (1992). *Cooperative language learning: a teachers' resource book*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall Regents.
- Kramsch, C.J. (1986). From language proficiency to interactional competence. *TheModern Language Journal*, 70, pp.366-372.
- Krashen, S. (1981). A case for narrow reading. *TESOL Newsletter*, 15(6), p. 23.
- Krashen, S. (1985). *The input hypothesis: Issues and implications*. London: Longman.
- Krashen, S. D. & Terrell, T. D. (1983). *The natural approach: language acquisition in the classroom*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Lam, W. S. E. (2004). Second language socialization in a bilingual chat room: global and local considerations. *Language Learning and Technology*, 8(3), pp. 44-65.
- Lazaraton, A. (1996). Interlocutor support in oral proficiency interview: the case of case in Marianne Celce-Murcia (ed.), *Teaching English as a Second Language or Foreign Language*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle.
- Lee, J. F., & Van Patten, B. (1995). *Making Communicative Language Teaching Happen*. New York: McGraw Hill, Inc.
- Lee, K. (2000). English teachers' barriers to the use of computer-assisted language learning. *TheInternet Test Journal*, 6(12).
- Lightbown, P. & Spada, N. (1993). *How languages are learned?* Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- McGroarty, M. (1989). The benefits of cooperative learning arrangements in second language instruction. *NABE Journal*, 13(2), pp. 127-143.
- McMeniman, M & Evans, R. (1998). Call through the eyes of teachers and learners of Asian language. Panacea or business as usual? *CALL-EJ Online*, 2 (1): available on <http://www.lerc.ritsumei.ac.jp./callej/index.html>.

- Mydlarski, D. (1998). Shall we dance?: applying the cooperative model to CALL. *The Canadian Modern Language Review/La Revue canadienne des langues vivantes*, 55 (1), pp. 124-138
- Murphy, K. L. (1991). Patronage and an oral tradition: Influences on attributions of distance learners in a traditional society (A qualitative study). *Distance Education*, 12(1), pp. 27-53.
- Negretti, R. (1999). Web-based activities and SLA: a conversation analysis research approach. *Language Learning and Technology*, 3(1), pp. 75-87.
- Nunan, D. (1987). Communicative language teaching. Making it work. *ELT Journal*, 41 (2), pp. 136-145.
- Nunan, D. (ed.) (1993). *Collaborative language learning and teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- O'Dowd, R (2003). Understanding the other side. Intercultural learning in a Spanish- English exchange. *Language Learning and Technology*, 7 (2), pp.118-144.
- Ortega, L. (1997). Process and outcomes in networked classroom interaction: Defining the research agenda for L2 computer-assisted classroom discussion. *Language Learning and Technology*, 1(1), 82-03.
- Parish, R., & Arends, R. (1983). Why innovative programs are discontinued. *Educational Leadership*, 40(4), 62-65.
- Park, S. H.& Cramer, J. & Ertmer, P. A.(2000). *Implementation of technology-enhanced problem-based learning curriculum: a year-long study of three teachers*: available as <http://center.uorego.edu>.
- Pelletieri, J. (2000). Negotiation in cyberspace: The role of chatting in the development of grammatical competence. In M. Warschauer & Kern, R. (Eds.) *Network-based language teaching: Concepts and Practice* Cambridge (pp. 59-86) England: Cambridge University Press.
- Pica, T. (1996). Language learners' interaction: how does it address the input, output, and the feedback needs of L2 learners? *TESOL Quarterly*, 30 (1), pp. 50-84.
- Piaget, Jean. 1965. *The moral judgment of the child*. New York: Free Press.
- Hubbard, P. (2004). Learner Training for Effective Use of CALL. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 17(1), pp. 1-6.
- Richards, J. (1998). *Beyond training*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

