Implementation of CALL in Bangladeshi Private Universities: Students' Perspective

Sinchan Pal Joy

ID -11103028

Department of English and Humanities

August 12, 2013

BRAC University

Implementation of CALL in Bangladeshi Private Universities: Students' Perspective

A Thesis

Submitted to the Department of English and Humanities

Of

BRAC University

Submitted By:

Sinchan Pal Joy

ID –11103028

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree

of

Bachelor of Arts in English

August 12, 2013

Acknowledgement

I am thankful to my parents, my friends and all my teachers from Dept. of English and Humanities, BRAC University for their continuous help and support. A special thank you goes to my supervisor Ms. Mahmuda Akhter for supervising me during my dissertation. I am also grateful to Prof. Firdous Azim, Chairperson of Dept. of English and Humanities, for believing in me. Last but not the least; I am really thankful to my friends Mohammad Munsafe and Tazma Islam, who helped me a lot during conducting my survey. I am indebted to all of them.

ABSTRACT

Computer-Assisted Language Learning (CALL) is among the latest approaches of English language teaching. With the rapid growth in Information and Communication Technology (ICT) and the increasing use of technology in every sphere of life, CALL is getting more popularity day by day, especially among the young generation. It is a very new concept for Bangladeshi education system. This dissertation tries to find out to which extend CALL is being implemented in the Bangladeshi private university classrooms and if there is any problem regarding the implementation. The study focuses on the students' perspective, and thus tries to discover the present condition of the students. Since, not much existing work is available on this topic in Bangladeshi perspective; it is mostly a primary research. However, the researcher tried to use extracts from the existing works on CALL by authors from different countries to show the validity of CALL in present day English language teaching. Some works by Bangladeshi authors are also studied and used in the paper to interpret the present English language teaching system in Bangladesh. The researcher used survey questionnaires to collect data from the classrooms. The data was analyzed using both the quantitative and qualitative methods. Journal articles and topic related books were used by the researcher to analyze the data and to relate the arguments of the researcher with the findings. The results show that the teachers and the students have quite enough technological facilities in their classrooms and home, however they use only basic technological aids, for example word processing software and general internet browsing for language learning. They rarely use any specific CALL oriented applications or webpages. Therefore, the findings of the research show that although a certain amount of CALL is implemented in Bangladeshi private university classrooms, surely there are lots of scopes for improvement. Moreover, this research

is focused only to the students' perspective. A further research compiling the

teachers' opinions should reveal a broader perception on this issue.

Table of Contents

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

1.0 Introduction

In Bangladesh, students study English language as a subject for at least 12 years of their academic life irrespective of their study streams. However, these 12 years of study does not seem to be enough when they enroll in different subjects in Universities. Therefore, there are some mandatory English language courses in almost every private and public universities of Bangladesh for students of every department. The duration of these courses vary from 4 months to 12 months. Now, a question might arise here that if they are learning the language for twelve years in their respective schools and colleges, then why do they need these extra courses? The common believe behind this is the use of traditional Grammar translation method in primary and secondary level of Bangladeshi classrooms (Rahman, Hamzah, Meerah and Rahman, 2010: 2-3) Though, the syllabus is being designed in communicative method for a long time now, often it is not possible to implement CLT in Bangladeshi classrooms due to many reasons (Billah, 2012). So, the universities need to make their students prepare for different academic purposes and also build good communicative skills for future applications in their professional life. Now, while teaching language to these first year or second year university students, CALL or Computer-Assisted Language Learning can play a vital role. It is because the students enrolling in universities presently are mostly "Digital Natives" (Prensky, 2001: 1). They are the people who saw computer from their early childhood as a compulsory part of their life. To them it was more of a toy then a machine. "Today's average college grads have spent less than 5,000 hours of their lives reading, but over 10,000 hours playing

video games (not to mention 20,000 hours watching TV). Computer games, email, the Internet, cell phones and instant messaging are integral parts of their lives."(Prensky, 2001: 1). Therefore, the aim of this study was to find out if/how the students of private universities are being benefitted by the use of CALL, and if they face any problem regarding the use of technology or not.

1.1 Problem Statement

Although, there is not a major problem with the current way of teaching English language in Bangladeshi private universities, there is always space for improvement, especially if the Universities are willing to compete with the pace of the rapidly changing education system of the world.Therefore, the researcheris trying to promote a better wayof teaching and learning English through the use of CALL for the benefit of both teachers and students. Moreover, just because the presently usedmethods (GTM, ALM, CLT etc.) and systems are doing okay, does not mean we should not look for better options and try to assimilate ourselves with the rest of the world and their latest innovations and methods of language teaching. The "digital natives" can be greatly benefitted with the use of CALL in their language learning classrooms.

1.2 Purpose of the study

The purpose of this study is to conduct a survey on a number of Bangladeshi private university students regarding the ways of English language teaching in their classrooms as well as the methods and technologies utilized to do so. The survey should give us an idea about how much technology is being used in these classrooms,

how accustomed they (both teachers and students) are with CALL and if they are facing any problems in this process.

1.3 Central Research Questions

    i)   Do the students of Bangladeshi private universities use computer for English language learning?

    ii)   Why do/ don't they use CALL?

    iii)   Do they face any problems? Are there enough facilities available for them? Do they know the proper use of the facilities available? Are they even interested in English language learning using computer?

    iv)   Do their teachers motivate or guide them to take the benefit of computer and other technology for language learning? How?

1.4 Significance of the Study

This research is going to be useful for both the teachers and the students of Bangladeshi Universities. On one hand, teachers will get a clear idea if the students are willing to adopt computer and other technological uses in the classrooms, if so, how much help will it do in the classes and how much of it can actually be implemented in the current situation without any major changes in syllabus, infrastructure and teachers' ability. On the other hand, this research will be helpful for the students who are actually eager to learn more through using technology. They will learn about many of the newest applications and methods used to learn language in and off classrooms.This research will also bring forward the problems the students face while using technology to learn language (if there is any). This research will also

help future researchers who are interested in the similar area of research and might work as a secondary source for them.

