

## Using Technology in the Classroom: A Study with Turkish Pre-Service EFL Teachers

**Assist. Prof. Dr. Ali Merç**

*Department of Foreign Languages Teacher Education  
Anadolu University  
Turkey  
amerc@anadolu.edu.tr*

### ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study is to investigate the student teachers' use of technology in their classrooms during practice teaching experience. To this end, a questionnaire was given to 86 student teachers completing their teaching practicum at Anadolu University English Language Teaching Program. Semi-structured interviews were also conducted with 12 of the participants for data triangulation. The analyses of the quantitative and qualitative data indicated that the practicum schools were not very rich in terms of the technological devices available to the student teachers for their EFL classes. It was also discovered that student teachers were not benefiting from technology available to them in their teaching practice at a satisfying level. Insufficient training, lack of basic facilities in the practicum schools, and student teachers' own choices were found the main reasons for student teachers to utilize technology in the teaching practice process. The findings of the study revealed a mismatch between teacher training programs and real-world classrooms in terms of technology integration in EFL instruction. Pedagogical implications of the study consist of the need for better integration of technology in EFL teacher training and a stronger link between the placement schools and the university.

### INTRODUCTION

“The use of technology in teaching becomes more important in present times, because teachers also have to be able to keep up with the technological knowledge of their students” (Richards, 2014, p. 2) in order to meet the expectations of today's ‘digital natives’, who are quite competent, and in a way, dependent to computers and other online instruments (Prensky, 2001). Moreover, the use of technology for teaching, learning, practicing and assessing foreign language has many advantages, particularly in the English as a Foreign Language (EFL) contexts where learners have very few opportunities to practice and assess their language skills. (Alsied & Pathan, 2013). The use of technology in instructional activities also plays an essential role for engaging students in learning (Günüç & Kuzu, 2014).

With the improvements in technology and its use in EFL classrooms, the roles of the EFL teachers are also changing (Zhu & Wang, 2006). Within this change, the knowledge of technology use is a must for foreign language teacher candidates in many teacher training programs (Barzaq, 2007) and for the pedagogical knowledge of both in-service teachers (Chiang, 2003) and teacher educators (Moradkhani, Akbari, Ghafar Samar, & Kiany, 2013). It is even cited as one of the EFL teaching practice assessment criteria (Canh, 2014). Language teachers' handiness to use technology is also mentioned amongst the effective teacher characteristics in higher education (Kourieos & Evripidou, 2013). Besides, the aim of professional development is seen as helping teachers make meaning of technology integration in teaching to regulate its influence on education (Barzaq, 2007).

As for the reasons to integrate technology in foreign language classrooms, Lam (2000) advocates that language teachers use technology because it submits an altered manner of demonstration and offers a kind of enthusiasm for students; not because of a lack of knowledge about teaching with technology, but due to a lack of contact with technology. As one of the most popular technological aids in the classroom, the use of PowerPoint presentations can suggest chances for integrating “colorful texts, photographs, illustrations, drawings, tables, graphs, movies, and transition from one to another through a slide Show” (Alkash & Al-Dersi, 2013, p. 14). Interactive White Board use is also suggested in foreign language teacher education programs to facilitate student engagement (Çelik, 2014).

As a matter of fact, EFL teachers perceived technology use very beneficial in many research and teaching contexts. For example, teachers in Iran had positive attitudes toward using technology to augment language learning through a computer-oriented instruction (Mollaei & Riasati, 2013). In the same vein, there was a positive correlation between a teacher's presence during a computer use and a Computer Assisted Language Learning (CALL) training and a positive attitude toward the use of Information and Communication Technologies (ICT), methodologies in learning in the Saudi classrooms (Alshumaimeri, 2008). Moreover, in a single-subject study, (Jebriil, 2012) documented that a Palestinian EFL teacher had very few instructional problems in adapting and implementing ICT, and that the participant teacher revealed a high level of educational

growth through the ICT-intervention practice. In addition, teachers' beliefs about the nature of knowledge and learning and beliefs about effective ways of teaching were in correlation with their technology integration practices. (Kim, Kim, Lee, Spector, & DeMeester, 2013). Furthermore, Korean EFL teachers were found to be seeing computer technology as a useful teaching tool that could easily boost means of teaching by providing students with a variety of language inputs and increasing students' learning capabilities in real-life contexts (Park & Son, 2009). Lastly, the advantages of using the Internet in the EFL classroom were listed as providing authentic materials for learners, making students meet native friends online, and assisting teacher-student communication (Chong, 2001). According to Shin and Son (2007), teachers' individual interest in Internet use, teachers' skills at incorporating Internet resources in classroom tasks, and computer amenities and technical support in schools were the three key factors influencing the Internet use in the foreign language classroom.

Although teachers had positive attitudes towards integrating technology in teaching EFL students, a number of challenges have also been quoted. For example, Chinese EFL teachers used technology chiefly for teacher-centred drives, such as instructional supply, and rarely utilized technology for student-centred tasks. Reasons limiting student-centred technological use in early EFL instruction were teacher-centred experiences in education and lack of operational professional growth that emphasized instructional planning and technology integration (Ni, 2011). Likewise, most of the Libyan teachers confronted difficulties related to time restrictions and lack of managerial support (Emhamed & Krishnan, 2011). Iranian EFL teachers were also found to be suffering from some complications in employing CALL in language classrooms because of the teachers themselves, facilities to use, learners (Hedayati & Marandi, 2014), lack of online services and resources, lack of interface in online teaching, cultural oppositions to online teaching, teachers' inadequate knowledge of online teaching (Dashtestani, 2014), incorporating technology in their teaching successfully because of instructors' self-confidence to utilize technological aids, seeing them as a waste of time, suffering from technophobia, and lack of technological devices that can be used for teaching (Kazemi & Narafshan, 2014). Finally, using the Internet in EFL classes also brought some disadvantages as it required ample time to get the accurate information, and as it was not easy to assess the Internet resources for the EFL classes (Chong, 2001).