- Richards, J. & Rodgers, T. (2001). *Approaches and methods in language Teaching: Second Edition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rivers, W. (1983). *Speaking in many tongues- essays in foreign language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rivers, W. (1987). Interaction as the key to teaching language for communication. In W.. Rivers (ed.), *Interactive Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University press.
- Robb, T.N. (1996). E-mail key pals for language fluency. *Foreign Language Educators of New Jersey*. 38 (3), pp.8-10.
- Roblyer, M. & Edwards, J. (2000). *Integrating educational technology into teaching*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Salaberry, M. R. (1996). A theoretical foundation for the development of pedagogical tasks in computer mediated communication. *Calico Journal*, 14(1), pp. 5-34.
- Salaberry, M. R. (2001). The use of technology for second language learning and teaching: a retrospective. *The Modern Language Journal*, 85(1), pp. 41-56.
- Schieffeling, B.B. & Ochs, E. (1986). Language socialization. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 15, pp. 163-191.
- Selinger, M. (1998). Forming a critical community through telematics. *Computers Education*, 30 (1/2), pp. 23-30.
- Sharan, S. (Ed.) (1994). *Handbook of Cooperative Learning Methods*. Westport,CT:Greenwood Press.
- Shehadeh, A. (1999). Non-native speakers production of modified comprehensible output and second language learning. *Language Learning*, 49(4), pp.627-675.
- Shield, L. & Weininger, M.J. (2004). Collaboration in a Virtual World: Groupwork and the Distance Language Learner. In R. Debski & M. Levy (Eds.). *World CALL: Global Perspectives on Computer-Assisted Language Learning*. The Netherlands:Swets & Zeitlinger Publishers.
- Signal, M. (1997). The Internet and foreign language education: benefits and challenges. *Tesol Journal* 3(6), available online at [http:// iteslj.org/Articles/Signal-Internet.html](http://iteslj.org/Articles/Signal-Internet.html).
- Smith, B. (2003). Computer-mediated negotiated interaction: an expanded model. *The Modern Language Journal*, 87(1).

- Sotillo, M.S. (2000). Discourse functions and syntactic complexity in synchronous, and asynchronous communication. *Language Learning & Technology*, 4(1), pp. 82-119.
- Stepp-Granny, J. (2002). Students' perceptions on language learning in a technological environment: implications for the new millennium. *Language Learning and Technology*, 6(1), pp. 165-180.
- Stevens, V. (2003). Interview with Vance Stevens, available as: http://www.homestead.com/prositesvstevens/files/efi/papers/interviews/itsoriginal_gvs.htm.
- Stevens, V. & Altun, A. (2001). The Webheads community of language learners: available on: <http://site.hsprofessional.com/vstevens/files/efi/papers/t2t2001/proceeds.htm>.
- Swain, M. (1985). Communicative competence: some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output. In S. Gass & C. Madden (Eds.), *Input in Second Language Acquisition* (pp. 235-253) Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Swain, M. (1988). Focus on form through conscious reflection. In C. Doughty & J. William (Eds.), *Focus on Form in Second Language Acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Symonds, W.C. (2000). High school will never be the same. *Business Week*, 3696, pp.190-193. Retrived December 3, 2001 from EBSCO Host.
- Tanian, S. & James, K. (2002). Could oral communication skills become a casualty of online learning?: A future scenario that could prevent this. *Herdsa 2002 conference*, pp.634-639.
- Thanasoulas, D. (2002). The changing and shifting sands of the history of English language teaching. *TEFL Articles*: available on:<http://www.english.com/tefl-articles/history-english-language-teaching.htm>.
- Trokeloshvili, D.A. & Jost, N.H. (1997). The Internet and foreign language instruction: Practice and discussion. *The Internet Tesl Journal*, 3(8).
- Tudini, V. (2003). Using native speakers in chat. *Language Learning & Technology*, 7(3), pp.141-159.
- Tsui, Amy B. M. (2001). Maximizing Computer-Mediated Communication as a collaborative learning environment for ESL teachers. *Information Technology & Multimedia in English Language Teaching* available online at: <http://elc.polyu.edu.hk/conference/papers/tsui.html>.
- Wang, Y. (2004). Supporting synchronous distance language learning with