1.5 Delimitation

The data was collected directly through conducting a survey on students of different private universities. So, the data was be very much raw and thus be mostly accurate. Moreover, Library and internet research will be used to study the theoretical aspects of the topic.

1.6 Limitation

There is not much research available on this specific topic in Bangladesh. So, as mentioned earlier, this will be mostly a primary research. Moreover, it is being done as a part of author's undergraduate ELT course completion. Therefore, the time and number of universities chosen for the research is limited. In addition, the number of students surveyed for the research might give a scattered idea about their thoughts and views; it will not be necessarily be a complete representation of all the students of this level. It should also be mentioned that the students of these universities come from a diverse educational background, sometimes a diverse socio-economic background as well. So, these factors might have an effect on the data collections, thus might provide a scattered data for the research. If there were more time available, then number of collected data would be more representative, and would be more accurate as well.However, the collected data samples are analyzed as through as possible to get an appropriate idea of the situation.

1.7 Operational Definition

There are some terms and definitions which have been frequently used in my research paper to support my arguments. They are:

1.7.1 CALL

Computer Assisted Language Learning (CALL) may be defined as "the search for and study of applications of the computer in language teaching and learning" (Levy, 2008: 1).

1.7.2 CLT

CLT or Communicative Language Teaching aims at 'communicative competence'. Unlike other methods, CLT enables the students to communicate using the target language. The rules and norms of grammar of native or target language do not play very important role in CLT, but how good students are able to communicate in real life situations is given preference (Freeman , 2000: 121).

1.7.3 GTM

In GTM or Grammar Translation Method, the grammatical rules and norms of a target language is taught to students, however the purpose was mostly to learn the grammar

of the native language and to gain some intellectual benefit from this process, instead of actually learning to use the target language (Freeman , 2000: 11).

1.7.4 Digital Natives/ N Gen/ D Gen

Students who were born in last decade of the 20th century are called the 'N Gen' (short for Net Gen) or 'D Gen' (short for Digital Gen). They are also called 'Digital Natives'. The reasons behind this naming are the rapid increase of use of technology in everyday life of the people of this generation. Lives of people of this generation are surrounded with the uses of different gadgets. From waking up early in the morning hearing the alarm from PC to video chatting with friends at late hours, everything is done in different gadgets, (which are mostly different forms of computer here). It is as if these gadgets have become a natural part of their lives (Prensky, 2001: 1).

CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

2.0 Introduction

In this chapter the researcher tried to provide theoretical information about CALL, its history, and its benefits in today's English Language Teaching classrooms.

2.1 CALL

Different researchers and CALL practitioner have given some suitable definitions for CALL. According to Levy, CALL is "the search for and study of applications of the computer in language teaching and learning" (2008: 1). Beatty (as cited in Hubbard, 2009: 1) offers another definition of CALL, "A definition of CALL that accommodates its changing nature is any process in which a learner uses a computer and, as a result, improves his or her language". While explaining Beatty's definition, Hubbard divides it into two parts or as he says it raises "two questions". First, he talks about "computer" and then he talks about the "improvement of language" part. He further explains, the word "computer" here does not necessarily mean the "the canonical desktop and laptop devices". It includes all the other forms of computers, from the iPods to mobile phones to the electronic whiteboards to everything that has a microprocessor in it. He also mentions about the network connections which allows these devises to go online and enable the user to browse internet. Now, while describing the second part about "improving language", he talks about "learning efficiency", "learning effectiveness", "access", "convenience", "motivation" and "institutional efficiency". Now, by learning efficiency, he means it takes less time or effort for the learners to learn the language. With learning effectiveness, he means, learners are to learn the language and its skills and retain it for a longer period of time more effectively. With the word access, he means, the materials able available to the

learners need, which were previously rarely available and totally unavailable. By convenience, he tries to say that learners are able to practice and acquire the language effectively at a wide range of places now. By motivations, he means, this process makes the learning process more enjoyable, and thus makes the learners interested to learning. With institutional efficiency, he means, the learners can have the same amount of facilities they had earlier with less amount of teacher time, thus more time for actual acquisition. While searching for another definition of CALL, the researcher found this definition by Chapelle, "Computer-assisted language learning (CALL) was the expression agreed upon at the 1983 TESOL convention in Toronto in a meeting of all interested participants." She used the term to refer to "the area of technology and second language teaching and learning despite the fact that revisions for the term are suggested regularly" (2001: 3). Therefore, a compiled and valid definition of CALL can be any use of technology for the purpose of language teaching or learning.

2.2 History of CALL:

Computer-Assisted Language Learning (CALL) is a new and at the same time an old approach to language learning. It is both in the sense that "CALL emerged as a distinct field with the beginning of CALL centred conferences and professional organizations that accompanied the spread of the personal computer in the early 1980s." (Hubbard, 2009: 3) Now, Hubbard's this statement portrays that only after the spread of microcomputers in the 1980s, CALL became a known phenomenon as it is today. Though, the term was there, it was also being used before then, the mainframe or mini computers were not quite effective in their implementation of CALL worldwide. A reason might be the excessive price and less availability of those

computers. However, it was unlike the other ELT methods or approaches which were already there for years. It was actually quite new. According to Beatty (As cited in Hubbard), "There were early attempts to teach specific foreign languages in the 1950s and 1960s on mainframe computers, but the first large-scale project was done with the PLATO system developed at the University of Illinois" (2009: 3). Hubbard also mentions, "This used a programmed instruction approach that provided students with practice material targeted at their presumed level along with feedback and remediation as needed" (2009: 4). Furthermore, Hubbard says:

> Early work with what were then called 'microcomputers', such as the BBC computer, Apple II and IBM PC, began to proliferate in the early 1980s. This new wave continued to include academic projects involving teams of designers, programmers and language teachers, but this era was also marked by the emergence of teacher-programmers, typically using the BASIC language to create activities for their own students. Meeting first as informal user groups at larger conferences, they were instrumental in founding organizations such as CALICO, the CALL interest section of TESOL and EuroCALL. (2009: 4)

Therefore, at that time it was a whole lot different than today's CALL, the ideas of present day computer technology was just being started at that time. While any normal smartphone has a micro-computer chip embedded in it today, the microprocessor was just been invented in the 1980s. That was the times when computer started to became more of a household machine rather than just a machine used for high-tech research.