Age was also found as a variable in technology integration in foreign language classrooms. According to Rahimi and Yadollahi (2010), a lower technology anxiety had resulted better integration of technology in EFL classrooms; and as older teachers had higher levels of technology anxiety than younger teachers, they were more hesitant to incorporate technology into their classes. It is also reported that external factors such as time constraints, inadequate technology, inflexible school programs and textbooks, and lack of managerial care affect the execution of CALL in a negative way. On the other hand, internal factors such as teachers' inadequacy in technology use, technological knowledge, and views on technology integration also influence teachers' choices to use technology in their classrooms (Park & Son, 2009).

In Turkey, in-service teachers have become the research interest in terms of their technology integration in the practice teaching environments. Erişti, Kurt, and Dindar (2012) found out that inadequacy of the personnel to assist teachers for technology, failure to give them the necessary help at the right time when needed, deficiency in sub-structure, physical setting, the quality of teachers' effectiveness in use of technology, and lack of satisfactory amount of time in the course of becoming competent in technology use are among the challenges that deter teachers' technology use in their classrooms.

Besides the above-mentioned investigation in the non-EFL Turkish training contexts, there have been a number of attempts to look closer at the technology integration in in-service EFL teaching contexts in Turkey. To illustrate, Sağlam and Sert (2012) found that teachers had positive views about the role of educational technology for improving language teaching. Nevertheless, they also acknowledged the problems experienced called for a requisite for a technology integration training for both teachers and students. It is concluded that EFL teachers benefit from technology for teaching academic and linguistic skills, inspiring students to build knowledge, exposing them to life-long learning skills and strategies, teaching students with diverse learning styles, finding and creating teaching materials, developing skills via the on-line sources, and creating an appealing context for learning. In another study, it was found that Turkish EFL teachers had little knowledge about on-line learning resources and has problems relate to the use of software programs. They also complained about a lack of technical and instructional support even if they had positive views about integrating technology into foreign language instruction (Aydın, 2013). In a very recent inquiry, Uluuysal, Demiral, Kurt, and Şahin (2014) investigated the technology integration practices of an EFL teacher in Turkey. The findings revealed that the EFL teacher had positive views about carrying out professional development; she was interested in the process and was conscious about her responsibilities in the process; and that she managed the process along the lines of her own speed to achieve her tasks. Moreover, it was observed that a flexible teaching process was

created; the teacher had positive attitudes towards the process; and that she successfully finished the process creating the instructional materials according to the objective of the professional development task.

Contrary to the present inquires offering that Turkish EFL teachers are often unable and/or unwilling to use technology in their teaching practice, teachers generally expressed that they enjoyed using computerized instructional tackles, saw themselves proficient enough, and believed that they could serve their students easily (Çelik & Aytn, 2014). Besides, teachers were excited and stated that technology could encourage students, augment their learning, and develop their long-term retention when their overall views about the role of technology in language instruction is considered. Even though teachers believed that they had limited training on using technology, they took it as an easy-to-overcome challenge. Contrariwise, lack of access to computers and the Internet was cited as posing an important problem. Also, teachers stated that governmental restrictions on Internet resources restricted their uses whenever they were available to them. Teachers thought that inadequate contact with technology was the main reason constraining the use of technology in the foreign language classrooms. Finally, Başaran (2013) reviewed 10 recent research articles conducted in Turkey related to teachers' and students' opinions about the use of CALL in language teaching. The analyses revealed that students and teachers had positive attitudes towards CALL; nevertheless, the teachers were hesitant to use computers in their classes because of insufficient teacher training on technology and how to employ technology into English teaching process. While the majority of EFL teachers had positive opinions about the potential benefits of CALL, they were not confident enough in trying new technological tools in their teaching. Not only teachers but also students desire their English teachers being more competent to incorporate technological tools in their classes.

As a transition from the in-service context to the pre-service context, we can cite Chung's (2014) current study comparing and contrasting the two groups of teachers on their beliefs about the technology integration in EFL instruction. The results showed that in-service teachers had more positive attitudes about using digital technology in the second language classroom than the pre-service ones despite both groups were generally positive about the matter. Also, the younger participants aged from 21 to 29 were more confident about their expertise in using digital technology. According to the researcher, provided that the teachers are confident and knowledgeable about the use of digital technology, they are more likely to maintain their positive attitudes towards the use of digital technology in the classroom. As a consequence, teachers' classroom practice, experiences with digital technology, technology-related training, context(s) in which such digital technology was used, and their age affected their attitudes towards technology use in the classroom.

Although there were numerous studies regarding the use of technology in foreign language teaching, studies concerning the student teachers' experiences with technology integration is rather limited. In one attempt, Kuo's (2008) study with Taiwanese EFL teacher candidates showed that that most of EFL student teachers had positive experiences and attitudes toward the use of Internet-assisted language instruction and saw technology as a vital method in their future teaching careers. However, approximately one fourth of EFL student teachers did not possess the sufficient levels of confidence and were unsure whether they had the skills and knowledge of technology to integrate technology into their future EFL classrooms. In a similar point of view, Schmid and Hegelheimer's (2014) findings after the analyses of the qualitative data that came from both pre-service and in-service teachers suggested that the field experiences accompanied by systematic guided reflection helped student teachers gain experience in implementing CALL in their teaching. According to the researchers, student teachers reported that school-based experiences helped them in those three ways: using technology in authentic language teaching contexts, assessing the effect of technology on language teaching and learning, and achieving genuine mastery experiences.