- desktop videoconferencing. *Language Learning and Technology*, 8(3).
- Warschauer, M. (1996). Comparing face-to-face and electronic communication in the second language classroom. *Calico Journal*, 13(2), pp.7-26.
- Warschauer, M. & Whittaker, P. F. (1997). The Internet for English teaching: Guideliness for English teachers. *TESL Reporter*, 30(1), pp. 27-33.
- Warschauer, M. & Healey, D. (1998). Computer and language learning; An overview. *Language Teaching*, 31, pp. 57-71.
- Warschauer, M. (1999). *Electronic Literacies Language, culture, and power in-online education*. Hilldale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Warschauer, M. & Meskil, C. (2000). Technology and second language teaching. In J. Rosenthal (Ed.), *Handbook of Undergraduate Second language Education* (pp.308-318) Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum..
- Warschauer, M (2001). On-line communication. In R. Carter and D. Nunan (eds.). *Cambridge guide to teaching English to speakers of other languages* (pp. 207 –212).Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- West, L. L. (2002). Best practices in integrating technology into adult ESL instruction: a literature search. *Sacramento County Office of Education*, available as: http://www.intelecom.org/ilrn/adult/crc/crcpdf/TECH21_ESLTech_3.pdf
- Williams, B. & Burden, R.L (1997). *Psychology for Language Teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Van den Brandan, K. (1997). Effects of negotiation on language learners' output. *Language Learning*, 47 (4), pp. 585-636.
- Van Ek, J. A., and L. G. Alexander. *Threshold Level English in a European Unit/Credit System of Modern Language Learning by Adults*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe, 1980.
- Vygotsky, L. S (1962). *Thought and language*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press

APPENDICIES

APPENDIX A

Consent Form for Students

Dear Students,

My name is Müzeyyen Aykaç and I attend the MA Tefl Program at Bilkent University. I am conducting a study about students' attitudes towards speaking lessons and towards the use of voice & text-based chat CMC as a speaking activity. The following questionnaire has been prepared for this study. I would appreciate it if you would answer the questions in the questionnaire.

Your completion of the questionnaire is assumed to grant permission to use your answers for this study. No information about your identity will be included in any reports derived from this research. No one including your teacher will be able to associate your names with your answers to the questionnaire.

Please read the questions carefully and answer all of them. Your answers will provide valuable data and will be useful and helpful for my thesis.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Müzeyyen Aykaç
Bilkent University
Ankara

I have read and understood above and agree to participate in this study.

Name _____ :

Surname _____ :

Class _____ :

Department _____ :

Student Number _____ :

Birth Of Date :

Birth Of Place :

Sex _____ : Female-----

Male-----

If available e-mail addresses:

Year of studying English _____ :

Interests _____ :

Signature

APPENDIX B

Öğrenci Onay Formu

Sevgili öğrenciler;

Ben, Müzeyyen Aykaç, Bilkent Üniversitesi MATEFL programında öğrenciyim. Öğrencilerin İngilizce konuşma dersleri ve Internet’te sesli ve yazılı konuşma konusundaki tutumları ile ilgili bir çalışma yapıyorum. Bu anket bu çalışma için hazırlanmıştır. Anketteki soruları cevaplarsanız çok sevinirim.

Anketin sizin tarafınızdan doldurulması ve çalışmada cevaplarınızdan yararlanılması düşünülmektedir. Bu çalışmadan elde edilecek hiçbir sonuçta sizin kimliğinizle ilgili bir bilgi kullanılmayacaktır. Dersinizden sorumlu öğretim elemanı da dahil olmak üzere hiç kimse anketteki sorularla sizin isminizi bağdaştıramayacaktır.

Lütfen soruları dikkatle okuyunuz ve tüm soruları cevaplayınız. Cevaplarınız çalışma için çok önemli ver sağlamakla kalmayacak aynı zamanda çalışmam (tezim) için yardımcı ve yararlı olacaktır.

Katılımınız ve işbirliğiniz için teşekkür ederim.

Müzeyyen Aykaç
Bilkent Üniversitesi
Ankara

Yukarıda yazılanları okudum ve anladım. Çalışmaya katılmayı kabul ediyorum.