It is known from the works of Davis (2012), the two most important professional associations of CALL, CALICO & EUROCALL were established respectively in 1982 and 1986. He also mentions about the World Wide Web, which started its journey in 1990 and became publicly available in 1993. In 1993 EUROCALL becomes a recognized professional association. The first WorldCALL conference was held in 1998 at Melbourne, Australia. In the new century, with the availability of broadband and the rapid growth of multimedia, CALL finally started to take the form of it is now (Davies, 2012).

Different CALL practitioners and researchers have divided the history of CALL in certain categories or timelines. Warschauer and Healey (as cited in Bax), talk about three phrases of CALL- ''Behaviouristic'', ''Communicative'' and ''Integrative'' (2003: 14). While talking about some "insistencies" in Warschauer's explanations of these three phrases of CALL, Bax (2003) also says, "Warschauer's discussions of the phases of CALL show significant differences in different publications—for example, Structural CALL was previously called Behaviouristic CALL (e.g. Warschauer and Healey, 1998)." (p. 15).

Further explanation of these three phases can be achieved from Table 1, Warschauer's three stages of CALL (as cited in Bax), the timeline for Structural CALL or Behaviouristic CALL is 1970-80. It mainly followed the Grammar Translation Method (GTM) and Audio Lingual Method (ALM) and the main focus of language learning was to gain accuracy. The principal use of computer in this phase was in drill and practice. At that time mainframe computers were used to implement CALL. After that the phase of Communicative CALL came into being. This time personal computers were already available and thus those were used in language teaching.

Here the principal use of computer was in communicative exercise. The main goal of language learning was to gain both accuracy and fluency following the method of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT). The timeline for Communicative CALL was 1980-90s. Integrative CALL came into being in the 21st century. The English teaching paradigm for Integrative CALL is "Content-Based, ESP/EAP". Here the principal use of computer is in collecting and using authentic discourse. Apart from fluency and accuracy, the principal objective of this phase was to gain "agency" (Bax, 2003: 15) However, Bax is does not agree with Warschauer and Healey's definition of Integrative CALL. He finds it quite similar to the application of Communicative CALL in the 1990s (2003: 18-19).

Contrary to Warschauer, Bax (2003) prefers to talk about "approaches" of CALL, rather than "phases". After offering a critical analysis and review of the history of CALL, he argues for three new categories of CALL:

1. Restricted CALL

2. Open CALL

3. Integrated CALL

While defining Restricted CALL, Bax (as cited in Davies) says,

> I call the first approach 'Restricted CALL'. In terms of its historical period and its main features it differs little from Warschauer and Healey's 'Behaviourist CALL' [...] the term 'Restricted' is more satisfactory since it allows us to refer not only to a supposed underlying theory of learning but also to the actual software and activity types in use at the time, to the teachers' role, to the feedback offered to students and to other dimensions - all were relatively

'restricted', but not all were 'behaviourist'. The term is more comprehensive, more flexible and therefore more satisfactory as a descriptor. (2012, Approaches to CALL (Bax))

The next approach, Open CALL is more open is the way of feedback given to the students, the software used in the classrooms, and the teacher's role in the classrooms. This approach also uses games and simulations in language teaching. Contrary to Warschauer's Communicative CALL phase, Bax mentions that this approach of CALL is still in use. This also clarifies the earlier disparity mentioned by Bax between Communicative and Integrative CALL.

Again, in contrast to Warschauer, Bax, uses the term "Integrated" instead of Integrative. Bax's idea of Integrated CALL is more of a futuristic idea of CALL, unlike Warschauer's Integrative CALL, which according to Warschauer, is already in use. Bax argues that Integrated CALL will be the Approach, when technology will become "invisible" in language teaching classrooms. It will be a normalized form of CALL.

Bax (2003) also provides some stages of normalization of CALL,

Stages of normalisation in CALL:

1. Early Adopters. A few teachers and schools adopt the technology out of curiosity.

2. Ignorance/scepticism. However, most people are sceptical, or ignorant of its existence.

3. Try once. People try it out but reject it because of early problems. They can't see its value—it doesn't appear to add anything of 'relative advantage' (Rogers, 1995).

4. Try again. Someone tells them it really works. They try again. They see it does in fact have relative advantage.

5. Fear/awe. More people start to use it, but still there is (a) fear, alternating with (b) exaggerated expectations.

6. Normalising. Gradually it is seen as something normal.

7. Normalisation. The technology is so integrated into our lives that it becomes invisible—'normalised'. (p. 24-25)

2.3 Why CALL should be used:

Firstly, CALL is not just about teaching language in a classroom, it is more about giving the students a tool for their language acquisition. It is something which the teacher could use in the classrooms, and again, the students can use it at their homes without someone's help. People may fear that this way the teacher's role is becoming more obsolete, however it is actually making teachers' role more effective. It is because in a language teaching classroom, a teacher is more of a facilitator, whose duty is to facilitate his students with all the tools and materials the students need. Now, if the students are more interested learn using technology and if it is actually facilitating their learning, than it is actually fulfilling the teachers' original duty. Plus, a computer is better than a human being at some cases, it does not sleep, it does not rest, it has unlimited patience, it can adopt very quickly, and it can repeat one single

sentence or any object of students need for millions times without getting annoyed. This is what makes CALL a very useful tool of language learning. (Davies, 2012)

Secondly, one simply cannot neglect the fact that an internet connection and a click is all it takes for a person to know the meaning of a word, no matter in whatever language it is in. All the person have to do is, open his internet browser, type the word in the search box, and eureka, everything in the world that he needs to know about the word is there online, a click away. Now, if it was not for technology, a person had to go through a dictionary just to find out what the word means, let alone its usage. So, that is when the point becomes clear, for vocabulary learning, technology has brought out a revolutionary change. On one hand, it eased all the work it used to take just to learn a word properly, on the other hand it saves a lot of valuable time of the learner. For example- sometimes the learner even forgets the perspective of why he was looking for the meaning of a word. With the use of technology in vocabulary learning, it would be fair to say that there is no chance of that.