In addition to the teacher training contexts worldwide, there are some, but limited, attempts to look closer at the technology integration in pre-service EFL teaching in the Turkish settings recently. In one study, Savaş (2012) listed the advantages of using digital video-recording in micro-teaching practices as being a self-evaluation and self-correction tool, increasing student teachers' self-confidence, refining their English speaking skills, providing a better analysis of the lesson plans, and accumulative collaboration with peers and warranting a fair-minded share of work load. The challenges, on the other hand, were cited as a waste of time for preparing videos, anxiety of video-recording, and difficulty in speaking in English in prep-videos. In a similar vein, Başöz and Çubukçu (2014) recently itemized the positive and negative perceptions of student EFL teachers about CALL. As the pluses, they believe that CALL creates a more comfortable and stress-free air; it is as valued as traditional language learning; it gives flexibility to language learning; it is a good extension of classical learning methods. Student teachers also believe that use of computers in learning a foreign language can improve their vocabulary knowledge and listening skills, and can augment their intelligence. As the minuses, on the other hand, student teachers think that CALL does not help them develop their writing skills; computer use is not as valuable as oral practice; and computers need to be accompanied by other methods in foreign language learning.

In another study with 200 TEFL certificate students in a Turkish university, Yüksel and Kavanoz (2011) found out that teacher candidates' attitudes towards technology were quite positive; these findings were related to the fact that the student teachers were given the necessary technological tools at different periods of their education. Moreover, while female student teachers had more negative attitudes towards technology, type of university and the attitudes were not found to be correlated with each other. In a very recent inquiry, Savaş (2014) focused on the usefulness of Tablet PCs as instructional tools in EFL classes. The findings revealed that prospective teachers could develop more positive attitudes toward the use of Tablet PCs in EFL teaching as they gained more experience in using these teaching devices. In another experiment with 124 prospective Turkish EFL teachers in North Cyprus, Hismanoglu (2012a) checked the EFL teachers' attitudes toward ICT integration into language instruction before and after an ICT-interwoven training. According to the findings, prospective EFL teachers' ICT attitudes before and after ICT interwoven training was significantly different to a positive level, which easily put the emphasis on the prominence of inserting more ICT-related courses in the existing EFL teacher education program.

Hismanoglu and Hismanoglu (2011) and Hismanoglu (2012b) examined the concept from a distance education perspective as well. While the general ICT attitudes of pre-service EFL teachers at the face-to-face higher education context were positive, most of those pre-service EFL teachers at distance higher education context showed more negative attitudes toward ICT integration in teaching (Hismanoglu & Hismanoglu, 2011). Furthermore, student teachers at the Distant English Language Teaching Program in Turkey specified three complications for ICT integration in their foreign language teaching experiences as the lack of exposure to lessons fully designed with ICT-integration, an exam-based system, and exam-oriented study habits (Hismanoglu, 2012b).

### **Significance of the Study and the Research Questions**

Many of the studies reviewed in both Turkish context and other contexts focus on the beliefs and perceptions of in-service and pre-service teachers regarding technology use in EFL classrooms. This study, on the other hand, concentrates on the actual practices of the student teachers in their practicum experiences in teaching English as a foreign language. Therefore, considering the related literature and the existing teaching practice context, the purpose of this study is to investigate student teachers' use of technology in their classrooms during their teaching practicum. It specifically aims, first of all, to document the availability of the technological facilities in practicum schools and their frequency of use by student teachers. Second, whether or not student teachers benefited from technology in the desired level is focused. To this end, the following research questions were formed:

1. Are practicum schools equipped with necessary technological devices available to student teachers' use?
2. How frequently do student teachers use the available technology in their teaching practice?
3. Do they use technology in a satisfying level in terms of quantity and quality? If not, what are the reasons for this?

## **METHODOLOGY**

### **Participants**

The participants of the study were 86 student teachers (62 female 24 male) studying English Language Teaching at Anadolu University. The student teachers were completing their 'Teaching Practicum' and course as a part of their graduation requirement in 2012-2013 Spring Semester. Each of them was assigned to a practicum school for 6 class hours a week. They were also assigned a cooperating teacher and a university supervisor. The student teachers worked in groups of three and with their assigned cooperating teacher for twelve weeks. The first two weeks of the practicum were allocated for observation. After two weeks, each student teacher taught for 10 teaching hours throughout the teaching practicum.

As for the training that student teachers got related to the use of technology in teaching, one compulsory course in their 3<sup>rd</sup> grade can be referred to. The course 'Instructional Technologies and Materials Development (4 ECTS)' aims to equip all teacher candidates from different disciplines for an awareness to find out about the technological devices in teaching without a specific focus on integrating technology into foreign language teaching. Apart from this formal training opportunity, student teachers are supposed to improve themselves on technology with the help of their observations of their teachers, presentations they give, or informal training opportunities they will create for themselves.

During the practicum, student teachers were supposed to deliver lessons collaborating with their cooperating teachers by following the existing curricula. Therefore, they did not have the chance to decide to use technological devices in their lessons or not to use them at all. They were not assigned to use technology neither

by their university supervisors nor their cooperating teachers. In contrast to some educational contexts, they were not assessed about their skill in effective use of technological devices in their lessons.

**Instruments and Collection of the Data**

A questionnaire developed by the researcher peculiar to this study and semi-structured interviews were utilized as the data collection instruments. The data were collected at the end of the practicum process (June 2013) when the student teachers completed their teaching practicum. First, the questionnaires were given; semi-structured interviews were conducted one week later.

The questionnaire consisted of two parts. In the first part, demographic features of the participants such as their age, gender, etc. were elicited. In the second part, both Likert-type and open-ended questions were asked to provide the bases to answer the research questions. Semi-structured interviews, on the other hand, were conducted with 12 randomly selected participants in Turkish, their native language. The interviews aimed to elaborate student teachers’ opinions related to the survey items and were tape-recorded within the permission of the interviewees for future transcription. Each interview lasted from 7 to 11 minutes depending on each interviewee’s opinions and explanations.