Ad-Soyad: _____

Sınıf: _____

Bölüm: _____

Öğrenci Numarası: _____

Doğum tarihi: _____

Doğum Yeri: _____

Cinsiyet: Kadın: _____ Erkek: _____

Varsa e-mail adresi: _____

Kaç yıldır İngilizce öğreniyorsunuz: _____

İlgi alanları: _____

İmza: _____

APPENDIX C

Students' Questionnaire

Section 1: Students' Language Skills

<u>Very Good:5</u> <u>Good:4</u> <u>Average:3</u> <u>Poor:2</u> <u>Very Poor:1</u>		Very good	Good	Average	Poor	Very poor
1. How would you rate your English?	Listening	⑤	④	③	②	①
	Reading	⑤	④	③	②	①
	Speaking	⑤	④	③	②	①
	Writing	⑤	④	③	②	①
2. How would you rate your English instruction in terms of usefulness to you?	Listening	⑤	④	③	②	①
	Reading	⑤	④	③	②	①
	Speaking	⑤	④	③	②	①
	Writing	⑤	④	③	②	①

<u>A Lot:5</u> <u>Some:4</u> <u>Average:3</u> <u>A Little:2</u> <u>Not At All:1</u>		A lot	some	Average	A little	Not at all
3. What English areas would you most like to improve?	Listening	⑤	④	③	②	①
	Reading	⑤	④	③	②	①
	Speaking	⑤	④	③	②	①
	Writing	⑤	④	③	②	①

4. Where do you use English? You may choose more than one item.	Watching TV	⑤	④	③	②	①
	Watching movies	⑤	④	③	②	①
	Talking with foreign friends	⑤	④	③	②	①
	Using computers for study	⑤	④	③	②	①
	Using computers to communicate	⑤	④	③	②	①
	Using computers to study	⑤	④	③	②	①

Section 2: Students' Opinions about Speaking Skills

5. Circle the options that applies to you for each question	Strongly agree	agree	neutral	disagree	Strongly disagree
Speaking is one of the most important skills of four language skills	⑤	④	③	②	①
Speaking English is very difficult for me	⑤	④	③	②	①
The activities in my English class give me opportunities to improve my speaking skills	⑤	④	③	②	①
I am afraid of making mistakes in speaking English	⑤	④	③	②	①
I look forward to coming to my speaking class	⑤	④	③	②	①
I often feel anxious about answering a question in English class	⑤	④	③	②	①
I like speaking in class	⑤	④	③	②	①

Section 3: Students' computer use and attitudes towards the use of CMC voice / text chat

Students' computer use

		daily	Once or twice a week	Several times a year	A few times a year	never
6. If you use computers, what are your major uses?	Problem solving	⑤	④	③	②	①
	Word processing	⑤	④	③	②	①
	Entertainment	⑤	④	③	②	①
	Games, music etc.	⑤	④	③	②	①
	e-mail	⑤	④	③	②	①
	Information, search(www)	⑤	④	③	②	①
	Internet chat groups	⑤	④	③	②	①
	Power point	⑤	④	③	②	①

Students' attitudes towards the use of CMC voice / text chat

Circle the options that applies to you for each question		Strongly agree	agree	neutral	disagree	Strongly disagree
7. I believe communication technologies are useful for language learning.		⑤	④	③	②	①
8. International voice / text chat groups can be used to learn speaking to support my learning.		⑤	④	③	②	①
9. My speaking ability can improve by using voice 7 text chat with international chat partners.		⑤	④	③	②	①
10. My interest and motivation to speaking can increase by using international chat groups.		⑤	④	③	②	①
11. If you are familiar with on-line chat:	a. I use Turkish	⑤	④	③	②	①
	b. I use English	⑤	④	③	②	①

APPENDIX D

ÖĞRENCİ ANKETİ

Size uyan seçeneği yuvarlak içine alınız.

Çok iyi	İyi	orta	zayıf	çok zayıf
5	4	3	2	1

1.İngilizcenizi nasıl değerlendirirsiniz.