Similar way, if a teacher wants to teach his class a proper pronunciation of a word or phrase, all he needs to do is open an online dictionary, find the word and play the sound for the students as many times needed. In case of phrase, he might need to download the sound of the phrase and play it for them. Now, it simply following the drill and practice method of ALM, but the teacher's work is being easier than ever. At the same time the learning is being more accurate because while playing the sounds in the computer, there is barely any chance of distortion due to continuous repetition, unlike human voices. Therefore, using computer and technology is very effective in every sphere of language teaching. All it needs is proper information of what to use and how to use.

Finally, as Prensky mentions, todays digital natives are living in a world surrounded by technology. Their days start with alarm clock in mobile phone and end with browsing facebook in mobile phones. The old and classical approaches to language teaching are not going to be effective for them. They need a process which they can actually relate to. After all it is all about teaching them. If the "digital immigrant" teachers cannot speak their language, then they will always fail to get the attention needed from these students. It is true that the immigrants will not have the fluency at first in speaking their language (using technology the way these digital natives do). Still, they have to try and make it work. In order to do so, CALL is going to be their aid. (2001: 1-5)

CHAPTER 3 – METHODOLOGY

3.0 Introduction

The research is mainly based on the use of technology in the English language learning classrooms of Bangladeshi private universities; therefore the researcher has conducted a survey on a number of students, from different private universities of Dhaka, Bangladesh. These students are generally in their first or second year of Undergraduate study, and they are from various departments. They were asked to fill out a questionnaire where they had to answer both close and open ended questions. Apart from this, the researcher also used secondary materials such as books, scholarly articles from online educational databases and newspaper articles on the selected topic as references for his research. All the books and articles used in this paper were published in English.

3.1 Research Design

Since, the research title itself mentions that, this research is about the students' perspective; the researcher had to keep the students' perception in mind. Therefore, a short, precise and straight questionnaire, instead of a large and elaborate one, was used by the researcher to conduct the survey on the students. This way the students were neither bored, nor did it take much of their time while filling out the questionnaire, and hopefully they gave maximum number of appropriate answers possible. As the survey was conducted on a large number of students from various universities using questionnaires, and the questionnaire is prepared with a

combination of both closed and open ended questions, the data is analyzed using both quantitative and qualitative technique.

3.2 Theoretical Framework

Since, the topic is about the private university students' perspective about CALL and problems regarding its implementation, the researcher had to conduct surveys to find out proper information concerning the issue. As mentioned earlier the survey was conducted on a number of private university students from Dhaka, Bangladesh. Here, the target group of the students is the students who are in their first or second year of undergraduate education and have enrolled in an English language learning course regardless of current stream of study or educational backgrounds (Bengali, English or Madrasa). As mentioned by Prensky (2001: 01) today's students "K through college" are always surrounded by technology from their birth. They have seen a computer screen before even uttering their first word, let alone reading a word. So, it is very natural for these students to learn easily with the help of technology. In western countries CALL is not a new term, researchers and teachers are trying to incorporate it to help their teaching process and to connect more effectively with their students. (Bax, 2002:14) However, not much available research is found about what the Bangladeshi students have to say about the use of CALL in their classrooms. Therefore, this research is being done to bring out the perspective of the Bangladeshi private university students regarding the implementation of CALL, merits and demerits of it.

3.3 Sampling

The research is being done with the aim to find out the students view about the use of technology in their English language learning classrooms. The researcher conducted a survey in several private universities amongst the students. The universities were chosen randomly. A total of 102 students from 4 private universities participated in the survey conducted by the researcher. They had to fill out the questionnaire form provided by him. In the questionnaire, they were both open ended and close ended questions available. No oral interview were taken by the researcher, however there were space provided in the questionnaire for additional comments from the students (if they had any). As mentioned earlier, the universities were chosen randomly, and the surveys were done in the respective classrooms with the permission of the university authorities.

3.4 Setting

The surveys were conducted in language learning classrooms of the private universities. Most of these classrooms had desks for students seating, a chair and a table for the teacher, white-board, PC, speaker, overhead projector etc. The students' questionnaires were taken to their respected classrooms, so the settings were formal. They were seated in their seats while the researcher provided them the questionnaire forms and were asked to fill it up. No direct formal or informal interaction took place other than this questionnaire between the researcher and the students.

3.5 Instrumentation

The researcher used a survey questionnaire to collect the students' data. There were questions in the questionnaire where the students had to mark their preferred choice, there were direct close ended questions where they have to answer simply 'yes' or 'no', and there were some open ended questions as well where they gave their opinion and supporting arguments. In total there were 12 questions which focused on the Central Research Questions. There was also additional space available for additional comments. Students were also allowed to choose (mark) more than one item or add additional items in their answers if necessary. In the students' survey questionnaire, question no. 1, 2, 5, 11 and 12 is related to Central Research Question no. 1, question no. 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7 is related to Central Research Question no. 2, question no. 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7 is related to Central Research Question no. 3 and question no. 8, 9 and 10 is related to Central Research Question no. 4.

3.6 Data Collection Procedure

For the data collection, the researcher first contacted the four private universities in Dhaka, Bangladesh personally. After getting the recommendation letter from the respected supervisor and with the permission of the authorities from those universities the researcher was given schedule to conduct the survey among the students. In for all four universities, he was allowed to conduct the survey before the start of a class or after the end of a class, and in all four classrooms the teachers were present during the survey. However, they did not interrupt in any way and were very helpful as they allowed the researcher to conduct the survey by keeping their class duration a little bit shorter than regular. Since, the questionnaire is short and pretty straight forward, it did

not take much time for the students to fill it up. Thankfully, most of the students answered all the questions.

3.7 Data Analysis Procedure

Once, the survey was done, all the survey papers were collected and evaluated. Since, some questions needed quantitative and some questions needed qualitative analysis, first the researcher had separated these two kinds of questions. Then, the Quantitative part (answers with 'yes'/ 'no' or multiple choices) was analyzed through the use of tables. On the other hand the Qualitative part (answers to open ended questions) was analyzed individually and more intensively to find any new insight if possible.