**RESULTS**

This study employed both quantitative and qualitative data collection tools. The findings are presented in accordance with the questions in the survey and the findings obtained from the interview data.

In response to the first research question, first of all, student teachers’ opinions about the usefulness of utilizing technological aids in foreign language teaching were questioned to have a better understanding of their practices. According to the student teachers, it was necessary (33,7%) and even very necessary (66,3%) to integrate technology into foreign language classrooms. Second, the technological tools available to student teachers in the practicum schools were elicited. The results indicated that the practicum schools were not very rich in terms of the technological devices available to the student teachers for use in their English classes (Table 1). For example, almost none of the practicum schools had a language lab (98%), a TV-Video player (95%), or an Overhead Projector (88%) while more than half lacked a smart board (79%), a radio-cassette player (79%), or a computer with or without Internet connection (57% and 7 % respectively). On the other hand, student teachers indicated that most schools (70%) had a projector in the classrooms available for use.

**Table 1.** Availability of technological tools in practicum schools

|  | Yes |    | No |    |
|--|-----|----|----|----|
|  | N   | %  | N  | %  |
| Language Lab                           | 2   | 2  | 84 | 98 |
| TV-Video Player                        | 4   | 5  | 82 | 95 |
| Overhead Projector                     | 10  | 12 | 76 | 88 |
| Computer (With Internet Connection)    | 37  | 43 | 49 | 57 |
| Smart Board                            | 18  | 21 | 68 | 79 |
| Radio-Cassette/CD Player               | 18  | 21 | 68 | 79 |
| Computer (Without Internet Connection) | 21  | 24 | 65 | 76 |
| Projector                              | 60  | 70 | 26 | 30 |

For a better understanding of the availability of the technological facilities, the student teachers were asked about their opinions related to the sufficiency of those tools. Here, there was an inconsistency among the answers: while 44.2% of the student teachers thought the facilities in the schools were insufficient (insufficient = 25.6%; very insufficient = 18.6%), the rest (55.8%) found those facilities sufficient (40.7%) or very sufficient (15.1%). Hence, more than half of the student teachers thought that the practicum schools had enough technological devices for their use.

The qualitative data supported the survey results in terms of the inadequacy of technological devices. Most of the student teachers interviewed complained about the lack and/or inadequacy of the technological tools in their practicum schools. They mentioned:

“There is no projection, no OHP, no computer, etc. I’ve heard that there was one OHP-like thing, but it’s said to be placed in a meeting room kind of a room, we had to go there as a whole class. The only technology was limited to my own laptop and loudspeakers and had a listening class. This was the only thing I did for the sake of technology.”

“I just used technology one or twice. And it was just with my own laptop because there was nothing in the school...”

“For example, we couldn’t find even a loudspeaker for listening, so I don’t think there were things like a projection or something like that.”

“Because it [the computer] doesn’t work in many classrooms. And there is no Internet connection. I had only one chance and I asked them [the students] listen to a record using my laptop, that’s all. But I heard some schools have smart boards, I mean, if we had them, we would, of course, use them in our lessons...”

“Now, technology was broken and not that much. Because of the facilities of the school, they didn’t have them in the classrooms. The only things we could benefit were the copy machine and the computer in the teachers’ room. We could go there and print out and copy the handouts there. But nothing in the classrooms...”

Additionally, they mostly acknowledged that they would be able to effectively use those facilities if they were given the chance to do so. Some of the ideas from student teachers about how they would benefit from those facilities were as follows:

“I could reflect the pictures I showed the children on the screen, or I could conduct an activity there because I know there are many enjoyable activities in the Internet. At least, I could ask students to do them. They could come one by one and answer on the screen. In my earlier practicum, the teacher was using it like that and students liked it a lot. I also liked it a lot.”

“I would use technology for showing a picture, for instance. Or I could use it for ‘checking understanding’ to show the answers of an activity, they could see them better, I guess. Songs, music, visuals... These can all be implemented via technology, especially for teaching young children...”

“I remember teaching the 6<sup>th</sup> grades, for example. They are, you know, rather overactive. It could be for teaching with songs, videos, etc. Using visual would be great, especially to reinforce these...”

“There was nothing in the classroom in the name of technology. If there were some, sure I would be using. I mean, instead of showing everything on paper, I would open the screen and show it like that. This is even something, I think. You know, when you show a picture to the whole class, some can see well, some cannot; you need to do it part by part. And one more thing: If there was a computer with Internet connection, as the teacher, it would be an advantage for me. I could check if I am not sure about something, pronouncing a word, meaning of a word, etc.”

In order to find out the frequency of use of the technological devices available to the student teachers, an explicit question was asked: ‘How often have you used the technological facilities throughout your teaching practicum?’ The answers to the question yielded the following results: While few of the student teachers indicated that they never used technology (14%), some mentioned that they seldom (20.9%) or sometimes (22.1%) benefited from technological facilities. On the other hand, almost half of the student teachers reported using technology quite frequently (24.4%) or at all times (18.6%). To have a clearer picture of the issue, student teachers were asked to mention the type of technology they used together with their frequency of use. As Table 2 shows, student teachers indicated no use of OHPs (98.8%), a language lab (97.7%), a TV-Video Player (89.6%), a Radio-Cassette/CD Player (84.9%), or a smart board (82.5%), which were already not present in their practicum schools, throughout their teaching practicum process. Among the present devices, the projector was never (48.8%) used or used occasionally (15.1%) by the student teachers. Computers available to the student teachers in the classrooms with or without the Internet connection were either never used (59.3% and 60.6% respectively) or used sparingly (18.6% and 23.2% respectively) in teaching practice. This signposted that student teachers were not benefiting from the technology either because they were not present or because they did not use for any reason.