Dinleme

5	4	3	2	1
---	---	---	---	---

Konuşma

5	4	3	2	1
---	---	---	---	---

Yazma

5	4	3	2	1
---	---	---	---	---

Okuma

5	4	3	2	1
---	---	---	---	---

2.Size gerekli olması (yada sizin için yararlı olması) açısından İngilizce derslerinizi nasıl değerlendirirsiniz?

Dinleme

5	4	3	2	1
---	---	---	---	---

Konuşma

5	4	3	2	1
---	---	---	---	---

Yazma

5	4	3	2	1
---	---	---	---	---

Okuma

5	4	3	2	1
---	---	---	---	---

Size uyan seçeneği yuvarlak içine alınız.

Çok	biraz	orta	az	hiç
5	4	3	2	1

3. Kendinizi İngilizce'nin en çok hangi alanlarında geliştirmek istersiniz?

Dinleme

5 4 3 2 1

Konuşma

5 4 3 2 1

Yazma

5 4 3 2 1

Okuma

5 4 3 2 1

4. İngilizce'yi nerede kullanıyorsunuz? Size uyan seçeneği seçiniz. Birden fazla seçeneği işaretleyebilirsiniz.

--Televizyon izlerken

5 4 3 2 1

--Sinema

5 4 3 2 1

--Yabancı arkadaşlarla konuşurken

5 4 3 2 1

--Okurken

--5 4 3 2 1

-- Bilgisayarda İletişim kurmak için kullanırken

5 4 3 2 1

--Çalışmak için bilgisayar kullanırken

5 4 3 2 1

Bölüm 2: İngilizce konuşma yetisi hakkında öğrencilerin düşünceleri

5. Size uyan seçeneği işaretleyiniz.

5:kesinlikle aynı fikirdeyim 4: aynı fikirdeyim 3:nötr 2: kabul etmiyorum

1: kesinlikle aynı fikirde değilim

---4 dil yetisi arasında konuşma en önemli yeti

5 4 3 2 1

---benim için İng. Konuşmak zor

5 4 3 2 1

---İngilizce derslerindeki aktiviteler konuşma yetimi geliştirmek için bana fırsat veriyor

5 4 3 2 1

--- İngilizce konuşurken hata yapmaktan korkuyorum.

5 4 3 2 1

---Konuşma derslerine gelmeyi dört gözle bekliyorum

5 4 3 2 1

--- İngilizce derslerinde sorulan soruya cevap verirken kendimi endişeli hissediyorum

5 4 3 2 1

---Sınıfta konuşmaktan hoşlanıyorum

5 4 3 2 1

Bölüm 3: Öğrencilerin bilgisayar kullanımı ve sesli / yazılı Internet konuşmasına karşı tutumu

6.Eğer bilgisayar kullanıyorsanız temel kullanım alanlarınız nelerdir? Size uyan seçeneği seçiniz. Birden fazla seçeneği işaretleyebilirsiniz.

5: günlük 4: haftada bir yada iki kez 3:ayda birkaç kez 2:yılda birkaç kez 1: hiç

---problemleri çözmede

5 4 3 2 1

---yazı yazarken

5 4 3 2 1

---resim, sinema

5 4 3 2 1

---oyunlar, müzik, etc

5 4 3 2 1

---elektronik posta

5 4 3 2 1

---bilgi, araştırma (www)

5 4 3 2 1

---gerçek zamanlı Internet konuşması

5 4 3 2 1

--power point

5 4 3 2 1

Size uyan seçeneği işaretleyiniz.

5. kesinlikle aynı fikirdeyim 4- aynı fikirdeyim 3- nötr 2- kabul etmiyorum

1- kesinlikle aynı fikirde değilim

7. İletişim Teknolojisinin İngilizce dilini öğrenmemde fayda sağlayacağına inanıyorum.

5 4 3 2 1

8. Uluslar arası sesli yada yazılı yapılan Internet konuşması, İngilizce konuşmayı öğrenmede, dil öğrenimimi destekleme açısından kullanılabilir

5 4 3 2 1

9. İngilizce konuşma becerilerim, uluslararası arkadaşlarla yapılan sesli yada yazılı konuşma sayesinde gelişebilir

5 4 3 2 1

10. İngilizce konuşmaya karşı olan ilgim ve motivasyonum, uluslar arası konuşma grupları aracılığıyla artabilir.