3.8 Obstacles Encountered

In order to conduct the survey, the researcher had to get permission from each of the university authorities. Though, it would probably not be a big issue at normal times, the survey was conducted during the holy month of Ramadan. So, the office hours were significantly shorter, and everyone was eager to get back home as early as possible. Therefore, getting the schedule to conduct the survey was a little bit tough. Furthermore, once the researcher got permission and schedule for conducting survey, the political condition of the country suddenly became unstable with continuous nationwide strikes. So, the researcher had to contact the authorities again to reschedule the time. It wasted valuable times. Though, private contacts came in quite handy in some cases, most of the time the researcher had to go to university and wait for some time to meet the authorities to get permission to conduct the survey.

Moreover, not all the teachers were very happy that the researcher took some time at the beginning of their classes. In addition, A certain university refused to let their students answer three specific questions from the questionnaire, so those questions were removed from the questionnaires used in that university.

CHAPTER 4: FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

4.0 Introduction

This chapter focuses on the findings of the survey conducted by the researcher to find the students' perspective about the implementation of CALL in Bangladeshi private universities. The survey was done using a survey questionnaire. Therefore, its findings were counted using the tallying system and analyzed in quantitative method. However, there were some questions in the questionnaire where the students were asked to give their individual opinions or reasons behind choosing an option. Therefore, qualitative method was also used to analyze the data properly. The researcher conducted the survey on a total 102 students from 4 classrooms of 4 private universities.

4.1 Overall Response of the Survey

Question No. 01

Question	Yes	No
Do you have a personal computer (desktop/laptop) at your home?	94 students 92.16%	8 students 7.84%

As it can be seen, question number 01 is a direct question where students had to choose between the two answers. All the students participated in the survey gave

answer to this question. Among the total 102 students, 94 students (92.16%) have answered that they have a personal computer at their homes and 8 students (7.84%) have said that they do not have a personal computer at their homes. It is clear that the majority 92.16% of the students have a personal computer at their homes. Therefore, it supports my primary argument that most of the students of this level are highly exposed to technology.

Question No. 02

Question: What are the purposes you use your PC for?			
Gaming	49 Students (48%)	Preparing presentations	84 Students (82.35%)
Internet browsing	85 Students (83.34%)	Preparing assignments	84 Students (82.35%)
Watching movies	80 Students (78.43%)	Searching online Reading Materials	58 Students (56.86%)
Watching videos	59 Students 57.84%	Reading e-books (for Entertainment)	31 Students (30.39%)
Listening to music	79 Students (77.45%)	Reading e-books (for study purpose)	48 Students (47%)

In question number 02, students were asked about the purposes they use their PC for. In this question they were given the liberty of choosing more than one option as their answer. Therefore, the results show- 49 students (48%) use their PC for gaming, 85

students (83.34%) use their PC for internet browsing, 80 students (78.43%) use their PC for watching movies, 59 students (57.84%) use their PC for watching videos, 79 Students (77.45%) use their PC for listening to music, 84 Students (82.35%) use their PC for preparing presentations, 84 Students (82.35%) use their PC for preparing assignments, 58 Students (56.86%) use their PC for searching online reading materials, 31 Students (30.39%) use their PC for reading e-books (for Entertainment) and 48 Students (47%) reading e-books (for study purpose). As it can be seen, the majority of the students (83.34%) use their PC for internet browsing. However, it is fascinating to see that the second next majority (82.35%) say they use their PC for preparing presentations and for preparing assignments. So, these prove that these people are not only using technology for their entertainment, they are using it in every sphere of their lives. Now, it should be mentioned again that almost all these students are in their first year of undergraduate study. So, they fall in the target age group of the previously mentioned "Digital natives". Therefore, Prensky's opinion about digital natives do apply for these people, and the survey results of question number 02 supports the argument about they being "surrounded by technology" as well (2001: 01).

Question No. 03

Question	Lab	Cyber café	Friends' Pc	Other(Specify)
If you do not own a PC, then where do you use it?	32 Students 31.77%	34 Students 33.33%	27 Students 26.47%	14 Students 13.72%

Question number 03 asked if a student does not own a PC, then where s/he uses it. Now, this question was only intended for the students who "do not own a PC". However, the survey shows a lot of students who answered in question number 01 that they have a PC, responded to question number 03 as well. The researcher has an impression that many of them might have failed to understand the actual question and might have answered to this question as "where do you use a PC apart from your home?" Nevertheless, the reasons behind asking the question was to see if the students do not have a PC, how much exposed they are to PC outside home. The answers shows that, while only 7.84% (from question no. 01) do not own a PC at home, 31.77% students use PC in the lab, 33.33% use PC in cyber café, 25.47% students use friends' PC and 13.72% of the students use PC in other place. A few of them mentioned about using brothers PC or relatives PC as "others". Therefore, it is very clear that even if some of the students do not have a PC at home, they are very much exposed to it.

Question No. 04

Question: What are the technological facilities you have in your English language classrooms?			
PC	98 Students (96%)	Audio/Video player	46 Students (45%)
Projector	97 Students (95%)	Internet	53 Students (51.96%)

Speaker	52 Students (50.9%)	Others (Specify)	18 Students (17.64%)

In question number 04, the students asked about the available technological facilities in their English language classroom. In this question they were given the liberty of choosing more than one option as their answer. 98 students (96%) said they have PC in their classrooms, 97 students (95%) said they have projector in their classrooms, 52 students (50.9%) said they have speakers in their classrooms, 46 students (45%) said they have audio/video player in their classrooms, 53 students (51.96%) said they have internet in their classrooms, and 18 students (17.84%) said they have other facilities in their classrooms. It is quite clear that majority of these students have PC (96%) and projector (95%) in their classrooms.

A few students mentioned about overhead project (OHP) as "other" facilities, the rest of the students who marked other as answer did not specify it.