**Table 2.** Frequency of use of the technological facilities throughout the practicum

|                          | Never |      | 1-2 Times |      | 3-4 Times |   | 5 times + |     | Total |     |
|--------------------------|-------|------|-----------|------|-----------|---|-----------|-----|-------|-----|
|                          | N     | %    | N         | %    | N         | % | N         | %   | N     | %   |
| Overhead Projector       | 85    | 98,8 | 1         | 1,2  | -         | 0 | -         | 0   |       |     |
| Language Lab             | 84    | 97,7 | 2         | 2,3  | -         | 0 | -         | 0   | 86    | 100 |
| Radio-Cassette/CD Player | 73    | 84,9 | 10        | 11,6 | 2,3       | 0 | 1         | 1,2 |       |     |

|  |    |      |    |      |    |      |    |      |
|--|----|------|----|------|----|------|----|------|
| TV-Video Player                        | 77 | 89,6 | 4  | 4,6  | 4  | 4,6  | 1  | 1,2  |
| Smart Board                            | 71 | 82,5 | 1  | 1,2  | 2  | 2,3  | 12 | 14,0 |
| Computer (Without Internet Connection) | 52 | 60,6 | 20 | 23,2 | 4  | 4,6  | 10 | 11,6 |
| Computer (With Internet Connection)    | 51 | 59,3 | 16 | 18,6 | 8  | 9,3  | 11 | 12,8 |
| Projector                              | 42 | 48,8 | 13 | 15,1 | 17 | 19,8 | 14 | 16,3 |

Although the numbers in Table 2 indicated a low frequency of use, student teachers were still asked to indicate if they benefited from technological facilities in the desired level during their teaching practicum. While 38.4% of them said they did, 12.8% of them were not sure about it, and almost half of them (48.8%) confessed that they did not benefit from them at a satisfying level. As for the reasons for not profiting from technology, 53 of the 86 student teachers, who mentioned not using the technology enough, checked some reasons on the questionnaire by checking more than one item if possible (Table 3). According to the survey results, most students suffered from the lack of basic facilities in the practicum school while very few mentioned insufficient training about technology use, students’ not preferring it, or their cooperating teachers’ reluctance. None of them indicated it as their supervisor’s choice whereas one third reported the reason as their own choice.

**Table 3.** The reasons for student teachers’ not benefiting from technological devices at a satisfying level

| Reason   | N  | %    |
|--|----|------|
| Lack of basic facilities in the practicum school | 41 | 59,5 |
| My choice  | 22 | 31,9 |
| Insufficient Training                            | 4  | 5,8  |
| Students’ dissatisfaction                        | 1  | 1,4  |
| Cooperating teacher’s choice                     | 1  | 1,4  |
| University supervisor’s choice                   | 0  | 0    |
| Total  | 69 | 100  |

Deviating from the majority, some student teachers believed that they were using technology very effectively in their teaching. For example, one student teachers explained how technology was helpful for him as follows:

“We used almost all of the facilities. We could use the copy machine, take printouts, like that. My 4<sup>th</sup> grade class was rather crowded, I had 38 pupils. Projection became a blessing for us because if I got a colorful printout, not everyone would see it, but with the projection, it was easy. Also, when you open the projection, their eyes are wide open: I ‘m able to take their attention easily.”

“I used all like that. I did my listening tasks using the loudspeakers; if the task requires a video, even in mp3 format first, than asking them to watch the video. So I tried to make things more meaningful for the pupils...”

As an attempt for a deeper understanding of the reasons for not benefiting from technology in a satisfying level for teaching English in teaching practicum, student teachers’ answers to some questions in the survey were analyzed. The interview data, similar to the survey results, suggested some reasons for student teachers’ not benefiting from technological devices in their classrooms at a satisfying level.

First of all, student teachers’ ideas about their training at the university about using the technological facilities in foreign language classrooms were elicited. The results indicated that most student teachers perceived the training they got sufficient (55.8%) or very sufficient (15.1%). Some student teachers, on the other hand, found the training insufficient (23.3%) or very insufficient (15.1%). The qualitative data also supported these findings. Student teachers were not very consistent about the adequacy of the training they got during their teacher training education. For example, one student teacher was complaining about the insufficient training on integrating technology into foreign language teaching:

“I’ve got both personal reasons and limited exposure, I mean, they don’t teach us to use videos or listening things...”

“We must get more technical knowledge. For example, we had some classes here, but I don’t think they are enough. I can’t interrupt easily when necessary, sometimes even I cannot turn on or turn off the computer, sometimes I ask help from students. And when I do this, then it causes me to lose the control of the class.”

“For example, I have never taught in a class with a smart board. So, even if there was one in my school, I wouldn’t be able to use it effectively.”

“I don’t think we got a good education about this. We know all these only from our own PowerPoint presentations we prepared for our own presentations. We were never taught like ‘It’s used like this, you must be careful about this, etc. I’ve heard from my friends that they had a smart board in their classrooms in the practicum schools last semester, and they really had hard times using it. The same would be for us, too. I heard that students in the class helped them use it. What a shame! Now we don’t have them, but what if I’m appointed to a school with all those technological facilities?”

“In fact, we had a ‘Computer’ lesson in the first year, but it was really nonsense, not enough at all.”

Some other student teachers mentioned that they had to find other ways to improve their skills in technology use for foreign language teaching purposes as they found the training as insufficient:

“I was trained abroad for the high school and I was taught there, and my father had sent me to a few courses about computer programs.”

“I didn’t learn it at school. It was not taught as how ‘Microsoft Office’ is used. I just learned it by doing by myself. I prepared presentations for myself, for my lessons, especially for the presentations to take teachers’ attention. So I improved myself in that way.”

“I just attended a computer course, I learned there, not at university. We didn’t learn them there.”