5 4 3 2 1

11. eğer on-line chat yapıyorsanız:

a. chat yaparken Türkçe dilini kullanıyorum.

5 4 3 2 1

b. chat yaparken İngilizce dilini kullanıyorum.

5 4 3 2 1

APPENDIX E

TEACHERS' QUESTIONNAIRE (MUĞLA UNIVERSITY)

Personal Background

1-In what department do you teach?

2-How long have been teaching English?

3-How long have you been teaching in your current department?

4-Please check

_____ Female

_____ Male

Section 1: Teachers' Computer Availability, Computer and Internet use

1-Does your school provide computers for teachers?

_____ Yes _____ No

2-Do you have a computer in your office?

_____ Yes _____ No

3-Do you have a computer at home?

_____ Yes _____ No

4-Do you use Internet?

_____ Yes _____ No

5- If you use Internet, do you use it for;

a-personal communication

_____ Yes _____ No

b-professional communication

_____ Yes _____ No

c-information

_____ Yes _____ No

d-entertainment

_____ Yes _____ N

6-What do you use computers for? Indicate your frequency of use.

	daily	once or twice a week	several times a month	a few times a year	never
a-Word processing	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
b-E-mail	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
c-Discussion Lists	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
d-World Wide Web	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
e-Internet Chat groups	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
f-Usenet Newsgroups	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
g- Electronic journals	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

Section 2: Beliefs and Attitudes

7- Circle the options that applies to you for each question

1: strongly disagree 2: disagree 3: undecided 4: agree 5: strongly agree

7a- I believe communication technologies are useful for English language learning.

1: strongly disagree 2: disagree 3: undecided 4: agree 5: strongly agree

7b- I should use the Internet in our department for teaching English language

1: strongly disagree 2: disagree 3: undecided 4: agree 5: strongly agree

7c- I would like to teach some classes in the computer lab with Internet connection

1: strongly disagree 2: disagree 3: undecided 4: agree 5: strongly agree

7d- Internet can be used to teach listening to support students' learning.

1: strongly disagree 2: disagree 3: undecided 4: agree 5: strongly agree

7e- International voice / text chat groups can be used to teach speaking to support students' learning.

1: strongly disagree 2: disagree 3: undecided 4: agree 5: strongly agree

7f- Students' speaking abilities can increase by using voice / text chat with international partners.

1: strongly disagree 2: disagree 3: undecided 4: agree 5: strongly agree

7g- Hearing the voice of English speaker can provide L2 students an authentic learning environment.

1: strongly disagree 2: disagree 3: undecided 4: agree 5: strongly agree

7h- Students' interest in learning speaking can increase by using International chat groups.

1: strongly disagree 2: disagree 3: undecided 4: agree 5: strongly agree

7i- Internet chat group participation can provide collaborative work on assignments.

1: strongly disagree 2: disagree 3: undecided 4: agree 5: strongly agree

7j- Participating international voice / text chat partners can make L2 learners feel comfortable in speaking.

1: strongly disagree 2: disagree 3: undecided 4: agree 5: strongly agree

7k- L2 learners can have high motivation and low anxiety for speaking after practicing a target language with chat partners.

1: strongly disagree 2: disagree 3: undecided 4: agree 5: strongly agree

Potential Problem Areas for You in Considering Use of Chat Resources with Your Students

8- Potential problem areas for you in considering use of chat resources with your students.

1: strongly disagree 2: disagree 3: undecided 4: agree 5: strongly agree

8a- Adequate access to computers

1: strongly disagree 2: disagree 3: undecided 4: agree 5: strongly agree

8b- Maintaining reliable connections to computers

1: strongly disagree 2: disagree 3: undecided 4: agree 5: strongly agree

8c- time to schedule “chat” session with international chat partners

1: strongly disagree 2: disagree 3: undecided 4: agree 5: strongly agree

8d- Fitting chat sessions to the standard ELT curriculum

1: strongly disagree 2: disagree 3: undecided 4: agree 5: strongly agree

8e- My lack of familiarity with use of computer chat facilities

1: strongly disagree 2: disagree 3: undecided 4: agree 5: strongly agree

8f- Teachers training in general use of computers in language instruction

1: strongly disagree 2: disagree 3: undecided 4: agree 5: strongly agree

8g- Specific training for me in use of computers chat facilities, particularly real-time voice chat

1: strongly disagree 2: disagree 3: undecided 4: agree 5: strongly agree

8h- Finding appropriate international students as chat partners for my students

1: strongly disagree 2: disagree 3: undecided 4: agree 5: strongly agree

8i- Training students in use of chat facilities for language exchanges

1: strongly disagree 2: disagree 3: undecided 4: agree 5: strongly agree

8j- Maintaining students' focus on ELT course goals while chatting with partners

1: strongly disagree 2: disagree 3: undecided 4: agree 5: strongly agree

8k- Obtaining adequate support from administration for using computers in ELT

1: strongly disagree 2: disagree 3: undecided 4: agree 5: strongly agree

Section 3: Open-ended Questions

1-I would welcome any additional comments you would like to make (replied to by 16 ELT teachers out of 60)

2-Do you think the Internet resources such as WWW, e-mail, electronic discussion groups, Internet chat groups, and so forth, can add enough to classroom English language learning to justify their expenses? (replied to by 34 ELT teachers out of 60)

3-What are your future expectations for the use of Internet resources in language learning and teaching, particularly in speaking skill? (replied to by 35 ELT teachers out of 60)

4-Please add any comment you may have about Internet voice chat technology for supporting speaking skill (replied to by 25 ELT teachers out of 60).

APPENDIX F

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS (FOR ELT WEBHEADS)

- 1- What do you think are the most important issues ESL / EFL teachers face in teaching speaking?
- 2- What is the role of using voice & text based chat in teaching speaking?
- 3- What are the advantages and disadvantages of using real-time voice chat in terms of teaching speaking?

APPENDIX G

INTERVIEW SAMPLES

INTERVIEWEE 1

Question 1: What do you think are the most important issues ESL / EFL teachers face in teaching speaking?

Interviewee: Students' are unable to hear their own "accents," and have unrealistic expectations about the amount of time and effort accurate, native-like pronunciation takes. Teachers try to teach pronunciation before fluency and vice-versa. The timing is up to the student, not the curriculum or teachers' expectations

Question 2: What is the role of using voice & text based chat in teaching speaking?

Interviewee: Voice chat could definitely be used to improve fluency, but I think pronunciation would have to be done through tape, voice-email, and much more listening practice than is generally prescribed. (You can't say it until you can actually hear it.)

Question 3: What are the advantages and disadvantages of using real-time voice chat in terms of teaching speaking?

Interviewee: Improved fluency will often lead to "fossilization" of pronunciation errors, even though students will become communicatively adept. Speaking may also mean more formal presentation styles of communication, rather than pronunciation or informal fluency. CMC tools are especially appropriate for practicing.

INTERVIEWEE 2

Question 1: Question: What do you think are the most important issues ESL / EFL teachers face in teaching speaking?

Interviewee: Students are often hesitant to open their mouth in the classroom when they feel shy and are afraid of using bad grammar, worry about a small vocabulary or simply do not like to stand up and present in front of class mates. They also may have only little experience with listening to International English accents.

Question 2: What is the role of using voice & text based chat in teaching speaking?

Interviewee: Access to instant communication and interaction

Question 3: What are the advantages and disadvantages of using real-time voice chat in terms of teaching speaking?

Interviewee: Students learning English as a foreign language, have access to communicate instantly and with less anxiety. They can have guest teachers easily, as well as meeting with other classes from different places, while staying in the local computer lab, or even connecting from home or elsewhere. If their own teacher has not developed some personal user experience, this project may suffer from stressful situations deriving from technical anxiety

INTERVIEWEE 3

Question 1: What do you think are the most important issues ESL / EFL teachers face in teaching speaking?

Interviewee: First, getting students to feel motivated to speak and then confident to discuss a given topic in class and online with a guest, for example.

Question 2: What is the role of using voice & text based chat in teaching speaking?

Interviewee: Text and voice-based chat are forms of communication, which is speaking whether in written or oral form. For me, communication is the no. 1 priority in EFL. Accuracy is not a major worry for me, because I believe that students should gradually acquire fluency without being worried about being correct. That will come with time... and with reading and writing. I'm basically thinking about about beginners and intermediate students here. When we think of advanced students who don't speak quite correctly, then we need to worry about accuracy.

Question 3: What are the advantages and disadvantages of using real-time voice chat in terms of teaching speaking?

Interviewee: I think there are basically advantages, because the students can hear their recordings at their will and correct possible mistakes. Or the teacher can send a recording with the necessary corrections and ask the student to make a new recording. The possibilities are endless. CMC tools for speaking may be intimidating for some students who don't feel comfortable in front of a mike, especially knowing that their conversation will be recorded. All in all, I think the advantages far outweigh the disadvantages.

INTERVIEWEE 4

Question 1: What do you think are the most important issues ESL / EFL teachers face in teaching speaking?

Interviewee: How to motivate students, and let them know that making mistakes is part of the learning process (it's quite difficult to get them to talk in front of the class, especially because they are afraid to be mocked by their peers)

Question 2: What is the role of using voice & text based chat in teaching speaking?

Interviewee: It can solve some problems: having a screen as a shield can help you overcome the fear / anxiety you might feel when you have to talk to an audience. In this context you aren't actually face to face with the rest of the class and it brings you some comfort.

Question 3: What are the advantages and disadvantages of using real-time voice chat in terms of teaching speaking?

Interviewee: It gives teaching and learning a new, fresh perspective. It might be able to engage students in a different way as it motivates them to take part in it. It can, on the other hand, discourage some students to the same, as they may not find this method attractive or are not familiar with computers.

INTERVIEWEE 5

Question 1: What do you think are the most important issues ESL / EFL teachers face in teaching speaking?

Interviewee: Getting students comfortable with speaking comfortably in the target language.

Question 2: What is the role of using voice & text based chat in teaching speaking?

Interviewee: Helps students communicate in authentic and truly communicative situation.

Question 3: What are the advantages and disadvantages of using real-time voice chat in terms of teaching speaking?

Interviewee: Advantages, opportunities to participate in real time with native and other non native target language speakers, disadvantages: less than ideal interface, bandwidth issues

INTERVIEWEE 6

Question 1: What do you think are the most important issues ESL / EFL teachers face in teaching speaking?

Interviewee: To make the students interact into lesson

Question 2: What is the role of using voice & text based chat in teaching speaking?

Interviewee: I believe it enable students to be more motivated for speaking. It is a fun also, speaking and hearing English speaker can encourage them. They can share their knowledge, collaboratively study on an assignment.

Question 3: What are the advantages and disadvantages of using real-time voice chat in terms of teaching speaking?

Interviewee: Though technology offers more useful ways in dealing computer, there are still some problems in providing reliable connections, understanding voice. except technical problems, finding intercultural class partners, fixing time and matching students' numbers-levels, authentic tasks are highly required to be emphasized in an online intercultural chat project. but its' advantages more than disadvantages.

INTERVIEWEE 7

Question 1: What do you think are the most important issues ESL / EFL teachers face in teaching speaking?

Interviewee: Overcoming shyness or fear of making a mistake in speaking

Question 2: What is the role of using voice & text based chat in teaching speaking?

Interviewee: Real communication. Students have a conversation with another person or people to find out specific information.

Question 3: What are the advantages and disadvantages of using real-time voice chat in terms of teaching speaking?

Interviewee: Disadvantages--It's time-consuming teaching the students to use these tools. Getting the co-operation of the technicians who control what software goes on a computer can also be frustrating. Advantages--students are thrilled to communicate with another person in English over the Internet.