Question No. 05

Question: Do your teachers use any technological facility in your English language classrooms?			
PC	90 Students (88.23%)	Audio/Video player	49 Students (48%)
Projector	84 Students (82.35%)	Internet	19 Students (18.62%)
Speaker	49 Students (48%)	Others(Specify)	14 Students (13.72%)

In question number 05, students were asked about the technological facilities their teachers use in their English language classrooms. In this question they were given the liberty of choosing more than one option as their answer. 90 students (88.23%) said their teachers use PC in their classrooms, 84 students (82.35%) said their teachers use projector in their classrooms, 49 students (48%) said their teachers use speakers in their classrooms, 49 students (48%) said their teachers use audio/video player in their classrooms, 19 students (18.62%) said their teachers use internet player in their classrooms, and 14 students (13.72%) said their teachers use other facilities in their classrooms. The results shows clearly that majority of their teachers use PC (88.23%) and projector (82.35%) in their classrooms.

A few students mentioned about overhead project (OHP) as "other" facilities used by the teachers in the classrooms, the rest of the students who marked other as answer did not specify it.

Question No. 06

Question	Yes	No
Do you think using PC or other technological equipment in a classroom can help language learning? If yes, How? If no, then what are the problems?	93 Students 91.17 %	5 Students 4.9 %

In response to question number 06, if they think using PC or other technological equipment in a classroom can help language learning? If yes, How? If no, then what are the problems?, 93 students (91.17%) have said that PC or other technological equipment in a classroom can help language learning and 5 students (4.9%) have said that PC or other technological equipment in a classroom cannot help language learning. The rest 4 students did not answer to this question. Clearly, the majority (91.17%) believes that use of technological equipment in a classroom benefits their learning.

As the question also asks the students to justify their stand, many students gave their opinions for and against the use of technology. Among the students who answered this question "yes", most of them said that use of audio and video clips makes language learning easier and more accurate; use of technology reduces boredom and increases their concentration span in a class.

A student also mentioned that "there are huge amount of language learning material available online" which should make their learning process easier and more interesting.

The students who said, use of technological equipment in a classroom cannot benefit their learning, argued that they do not have enough time to use technology in classrooms, they feel only "practice" can help language learning not technology. A student also mentioned that students might cheat if technology is used in classrooms, but did not explain how students might cheat.

Question No. 07

Question	Yes	No
Do you think using PC or other technological equipment at your house can improve English? If yes, How? If no, then what are the problems?	95 Students 93.13 %	1 Student 0.98 %

For question number 07, students were asked if they think using PC or other technological equipment at their houses can improve their English or not. 95 students (93.13%) agreed than use of PC or other technological equipment at their houses can improve their English. 01 student (0.98%) agreed than use of PC or other technological equipment at his house cannot improve his English. The rest 6 students did not answer to this question. So, the majority (93.13%) students believe that use of technological equipment at their houses can improve their English.

While many students did not justify their answer with any points, some students who said technological equipment at their houses can improve their English mentioned that all the controls and commands needed to run a PC is in English. Therefore, a person got to learn and understand a certain amount of English in order to use a PC. Moreover, most of the websites and pages available on the internet are written in English, so even the normal internet browsing makes a person learn English in his subconscious. Likewise, computer games help English language learning as well.

Some students said that watching English movies and videos in their PCs improve their English listening and speaking skills. Some students also mentioned that the use of subtitle while watching any movie or video clip helps their comprehension of the language.

A student also mentioned that use of internet, online dictionaries and reading eBooks helps their vocabulary learning.

Another student mentioned that it is easy to learn English while staying at home using digital learning materials.

The student who said PC or other technological equipment at his house cannot improve his English argued that PC or other technological equipment "is only for gaming and enjoy the internet". Though the answer is kind of incomplete and unclear, this particular answer gave the researcher the impression that either the student is unaware of the facilities available using which a person can study a language using a PC or other technological equipment, or simply he might not be interested in learning in this process at all.

Question No. 08

Question	Yes	No
Do your teachers encourage/motivate you or ask you to use PCs for English language learning purpose? If yes, how? What kind of benefits did they	59 Students 57.84 %	7 Students 6.86 %

talk about?		

For question number 08, students were asked if their teachers encourage or motivate them to use PCs for English language learning. 59 Students (57.84 %) said that their teachers do encourage or motivate them to use PCs for English language learning and 7 Students (6.86 %) do not encourage or motivate them to use PCs for English language learning. 14 students did not give any answer to this question. Moreover, a certain university authority refused to let their students to answer to this question. So, 22 students from that university did not answer to this question. However, the majority (57.84 %) of the students says that their teachers encouraged or motivated them to use PCs for English language learning.

Students who answered "yes" to this question also mentioned that teachers talked about vocabulary improvement through the use of internet browsing, dictionary software, online dictionary.

Couple of students also said that their teachers asked them to use podcasts for language learning.

Few students said that their teachers asked them to read online magazines and use online libraries for collecting reading material. However, the students did not specify the magazines or libraries their teacher suggested them.

Two students said that their teachers did not motivate directly but gave homework which required the use of PC.

Question No. 09

Question	Yes	No
Did they suggest any particular computer application or website? If yes, what are those?	33 Students 32.35 %	41 Students 40.19%

In question number 09, students were asked if their teacher suggested any particular computer application or website. In answers, 33 students (32.35 %) said that their teacher did suggest some application or website. 41 students (40.19%) said that their teacher did not suggest any particular application and or website. Therefore, the majority (40.19%) of the students said that their teachers did not suggest them any particular computer application or website for language learning.

Similar to question number 08, a certain university authority refused to let their students to answer to this question. So, 22 students from that university did not answer to this question as well. Apart from this, 4 other students did not give any answer to this question.

Among the students who stated that their teachers suggested them some particular computer applications or website for language learning, most of the students did not mention the name of the applications or website that their teachers suggest them. On the other hand some students said their teachers suggested them to use Google search, Wikipedia, MS word, MS PowerPoint, BBC Podcast and dictionary.com.

A student also mentioned that his teacher suggested the popular IPhone app Readdle.