Second, they were questioned about the use of technology by their cooperating teachers, who were supposed to mentor them throughout their practice process. The analysis showed that 34.9% of the cooperating teachers were not using technology in their classrooms at all. Some of them were reported rarely (25.6%) and sometimes (19.8%) benefiting from technology while 14% were found to be using technology in teaching English quite often. Only 5.8% of them were always utilizing technological tools in their teaching. One student teacher explained the reasons for cooperating teachers’ not using technology as not having the facilities in the schools as follows:

“They don’t use it because they don’t have it. I’m sure they can use it because they were easily able to help us with the copy machine or the computer when we experienced problems with them. And if they use, I’m sure they will be very successful.”

## DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

As the first finding of this study, student teachers in this study reported the usefulness of using technology in foreign language classrooms. The findings are in line with the previous research in various in-service (Alshumaimeri, 2008; Chung, 2014; Jebri, 2012; Kim et al., 2013; Mollaei & Riasati, 2013; Park & Son, 2009) and pre-service contexts worldwide (Chung, 2014; Kuo, 2008; Schmid & Hegelheimer, 2014). The findings also agree with the previous research on in-service (Çelik & Aytun, 2014; Sağlam & Sert, 2012; Uluuysal et al., 2014) and pre-service (Başöz & Çubukçu, 2014; Hismanoglu, 2012a; Savaş, 2012; Savaş, 2014; Yüksel & Kavanoz, 2011) teachers in Turkey. The study has not revealed unexpected results as technology is now in the agenda of all teachers in order to keep up with the modern practices. Teachers also know that they need technology to serve those digital natives in a more meaningful and comprehensive way.

Another finding obtained from both quantitative and qualitative data sources, the practicum schools were found to be poor in terms of providing student teachers with the necessary technological equipment for use in foreign language instruction. Student teachers and in-service teachers in the previous recent studies also complained about the lack of these tools (Aydın, 2013; Çelik & Aytun, 2014; Dashtestani, 2014; Hismanoglu, 2012b; Kazemi & Narafshan, 2014). It is easy to come to a conclusion that this lack and/or inadequacy of those facilities was the key reason for both student teachers and their cooperating teachers for not benefiting from technology in their EFL classes at a satisfying level. One point should be made clear in this discussion that those student teachers were mostly very eager to implement technology-based classroom activities if they had the chance to do so. During the interviews, the majority of the student teachers stated that they would integrate technology into their classroom practices. They would not only gain experience about the how-to-use perspective, but also support their teaching with several technology-aided classroom tasks. It is now known that technology-integration not only enhances student learning but also increases student teachers’ self-confidence and help them cultivate their skills in English as a foreign language (Savaş, 2012).



This study also showed that student teachers were not benefiting from technology available to them in their teaching practice at a desired level. The cooperating teachers were also very poor in terms of benefiting from technological aids in the EFL classrooms. As all parties in teacher training would accept, the cooperating teachers are supposed to be good role-models for student teachers. Student teachers really expect support and a positive role-modelling from their mentors for integrating technology into their teaching (Hudson & Nguyen, 2008) as well as employing a communicative approach to their language teaching practices (Zhang, 2013). Therefore, cooperating teachers should work as mentors to the student teachers not only in teaching skills and strategies, but as effective technology users.

In point of fact, cooperating teacher effect is not the only reason. According to Liu (2011), teachers prefer lecturing to using more constructivist practices with technology despite many of them favored learner-centered instruction. There is no doubt that an open and caring milieu is necessary to exploit student teachers' practices during the teaching practicum in order to alter their beliefs and to endorse their cognitive development (Yuan & Lee, 2014). Furthermore, having a high level of language proficiency as well as a certain level of technological knowledge is a need for the use of technology in the EFL classroom; therefore, teacher education programs should offer English language teachers more opportunities for refining their language competence with a specific focus on their oral skills (Kourieos & Evripidou, 2013). Student teachers should not be criticized a lot as they are only at the beginning of their career as teachers considering the fact that they could develop more positive attitude toward technology use in EFL teaching as they expand their experience in using the instructional tools (Savaş, 2014).

The final finding of the study indicated that student teachers were not utilizing technological aids for particular reasons. Not being familiar with certain technological devices or not possessing the necessary knowledge about teaching English via technology just like the teachers in Lam (2000)'s study, were among those reasons. Although a certain proportion of the student teachers found their training at the university about using the technological facilities in foreign language classrooms sufficient, within an ambition to reach a 100% satisfaction level, the training student teachers are provided with on the use of technology in EFL teaching is worth discussing. As one student teacher explains during the interviews, foreign language teacher training programs, must have courses tailored to the needs of the EFL learners, in which they could learn the theoretical background about technology in English classrooms as well as practice opportunities for developing materials, presenting language items such as vocabulary and grammar, and practicing language skills, especially listening comprehension skills. She said:

“It's not something that teachers can learn it [technology] by themselves. They must, first, be interested in it. If they are not interested, then they have to learn it because every teacher has to know about it. I know that all schools in future will be equipped with technological tools, especially smart boards, so all teacher candidates must be provided with the necessary knowledge about technology integration in teaching English.

As the student teacher explained, all schools will possess the necessary technological aids in near future. However, those teachers will not be ready to integrate that technology into their classrooms as they did not have the necessary know-how related to the different aspects of ICT, CALL, mobile learning, and so on. According to Başal (2013), practical knowledge about material development for online courses is the missing part of ELT departments training English language teachers. In agreement with this idea, this study was sufficient to document the existing mismatch between teacher training and the needs of the real world.”

### **Suggestions and Implications**

The findings of the study is able to provide some suggestions for student teachers, cooperating teachers, and university supervisors for the integration of technology in EFL teaching and some implications for teacher training programs and practicum schools for a better practicum placement for the student teachers and a more fruitful learning for the students.

First of all, the pedagogical instruction in the higher education institutions should learn some lessons. In other words, EFL teacher training programs should revise their existing program and give their all effort to supplement a technology-integration training in the current curriculum. Barzaq (2007) recommends EFL teacher education programs for an improvement in technology education that they “develop the faculties of education in alignment with up-to-date modern developments, and requirements, so as to accommodate recent changes and digital uses in the educational process (p. 218); they “adapt educational technology to emphasize the e-learning projects, to elaborate the online learning as well, train student- teachers on technological applications and add the computer technology as mandate requirement” (p. 219). Also, EFL teacher candidates should be trained as online material

developers (Başal, 2013) for a better technology integration. One must not forget that increasing pre-service teachers' contact, training, and acquaintance to technology will help them enhance their self-efficacy, motivation, and computing habits (Robertson & Al-Zahrani, 2012). This can be done either by adding technology in the courses where language teaching methodology is taught. Another option can be to provide students, who are the future EFL teachers, with elective courses specifically designed to teach English through technology.

Second, practicum schools and universities should work in cooperation for a technology integration because student teachers think that technology-rich practicum opportunities strengthen the improvement of essential technology-related skills (Schmid & Hegelheimer, 2014). For example, Murphy, Richards, Lewis, and Carman (2005) proposes a Teacher Inquiry Group (TIG) involving a group of classroom teachers and other school and district personnel, together with teacher education faculty members meeting to work on, share, and extend best practices for incorporating technology into classrooms. Payant (2014), on the other hand, recommends the use of video recordings to discover pre-service teachers' identities as teachers, and their pedagogical and practical knowledge bases. Finally, beliefs of student teachers about the nature of knowledge and learning should be taken into consideration so as to enable technology integration as these beliefs could be a preliminary argument to deal with the obstacles to technology integration (Kim et al., 2013).

## REFERENCES

- Alkash, K. A. M., & Al-Dersi, Z. E. M. (2013). Advantages of using PowerPoint presentation in EFL classroom & the status of its use in Sebha University. *IJ-ELTS*, 1(1), 3-16.
- Alshumaimeri, Y. A. (2008). Perceptions and attitudes toward using CALL in English classrooms among Saudi secondary EFL teachers. *The JALT CALL Journal*, 44(2), 29-66.
- Alsied, S. M., & Pathan, M. M. (2013). The use of computer technology in EFL classroom: advantages and implications. *IJ-ELTS*, 1(1), 61-71.
- Aydin, S. (2013). Teachers' perceptions about the use of computers in EFL teaching and learning: the case of Turkey. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 26(3), 214-233.  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2012.654495>
- Barzaq, M. Y. (2007). *Student-teachers' training programmes evaluation in English Language Teaching Colleges of Education in Gaza Strip universities*. Unpublished Master's Thesis. The Islamic University, Gaza.
- Başal, A. (2013). ELT teachers as online material developers. *The Online Journal of Distance Education and e-Learning*, 1(2), 8-12. <http://www.tojdel.net/volume01-issue02.php>
- Basaran, B. C. (2013). Attitudes of EFL teachers and learners towards CALL in Turkey. In Proceedings of the *International Conference ICT for Language Learning* (6<sup>th</sup> Ed.), Florence, Italy. Retrieved from <http://conference.pixel-online.net/ICT4LL2013/conferenceproceedings.php>
- Başöz, T., & Çubukçu, F. (2014). Pre-service EFL teacher's attitudes towards Computer Assisted Language Learning (CALL). *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 116, 531-535.  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.01.253>
- Canh, L. V. (2014). Great Expectations: The TESOL practicum as a professional learning experience. *TESOL Journal*, 5(2), 199-224. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/tesj.103>
- Chong, D. H. (2001). The practical considerations of the Internet in the EFL classroom. *The Journal of Multimedia-Assisted Language Learning*, 3(2), 9-35.
- Chung, S. (2014). *Pre-service and in-service ESL teachers' beliefs about the use of digital technology in the classroom*. Unpublished MA Thesis. Carleton University, Ottawa, Ontario.
- Çelik, S. (2014). Exploring IWB use for Language Instruction in Turkish Higher Education Settings In E. Cutrim Schmid & S. Whyte (Eds.), *Teaching languages with technology: communicative approaches to interactive whiteboard use. A resource book for teacher development*. London: Bloomsbury.
- Dashtestani, R. (2014). English as a foreign language—teachers' perspectives on implementing online instruction in the Iranian EFL context. *Research in Learning Technology*, 22.  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.3402/rlt.v22.20142>
- Dias, I. C. B., & Bocorny, A. E. P. (2014). Perceptions and perspectives on internet assisted language teaching by English teachers from Rio Grande do Sul. *Revista Entrelinhas*, 8(1), 46-57.
- Emhamed, E. D. H., & Krishnan, K. S. D. (2011). Investigating Libyan teachers' attitude towards integrating technology in teaching English in Sebha secondary schools. *Academic Research International*, 1(3), 182-192.
- Hedayati, H., & Marandi, S. S. (2014). Iranian EFL teachers' perceptions of the difficulties of implementing CALL. *ReCALL*, 26, 298-314. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0958344014000172>
- Hismanoglu, M. (2012a). The impact of a curricular innovation on prospective EFL teachers' attitudes towards ICT integration into language instruction. *International Journal of Instruction*, 5(1), 183-202.

- Hismanoglu, M. (2012b). Prospective EFL teachers' perceptions of ICT integration: A study of Distance Higher Education in Turkey. *Educational Technology & Society*, 15(1), 185-196.
- Hismanoglu, M., & Hismanoglu, S. (2011). Attitudes of English teacher candidates toward ICT. *E-International Journal of Educational Research*, 2(2), 17-29. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2012.654495>
- Hudson, P. B., & Nguyen, T. M. H. (2008). *What do preservice EFL teachers expect from their mentors?* Paper presented at Australian Association of Research in Education (AARE) Conference 2008, 30th November - 4th December, 2008, Brisbane. Retrieved from <http://eprints.qut.edu.au/>
- Jebri, W. A. (2012). *The viability of Palestinian EFL teachers to effectively apply ICT as an educational medium in Palestinian basic schools in the Gaza Strip: A pedagogical perspective*. Unpublished M.S. thesis. State University of New York at Albany. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/1019244031?accountid=7181>
- Kim, C., Kim, M. K., Lee, C., Spector, J. M., & DeMeester, K. (2013). Teacher beliefs and technology integration. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 29, 76-85. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2012.08.005>
- Kourieos, S., & Evripidou, D. (2013). Students' perceptions of effective EFL teachers in university settings in Cyprus. *English Language Teaching*, 6(11), 1-16. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/elt.v6n11p1>
- Kuo, M. M. (2008). Learner to teacher: EFL student teachers' perceptions on Internet-Assisted Language Learning and Teaching. Online Submission. Education Resources Information Center. ED502217.
- Lam, Y. (2000). Technophilia vs. technophobia: A preliminary look at why second-language teachers do or do not use technology in their classrooms. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 56(3), 389-420. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3138/cmlr.56.3.389>
- Li, G., & Ni, X. (2011). Primary EFL teachers' technology use in China: Patterns and perceptions. *REL C Journal*, 42(1), 69-85. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0033688210390783>
- Liu, S. H. (2011). Factors related to pedagogical beliefs of teachers and technology integration. *Computers and Education*, 56(4), 1012-1022. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2007.01.002>
- Mollaei, F., & Riasati, M. J. (2013). Teachers' perceptions of using technology in teaching EFL. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics & English Literature*, 2(1), 13-22. <http://dx.doi.org/10.7575/ijalel.v.2n.1p.13>
- Moradkhani, S., Akbari, R., Ghafar Samar, R., & Kiany, G. R. (2013). English language teacher educators' pedagogical knowledge base: The macro and micro categories. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 38(10), 123-141. <http://dx.doi.org/10.14221/ajte.2013v38n10.7>
- Murphy, K., Richards, J., Lewis, C., & Carman, E. (2005). Strengthening educational technology in K-8 urban schools and in preservice teacher education: A practitioner-faculty collaborative process. *Journal of Technology and Teacher Education*, 13(1), 125-139.
- Park, C. N., & Son, J. B. (2009). Implementing computer-assisted language learning in the EFL classroom: Teachers' perceptions and perspectives. *International Journal of Pedagogies and Learning*, 5(2), 80-101. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5172/ijpl.5.2.80>
- Payant, C. (2014). Incorporating video-mediated reflective tasks in MATESOL Programs. *TESL Canada Journal*, 31(2), 1-21.
- Prensky, M. (2001). Digital natives, digital immigrants. *On the Horizon*, 9 (5), 1-6. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/10748120110424843>
- Rahimi, M., & Yadollahi, S. (2011). Computer anxiety and ICT integration in English classes among Iranian EFL teachers. *Procedia Computer Science*, 3, 203-209. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.procs.2010.12.034>
- Richards, J. C. (2014). Foreword. In J. D. D. M. Agudo, (Ed.). *English as a foreign language teacher education: Current perspectives and challenges* (pp. 1-3). Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Robertson, M., & Al-Zahrani, A. (2012). Self-efficacy and ICT integration into initial teacher education in Saudi Arabia: Matching policy with practice. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, 28(7), 1136-1151. Retrieved from <http://www.ascilite.org.au/ajet/ajet28/robertson.html>
- Savas, P. (2014). Tablet PCs as instructional tools in English as a Foreign Language education. *TOJET*, 13(1), 217-222. Retrieved from <http://www.tojet.net>
- Savaş, P. (2012). Use of digital video recording in the preparation stage of pre-service foreign language teachers' micro-teachings. *International Journal on New Trends in Education and Their Implications*, 3(3), 107-116.
- Shin, H. J., & Son, J. B. (2007). EFL teachers' perceptions and perspectives on internet assisted language teaching. *Computer-Assisted Language Learning Electronic Journal (CALL-EJ)*, 8(2). Retrieved from [http://callej.org/journal/8-2/h-js\\_j-bs.html](http://callej.org/journal/8-2/h-js_j-bs.html)
- Uluuysal, B., Demiral, S., Kurt, A. A., & Şahin, Y. L. (2014). A technology integration journey of a teacher. *TOJQI*, 5(4), 12-22. Retrieved from <http://www.tojq.net>
- Yuan, R., & Lee, I. (2014). Pre-service teachers' changing beliefs in the teaching practicum: Three cases in an EFL context. *System*, 44, 1-12. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2014.02.002>

- Yüksel, G., & Kavanoz, S. (2011). In search of pre-service EFL certificate teachers' attitudes towards technology. *Procedia Computer Science*, 3, 666-671. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.procs.2010.12.1111>
- Zhang, H. (2014). *Pre-service Chinese English as a Foreign Language (EFL) teachers' perceptions about implementation of communicative language teaching*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. The University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, New Mexico.
- Zhu, S. P., & Wang, H. (2006). Positioning the roles of English teachers in on-line college English teaching. *Journal of Hainan Normal University (Humanities and Social Sciences)*, 3, 154-156. Retrieved from [http://www.oriprobe.com/journals/hnsfxyxb/2006\\_3.html](http://www.oriprobe.com/journals/hnsfxyxb/2006_3.html)

#### NOTES

1. An earlier version of this paper was presented at the “Hong Kong International Conference on Education, Psychology and Society” on December 19-21, 2013 in Hong Kong, PRC.
2. Sample extracts from the interviews were originally Turkish. They were translated into English by the researcher.