Question No. 10

Question	Yes	No
Have you ever felt that you are more tech-savvy than your teacher? When? Why?	9 Students 8.82 %	52 Students 50.98 %

In question number 10, the students were asked if they ever felt that they were more tech-savvy than their teacher. 9 students (8.82%) said that they felt they are more tech-savvy than their teachers, while 52 students (50.98%) stated that they never felt they are more tech-savvy than their teachers. Similar to question number 8 and 9, a certain university authority refused to let their students to answer to this question. So, 22 students from that university did not answer to this question too. Apart from this, 19 other students did not give any answer to this question. However, the majority (50.98%) stated that they never felt they are more tech-savvy than their teachers.

While most of the students did not answer to the second part of the question- when/why they felt they are more tech-savvy than their teachers or not, a few of the students said they felt they are more tech-savvy than their teachers because their teachers never showed much interest in using PC or other technological facilities in the classroom.

Question No. 11

Question	Yes	No

Have you ever used internet, any computer or mobile games or mobile application by yourself for English language learning? If yes, which are they?	76 Students 74.5 %	16 Students 15.68 %

In question number 11, students are asked if they ever used internet, any computer or mobile games or mobile application for English language learning. In the answers, 76 students (74.5 %) have said "Yes" and 16 students (15.68%) have said "No". 10 students did not give any response to this question. Undoubtedly, the majority (74.5 %) of the students agreed that they have used computer or mobile games or applications for English language learning.

Although, majority of the students said they have used internet, computer or mobile games or applications for English language learning, many of those did not answer to the second part of the question, which asks to mention the names of the website, apps or games they used. Among the students who mentioned the names, MS Word and MS PowerPoint was the most common answer. Next in line was the popular video watching website www.youtube.com. Some students mentioned about www.google.com. A few students mentioned about using http://www.sparknotes.com/ for their assignments. Apart from these, some students mentioned about playing Hangman and word puzzles game in mobile phone for vocabulary learning. Few students also mentioned about using BBC podcasts and online dictionaries for language learning. Two students mentioned attending online quizzes for language

learning. Apart from these, some students mentioned about playing Cricket and Fifa football games on PC for language learning.

Question No. 12

Question	Yes	No
Have you ever come across the term CALL (Computer-Assisted Language learning)? If yes, where?	19 Students 18.62 %	67 Students 65.68 %

Question number 12 asks if the students are familiar with the term CALL (Computer-Assisted Language Learning). In response, 19 students (18.62 %) have said they have heard this term before, and 67 students (65.68%) have said they have never heard this term before.

While answering the latter part of the question, some students said they have heard the term in their English Language class. Two students said that they came across with the term in their CSE class.

Two other students mentioned that they have heard the term at their home, however they did not mention in what perspective they heard the term.

4.2 Findings Related to Central Research Questions

Response to CRQ 01.

Central Research Question number 01 inquires, do the students of Bangladeshi private universities use computer for language learning? As mentioned in chapter 03, this question is related to the question number 1, 2, 5, 11 and 12 of the survey questionnaire. From the overall analysis of the students' responses of these five questions some facts came forward. Those are:

i) 92.16% of the students have a PC. (question 1)

ii) 83.34% of them use their PC for internet browsing. (question 2)

iii) 82.35% of them use their PC for preparing presentations and assignments. (question 2)

iv) 88.23% of their teachers use PC for language teaching in their classrooms. (question 5)

v) 82.35% of their teachers use projector for language teaching in their classrooms. (question 5)

vi) 74.5% of the students have used internet, computer or mobile application by themselves for language learning. (question 11)

So, it should be safe to say that a fair amount of students (average 83.82%) of Bangladeshi private universities use computer for English language learning. However, from the results of the survey, it is also derived that the amount of CALL they are using in the classroom or at home are not very deep. They are still unaware of many usages and benefits of CALL. There are lots of scopes for improvement in this section. They should be inspired more, and should be notified about the other popular tools of CALL.

Response to CRQ 02.

Central Research Question number 02 inquires, why do/don't the Bangladeshi private university students use CALL? As mentioned in chapter 03, this question is related to the question number 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7 of the survey questionnaire. Now the response to CRQ 01 already states that a fair amount of the students (average 83.82%) use CALL for language learning. Therefore, the question arises, why do they use CALL? Overall analysis of the survey data shows:

i)   91.17% of the students think PC or other technological equipment in a classroom helps language learning. (question 06)

ii)   93.13% of the students think using PC or other technological equipment at home helps language learning. (question 07)

Apart from these, answers of question number 4 show that 96% of the students say they have PC and 95% of the students say they have projector in their classrooms. Answer of question number 03 states that, 32% of the students use PC in a Lab, 34% of the students use PC in a cyber café, 26.42% students use friends' PC and 13.72% students use 'others', if they do not have a PC available for them. Answers to survey question 2 and 5 also indicates that these students use PC for almost every sphere of their lives, and their teachers use a fair amount of technology in the classrooms as well. These statistics show that the students are very much exposed to PC and other technological facilities both at their home and classrooms. Perhaps this exposure to technology might be a reason for these students' use of CALL.

Response to CRQ 03.

Central Research Question 3 inquires; do the students face any problems? Are there enough facilities available for them? Do they know the proper use of the facilities available? Are they even interested in English language learning using computer? This question is related to question number 4, 5, 6 and 7.

From the responses of question number 4, it was clear that the students have enough PC and Projectors in their classrooms. They also have internet connection, speaker and audio-video players, but not in sufficient numbers. Similarly, from the responses of question number 5, it can be seen that the teachers are mostly using PC and projector. Other technological facilities are not being utilized much. Responses from question number 06 and 07 show that majority of the students are interested to learn English through the use of technology both at their classrooms and at their homes. Only 5% of the students fear that using technology in English language classrooms might lead to cheating, and they do not have enough time for using technology in the classrooms. They did not give any supporting point about why they think so. However, the researcher believes, these 5% of the students are not aware of the proper technological faculties available for English language classrooms. Thus, they are afraid of using technology. To sum up CRQ 03, the students do face problems e.g. - not many of them know the proper use of the technology in English language learning. They do have some facilities available in the classrooms, but it is not enough. All the classrooms should at least have internet connection for using online language learning applications. There should also be speakers for the betterment of listening and speaking skills of the students. Lastly, the students are very much interested in English language learning through technology.

Response to CRQ 04.

Central Research Question 04 asks- Do their teachers motivate or guide them to take the benefit of computer and other technology for language learning? How?

CRQ 04 is related to question number 8, 9 and 10 of the survey questionnaire. From the response of question number 8, it can be seen that 57.84% of the students said that their teachers have encouraged or motivated them to use PCs for language learning purpose. Response to question number 09 shows that only 32. 35% of the students said that their teachers have suggested them any particular computer application or website for language learning. Response to question number 10 shows that 8.82% of the students have felt they are more tech-savvy than their teachers, where as 50.98% of the students said they have never felt that. Rest of the students did not attend the question. Therefore, overall analysis of the responses reveals that some teachers do encourage their students to use technology for English language learning, but the amount is insufficient. They should encourage further, and more importantly, they should advise their students to use specific applications and websites, which will interest the students more. Last but not the least, the teachers themselves should use more technology in the classrooms; otherwise no matter how much they encourage their students, it will all be for a lost cause.

CHAPTER 5 – CONCLUSION

The main aim of this paper was to find out if CALL is being implemented in Bangladeshi private universities or not. If yes, that what are the problems the students face. The paper is written keeping the students' perspective in mind. The researcher used survey questionnaires to collect data about students' opinions, and the study of the data shows that yes, CALL is being implemented to quite an extend in Bangladeshi private universities. Still, there is lots of scope for improvement. However, they have almost all the sufficient materials or technological facilities needed to use implement CALL in a broader perspective. The researcher feels that, instead of being stuck to MS word, MS PowerPoint or general internet browsing, the teachers should start using other applications (e.g. - hotpotatoes) in the classrooms, which are specially designed for CALL. Few students tend to feel that more use of technology will take more time that their usual class time. Well, while it's true that use of technology does not save much time (Davis, 2012) at the same time it does not take extra time than the schedule class. The point which the teachers should keep in mind that implementation of CALL or use of technology is not adding something new to teach. It is similar to using any other teaching aids they use in their classes. The job of CALL is not to make the teachers role obsolete, in contrary the aim is to make their job more effective (Davis, 2012). Now, if they implement the proper technology in the classrooms, the students are bound to give attention. As the results of the survey show, majority of the students feel that if the teachers use visual aid in the classrooms, it makes the learning process more interesting and less "boring". Additionally it is only natural for the students to learn more effectively if they are interested to the learning by themselves. This way, the teachers do not need to motivate the students

anymore, all they need to do is find out the appropriate application for their students and use it properly in the classroom, and ask the students to use it as well. Now, there are some issues to focus here. Traditionally, Bangladeshi English language teachers are from arts background, and until a recent time, computers were not very popular (neither available) amongst general mass. In the same way, when the teachers graduated from their institutes, there is high probability that they were not trained in CALL approaches and its different tools. Therefore, proper teacher training is very important for the implementation of CALL in Bangladeshi private universities. As the survey shows, almost all the private university classrooms have at least PC and projector and some classrooms have internet connection and speakers, not much infrastructural change is needed to be done. The students are more than eager and interested to learn language through the use of technology. It is high time they are given the proper opportunity.

References

Bax S. (2003) CALL - past, present and future", *System* 31, 1: 13-28.

Billah, M. (2012, March 18). Is CLT working in Bangladesh?.*The Financial Express*.

Retrieved from http://www.thefinancialexpress-bd.com/more.php?news_id=123772&date=2012-03-18

Chapelle, C. A. (2001). *Computer applications in second language acquisition*. New York: Cambridge.

Davies, G. (2012). Computer Assisted Language Learning: Where are we now and where are we going?. Retrieved from http://www.camsoftpartners.co.uk/docs/UCALL_Keynote.htm#_Toc142650258

Freeman, D.L. (2000). *Techniques and Principles in Language Teaching*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Hubbard, P. (Ed.) (2009). *Computer Assisted Language Learning: Vol 1 (Critical Concepts in Linguistics)*. London: Routledge.

Levy, M. (2008). *Computer-Assisted Language Learning: Context and Conceptualization*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Prensky, M. (2001). Digital Natives, Digital Immigrants. *On the Horizon,* 9(5), 1-6.

Rahman , M. Md. Hamzah, M.I. M., Meerah. D.T.S.M., Rahman, M. Historical Development of Secondary Education in Bangladesh.*International*

Educational Studies, 3, 2-3.

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

Appendix

Students' Questionnaire:

Please answer the following questions. You can always add your comment or opinion with each question. There is also space at the end of the questionnaire for any additional comment. You can mark more than one item as the answer of a question if necessary.

1. Do you have a personal computer (desktop/laptop) at your home?

Yes	
No	

2. What are the purposes you use your PC for?

Gaming		Preparing presentations	
Internet browsing		Preparing assignments	
Watching movies		Searching online Reading Materials	
Watching videos		Reading e-books (for Entertainment)	
Listening to music		Reading e-books (for study purpose)	

3. If you do not own a PC, then where do you use it?

Lab		Friends' Pc	
Cyber café		Other(Specify)	

4. What are the technological facilities you have in your English language classrooms?

PC		Audio/Video player	
Projector		Internet	
Speaker		Others(Specify)	

5. Do your teachers use any technological facility in your English language classrooms? Mark the used items.

PC		Audio/Video player	
Projector		Internet	
Speaker		Others(Specify)	

6. Do you think using PC or other technological equipment in a classroom can help language learning? If yes, How? If no, then what are the problems?

Answer:

7. Do you think using PC or other technological equipment at your house can improve English? If yes, How? If no, then what are the problems?

Answer:

8. Do your teachers encourage/motivate you or ask you to use PCs for English language learning purpose? If yes, how? What kind of benefits did they talk about?

Answer:

9. Did they suggest any particular computer application or website? If yes, what are those?

Answer:

10. Have you ever felt that you are more tech-savvy than your teacher? When? Why?

Answer:

11. Have you ever used internet, any computer or mobile games or mobile application by yourself for English language learning? If yes, which are they?

Answer:

12. Have you ever come across the term CALL (Computer-Assisted Language learning)? If yes, where?

Answer:

Additional Comments: