A Case Study of CALL Integration into English Courses at a Thai University
Maneekhao, K. and Tepsuriwong, S. Proceedings of the 13th English in South-East Asia Conference: English and Literatures-in-English in a Globalised World, National Institute of Education, Singapore. 4 – 6 Dec. 2008, pp. 301 – 317.

The definitive version of this article was published as Maneekhao, K. and Tepsuriwong, S. (2008) A Case Study of CALL Integration into English Courses at a Thai University. Proceedings of the 13th English in South-East Asia Conference: English and Literatures-in-English in a Globalised World, National Institute of Education, Singapore. 4 – 6 Dec. 2008, pp. 301 – 317.

A Case Study of CALL Integration into English Courses at a Thai University

Abstract

This paper reports a practitioner's lesson from integrating the ELLIS Academic program, a listening-based software, into two English foundation courses. Theoretical guides of CALL application, the course selection process and factors considered in the integration, such as proportion of CALL to other course components, learners' preparation and supports, as well as issues on logistics were reviewed. Results of the integration evaluation based on a questionnaire distributed to 140 students enrolled in these courses revealed their positive attitudes towards the course management. They were also satisfied with the preparation, but preferred more supports from teachers. They also favored the new course elements which were specially designed to reinforce the application of language learnt from the program. Their comments and feedback as well as our direct experiences from the integration were discussed focusing on lessons learnt and suggestions for effective CALL integration.

Introduction

In Thailand, the utilization of technology is generally accepted as one factor in raising the standard of living and education of Thai citizens. In 2001, the National IT Policy 2001-2010 was developed. This 10-year plan highlights ICT in improving the quality of education by providing guidelines for training teachers, developing e-materials, infrastructures and networks to increase ICT use for learning and management. Such plan has an effect not only on policy development of educational institutes but also on other agents who wish to take parts in developing the country's human resources.

In 2006, as a part of its national education development project, the Stock Exchange of Thailand (SET) requested educational experts to select English language learning software which is appropriate to tertiary educational level in Thailand. Finally, they invested a large

sum of money to buy 2,000 licenses of ELLIS, a CALL program, and distributed 40 licenses to each of 50 tertiary institutes that proposed a clear action plan to use it.

SET arranged a venue for the selected institutes to share different approaches to ELLIS applications that they had proposed. Most of them planned to install the program into a language lab and let students use it in their free time. Many institutes intended to use it as a compulsory element of a course. One institute aimed at using it as an exit exam of the university. Clearly, ELLIS inspired these institutes to study effective approaches to its applications. In fact, SET aimed at an integration of this software into foundation courses for undergraduate students and/or training courses for staff and people outside the institutes. It also had a plan to enlarge the scale of this project to include more institutes and provide more licenses of ELLIS to each institute in the near future.

Therefore, apart from the "WOW" factor, and useful elements of the program, it is necessary to consider how the program can be integrated into a course, and listen to the voice of not only experts, but also the practitioners or users of the program, the teachers and the students (Murray & Barnes, 1998)

King Mongkut's University of Technology Thonburi (KMUTT) was among the institutes receiving ELLIS from SET, and one of the few institutes who tried to apply learning theories in formal integration of this software into a course. This paper reviewed KMUTT practitioners' experiences and lessons learnt from integrating ELLIS into two courses. Constraints of theoretical applications, learners' attitudes, their comments and feedback were also presented and discussed to cast light on CALL integration.

Information about ELLIS Academic Program

ELLIS is an academic program working on the Intranet system. This program teaches basic skills in vocabulary, listening, grammar, communication, culture and pronunciation. It aims to make students feel comfortable using everyday English in formal and informal situations, and able to adapt to a new culture. Some topics covered are making introductions, shopping for food and clothing, phoning and job interviewing.

The program includes 6 major academic components and a learning management system for teachers to track students' learning. The academic components include a computer-adaptive placement test, 4 integrated-skill programs (ranging from Basics, Intro, Middle Mastery, and Senior Mastery), and a program for pronunciation practice called Master Pronunciation.

The placement test is designed to measure learners' abilities in each of the three skill areas: listening comprehension, grammar, and vocabulary. The test result indicates both the learner's overall language proficiency level and their level within the ELLIS Academic program.

Each of the 4 integrated-skill programs is divided into units which contain 3-4 lessons. The lessons consist of a short video, the Script Page, the Skills Menu activities, the Role-play activity, and a lesson quiz. After completing all lessons, students can play a game, take the unit test and review their most recent test answers.

Master Pronunciation provides detailed instructions first in Sounds and then in Beyond Sounds. Students can practice the sounds in Sound Contrasts and Tongue Twisters. Then, they can practice the pronunciation concepts they have learnt in Useful Phrases.

CALL integration at KMUTT

Although ELLIS is well-designed and provides a lot of useful options that cater for learning, the program alone cannot bring learners to the desired goal. Success in implementing CALL does not depend on the quality of the program only, but on several interrelated factors. The crucial factors include logistics, roles of instructors, administrative and pedagogical support and integration into a syllabus (Chambers and Bax, 2006; Bax, 2003; Stepp-Greany, 2002; Jones, 2001). In this section, we will present our course selection and discuss how these factors influenced the integration of ELLIS into the courses.

Course selection

There are many foundation English courses for undergraduate students at KMUTT. All of them have 3 credits. Some are for science and engineering students, some for architecture students and some for information technology students. ELLIS program was blended into 2 courses for the students of information technology, LNG 331 and LNG 332, because it provides features that serve the objectives of the listening and speaking sections stated in the course descriptions below.

> **LNG 331**
> …The listening skill study focuses on listening strategies including distinguishing sounds in words, phrases, sentences and short passages for basic understanding. Students will practice using simple sentences for purposeful communication. … Additionally, they will have opportunities to obtain study skills both inside and outside the classroom with exercises and activities emphasizing language for communication together with grammatical structures and vocabulary in context.
>
> **LNG 332**
> … the students will practice listening for gist of paragraph-level statements, speaking in daily life and asking and answering questions for clearer information.

It is crucial to note that for effective CALL integration, the program should not be used as the prime indicator in selecting a course. Course objectives play important roles in the process. No single commercial course book or software would serve a course well as they are designed separately for different purposes (Cunningsworth, 1995; Richards, 2001). When software is available, it cannot be directly integrated into any courses without considering the course objectives. The extent to which it is integrated also depends mainly on the course objectives. In LNG 331 and LNG 332, for example, ELLIS was integrated into the lessons making it the main components for the speaking and listening elements in these integrated-skill courses.

These two courses last about 15 weeks. Classes normally meet twice a week: once in a normal classroom and the second time in a listening lab. Previously, all of the listening activities were under teacher control. The students were required to work on teacher-selected materials mostly in the forms of cassette tapes selected from commercial books. These

cassette tapes were not available in the Self-Access Learning Centre and therefore provided no ways for students to gain extra practice outside class time. Certainly, this controlled-practice could not promote learning independence in students. Actually there are a lot of CALL programs at KMUTT, but none of them are specially designed for listening and speaking practice. Previously, we once tried to make use of listening elements in those programs and some web sites. Unfortunately, we were not successful since the lessons were from many different resources and the integration was not very effective. The availability of ELLIS helped us solve these problems. However, the implementation of this program was not carried out without any problems.

Factors considered when integrating the software into the courses

ELLIS was first implemented in these two courses in 2006. The results from an observation and a questionnaire distributed to students at the end of the semester revealed that this integration was not quite satisfactory. The students complained about the amount of requirements and the lack of preparation and support from teachers. They also paid little attention to some useful elements in the program such as grammar explanations, since there was no evaluation concerning these elements. These findings led to a revision of the program integration and course management in general. In 2007, the program was used again and a formal survey was conducted to investigate the students' reflection on the integration. The following sections report the description of factors considered in the latest integration.

Logistics and time allocation

The benefit of ICT in education that is frequently mentioned in academic papers is its accessibility at anywhere and anytime. Since students differ in language abilities, learning paces and preferences, the flexibility of time and logistics is very influential to learning success (Chambers and Bax, 2006). Unfortunately, this concept is not applicable to the situation at KMUTT. Due to the fact that ELLIS runs on the Intranet, it could be accessed only in the building of School of Liberal Arts. Actually, the program was installed in a computer server of this Faculty. The plug-in program was installed in 80 client computers in a computer lab and 4 computers in the Self-Access Learning Centre (SALC). Unfortunately, the computer lab could be reserved for classroom teaching only due to tight class schedules and lack of staff to facilitate students in the lab. This made it impossible for students to use the program outside class time. They could access it during class time in the lab session scheduled once a week only.

To soften the problem of inconvenient program accessibility, we rescheduled the use of the computer lab to allow one free day per week for self-access learning so that the students could get extra practice. We also assigned a technician to facilitate students on this free day. Apart from the lab, the students were encouraged to go to the SALC which was open daily from 8.30 am.-19.30 pm. This new logistic management enabled our students to practice ELLIS not only with the teacher in a regular class, but also on their own in the computer lab and the SALC in their free time.

Actually, the students were not required to study outside class time if they could finish their work and were satisfied with their progress done in class. The extra access to the lab and the SALC were mainly intended for slow students to keep up with their peers and to complete the course requirements.

Proportion of CALL integration and evaluation scheme

Although ELLIS matched the courses' objectives for improving students' listening and speaking as well as promoting learning independence, the course syllabi had to be revised carefully. Jones (2001) suggests that in order to exploit the rich potential of CALL, curriculum revision is required so that CALL plays a key part in it. This can be done at different levels of classroom practice, including laboratory and self-access modes.

In the two courses, listening and speaking accounted for 50% of the course times and contents. This original proportion was kept but instead of studying with a teacher, the students attended a computer lab to study from ELLIS by themselves. However, class activities were revised to reinforce the students' self-study. The evaluation scheme, therefore, needed to be changed to suit the revision. The evaluation scheme of the course LNG 332 before and after CALL integration shown in the table below can best show these differences.

Table 1: Evaluation scheme of a course before and after CALL integration

Before CALL integration		After CALL integration	
Class attendance	10%	Class attendance	5%
Quizzes	10%	Quizzes	5%
Course Project	20%	Course Project	15%
		Role play	*10%*
		Portfolio	*5%*
Midterm exam	30%	Midterm exam	30%
- Listening (10%)		- Listening (10%)	
- Reading & Writing (20%)		- Reading & Writing (20%)	
Final exam	30%	Final exam	30%
- Listening (10%)		- Listening (10%)	
- Reading & Writing (20%)		- Reading & Writing (20%)	

As can be seen from Table 1, the score for class attendance, quizzes and course projects were reduced to allow reasonable scores for Role play and Portfolio, the two activities specially designed to reinforce ELLIS use. The students were required to make use of the language learnt from the program in a role play, which they were asked to perform in class twice a semester. Moreover, they had to complete the Portfolio task by reflecting upon their learning process in the Record book (see Appendix). So some scores were allocated to these additional activities. The features and rationales for these activities will be discussed later.

Promotion of learner autonomy

Being autonomous learners is an ideal characteristic in students, and ELLIS contains many features that help promote autonomy such as placement tests, prompt feedback, glossaries, grammar explanations, test reviews, and learning records etc. The software developers also try to make the program user-friendly by equipping it with a manual and help buttons in the program. In spite of these useful features, students may not succeed in CALL use unless they get sufficient training, supervision and support from teachers (Hegelheimer and Tower, 2004; Jones, 2001).

Student preparation Preparing students for self-directed learning is a crucial step and needs to be done carefully because an inappropriate imposition of this concept may cause resistance from students (Harmer, 2001). In the first course, learner training activities were added as a part of the course orientation to prepare students both psychologically and technically for autonomous learning.

During the first two weeks of the first course, the students were trained how to learn and to tune their attitudes towards self-access learning by focusing on psychological preparation and metacognitive strategies, which theoretically could make them understand their own thinking and learning processes (Oxford, 1990; O'Malley & Chamot, 1990; Chamot et al., 1999; Chamot, 2004). Important topics include characteristics of good language learners, making a study plan, monitoring learning, problem-solving and self-evaluation. This training was elaborated by the Portfolio task in which they had to regularly reflect on their learning from ELLIS in the Record book provided.

For technical support, we spent 2 periods (100 minutes) training the students to use ELLIS and to complete the Record book, which had to be done every time they worked on ELLIS. Firstly, they had to make a study plan by stating the planned topics and amount of time. Then, they recorded what they learnt such as vocabulary and language points. Lastly, they reflected upon their self-satisfaction, problems and solutions, so that they could think about their own strengths and weaknesses and make use of the information for future action (Harmer, 2001).

Additionally, we introduced other learning resources in our faculty e.g. Self-Access Learning Centre (SALC) and some other language software, since ELLIS program was also installed in the SALC, and the students were supposed to know other self-access learning opportunities elsewhere.

Freedom of choice

It is generally known that to promote independent learning, students need to have enough freedom to determine their learning goals, to plan their own learning and to choose learning materials from various sources, as they come from different social and linguistic backgrounds and differ in their learning styles and preferences (Williams and Burden, 1997; Ellis, 2007) Unfortunately, this concept proved to be inapplicable in the foundation courses due to their test-based nature. That is all students had to complete the same assignments and be evaluated by the same criteria. They also had to take the same tests in the Mid-term and Final exams.

In our courses, the students were officially assigned to take the placement test twice: once during the first week of the first course and once before the final examination of the second course. The students spent about 30-45 minutes to complete the tests for all skill areas. All students knew their score and level promptly after they submitted the test. In theory, these students were supposed to select the units that suit their level, but that ideal principle had never been practiced. The placement test score was used to let the students know their general skill level, not to place them in a level within the ELLIS program.

Actually, after the test, the teachers clarified the meaning of the scores and their levels. We identified their common weaknesses, explained them and gave suggestions on what should be focused on in self-practice. As for the content, 7-8 compulsory units were selected (dependent on the semesters) and all students had to complete them in each course. In the first course, the programs “Master pronunciation” and “Basic”, which were not included in

the requirements, were recommended to improve their pronunciation and somehow ease their listening.

To provide some freedom and to promote independent learning, we let the students monitor their own learning through the Record Book. Also, instead of forcing them to finish a certain unit in each week, we simply told them at the beginning what units they had to complete before the exams and let them plan their learning. Luckily, a variety of independent activities in each unit of ELLIS can also partly serve the diversity of the students. In each class, they were free to select any activities to work on, and decide what to do and when to do it. They did not even have to complete every single activity in each unit if they did not want to.

Motivation Motivating students to learn English by themselves was the most challenging because most of them paid more attention to their major subjects and had little time for English. However, all students naturally were afraid of failing or getting low grades from a course, so the most motivating factor for them was a grade or scores which can be considered extrinsic motivation.

As discussed earlier in the evaluation scheme, extra scores were allocated for activities related to ELLIS practice to motivate students. These included scores for Role plays and Portfolios. Other extrinsic motivation used in the courses was a listening exam. The students were well informed that one-third of a listening exam would be taken directly from dialogues in ELLIS with newly-designed questions, and the rest was also based on extracts from web sites or movies with relevant language foci from the units that they were assigned to study. The use of seen or studied dialogues was to motivate them to study and, more importantly, to check whether they could apply the skills obtained in other situations. The other extrinsic motivation was the placement test. Though no score was allocated for it, it was used to measure the students' levels before studying and this, in turn, could stimulate them to improve their proficiency levels.

To increase their intrinsic motivation and to emphasize the beneficial value of learning success, we provided a relaxing atmosphere and encouraged interaction among them (Harmer, 2001). In the lab, the students were allowed to walk and talk with their friends. The availability of extra lab hours and SALC also reduced their tension to complete all activities in class time. To create a fun atmosphere, all teachers agreed to let the students practice speaking in pairs or in groups at the end of each class by applying a dialogue in the program. Apart from entertainment, communication among the students can provide an opportunity to use the language and help the teachers to monitor their progress (Jones, 2001).

Learning support In a technology-based class, two types of support were frequently requested by students: technical support and academic support. Although our students were highly competent in computer technology, they still needed technical help, especially at the start of the semester when they were new to the system. Usually, our technicians were always available in the lab area in order to help solve any technical problems both inside and outside class time.

Training and help were also offered by the technicians to every teacher so that they had at least basic understanding about program structures and how to make full use of the program capacity. This practice is in line with the suggestions given by Jones (2001) that if we wish to exploit the rich potential of CALL, an adequate training must be given to committed teachers.

While the technicians were always available for technical support, the provision of academic support is the responsibility of teachers. To start with, the teacher cooperated with the students to complete the first lesson in ELLIS, so that they understood the instructions and learning steps. The first record in their Record book was checked and returned to them as soon as possible, followed by plenary explanations about common problems and how to improve their learning reflection. Then, we would regularly survey their progress either from their learning record in the learning management system (LMS) or from the record shown on their personal Menu page. Suggestions and encouragement would be given to the students who seemed to work too slowly or had problems in managing their learning. Clarification on instructions, language explanations, pronunciations etc. could always be requested.

Teacher's feedback Many studies report that feedback given throughout the process of skill acquisition can illuminate success and failure in language performance to the students so that they can monitor their linguistic development and language use in the future (Harmer, 2001; Watson Todd, 1997; Zacharias, 2007). As students' questions and problems varied, the feedback and the explanations in ELLIS could not cover everything the students needed. Therefore, the teachers had to step in and give feedback on three different things: their learning management, their pronunciation and their language accuracy.

Apart from regularly investigating students' learning progress from the LMS or Menu page, we also inspected their management shown in the Record book. To avoid confusing the students or discouraging them to do self-directed learning, the teachers agreed not to give too detailed feedback on language accuracy, but focus on the quality of their plan, the clarity of their report on their new knowledge, problems and solutions. We also tried to encourage them to think about how to avoid the same problems and achieve their learning plan. Hopefully, the right amount of feedback would result in continuing or increasing their motivation, together with garnering good attitudes towards learning (Harmer, 2001; Zacharias, 2007).

As the students practiced listening by themselves, the feedback on this skill could be given only through their reflection in their Record book. Luckily, we could give feedback on their pronunciation and language accuracy in classroom-speaking activities and more formally in the Role plays. Most feedback was normally on their communicative ability, since we cared more about their fluency and wanted to let them gain more confidence in speaking English. This practice is in line with the suggestions given by Cole and Chan (1987) that how and when feedback should be given depends on the objective of the activity (accuracy or fluency), the stage of lesson and the type of mistakes they make.

Learners' attitudes and feedback on CALL integration

The design of ELLIS integration into English courses at KMUTT was based on theoretical guidelines suggested in literature on CALL application which emphasizes factors related to logistics and time allocation, syllabus modification to balance proportion of CALL integration, and redesigning appropriate evaluation schemes, as well as issues on learner autonomy. These elements were investigated at the end of the courses to see how learners viewed the integration. Their attitudes, feedback and comments on the courses were studied as a part of the course evaluation.

Subjects and instrument

A rating–scale questionnaire was designed to survey students' opinions focusing on factors considered when integrating ELLIS into the courses. Some open-ended questions were also asked to check their learning problems and their preferences of ICT integration patterns into a course.

The questionnaire was distributed to 142 students who used the listening lessons of ELLIS program in LNG 331 and LNG 332 courses and 140 students returned the questionnaire. These students were from 4 different classes studied with different teachers who agreed to follow the same teaching procedures. The 4 classes also followed the same course requirements and evaluation schemes. All of the subjects had got a higher vocational diploma. They enrolled in a 2-year program at KMUTT to get a bachelor's degree in the information technology fields. Therefore, they had no problems in using IT facilities. However, their English proficiency when they first entered the university was quite low. These students had to take four consecutive English courses and LNG 331 and LNG 332 were their first two courses.

Student's opinions on logistics and time allocation

In order to allow more access to ELLIS outside class time, the computer lab was reserved one day per week for self-access learning. Though time allocation was quite limited, many students (34.29%) came to use ELLIS to practice listening on their own almost every week or even every week. Some students (22.86%), however, came only a few times throughout the term or never came on their own at all. This group of students used ELLIS during class time only. They explained that they did not have time for ELLIS due to personal errands or hard work from other courses. Many of them mentioned that they were not free on the day that the computer lab was open for self-access practice. In fact, many students seemed to see the value of getting more practice but limited time seemed to be their main constraint. To ease self-access learning, they suggested that the program should be easily accessed from anywhere at any time. Many preferred to be able to use it at home. Therefore, if ELLIS were more accessible, this would reinforce self-access learning better. Good logistics has to be taken into serious consideration in managing available resources such as the numbers of licenses of the software and the opening time of the computer lab to maximize practice time.

Student's opinions on proportion of CALL use to other lessons

In the integration, ELLIS became one integral part of the courses' contents. The students learnt with the program for 50% of the class time by attending the computer lab to use ELLIS once a week. The program acts as a surrogate teacher providing practice and feedback to them. When the students were asked about these issues in a rating scale questionnaire, they supplied interesting answers. For appropriateness of class time proportion to lab time, they seemed to be satisfied with this design in the course. The mean score on a 5-point rating scale is 3.1 which can be interpreted as 'average'. The proportion of ELLIS use in the course was also appropriate ($\overline{X}$ = 3.45). However, when they were asked about learning with ELLIS or other computer programs, most students preferred having a teacher with them to learning with the surrogate teacher. This issue will be further discussed in the next section on 'learning support'.

As for ELLIS itself, the students thought that the program was very useful. It helped improve their listening skills at a very satisfactory level. The mean score on this issue was 4.22 which could be interpreted as 'highly improved' on a 5-point rating scale. The students thought that the lessons available in the program suited their levels of English proficiency well ($\overline{X}$ = 3.86). The lessons contained interesting contents ($\overline{X}$ = 3.87). Moreover, the presentation

styles of the lessons were quite interesting ($\overline{X}$ = 3.96). The help on listening techniques, the amount of explanations, exercises and feedbacks to their wrong answers provided in the program were sufficient, although their scores were not very high (3.5, 3.92, and 3.59 respectively), compared with other items. Indeed, the students had positive attitudes towards the program and they were satisfied with the use of it in the two courses.

As for the syllabus revisions which were designed to reinforce the use of ELLIS in the courses, the students viewed that it was useful, especially the Role play. They thought that applying the language learnt from ELLIS in the role plays was very beneficial ($\overline{X}$ = 4.08). They also agreed that recording what they have learnt, reflecting upon their learning problems and how they solved the problems, as well as evaluating their levels of success in learning were the main activities in the Portfolio that benefited them. The mean scores were 3.94, 3.81, and 3.82 respectively.

Therefore, from the students' feedback, ELLIS integration into the courses was appropriate. The students were satisfied with the proportion of the class time and ELLIS practice in the computer lab. Moreover, they thought that the program and the activities designed to foster learning from it were advantageous.

Students' opinions on promotion of learner autonomy

The students' attitudes and comments on issues related to what was done to promote learner autonomy were classified into 5 areas: student preparation, freedom of choice, motivation, learning support, and teacher's feedback.

Student preparation Most of the students were very satisfied with the preparation provided. Further analysis revealed that 61% of the students were very satisfied with the introduction to ELLIS which aimed at enabling them to use the program on their own while another 27% were extremely satisfied with the session. Moreover, all of them rated the lessons on good language learners very high; 27% said that the lessons were satisfactory; 58% viewed them as very satisfactory; and the other 15% extremely satisfactory. The preparation for the Portfolio and the Role play received a similar level of satisfaction. Therefore, student preparation for ELLIS seemed to be sufficient.

Freedom of choice As explained in the previous section, we could not provide much freedom to the students; they had to complete the assigned units in the limited time. Their satisfaction on the opportunities to select their learning goals and determine their learning process was average ($\overline{X}$ = 3.25 and 3.41 respectively). However, they were happier with the opportunities to do self-evaluation, which was one requirement in the Record book, and with the freedom to speak and select minor activities in the classroom. The mean scores were 3.6 and 3.69 respectively.

Motivation In ELLIS integration, both intrinsic and extrinsic motivations were applied to foster students' self-study. Intrinsic motivation came from the students' own interest to learn and to improve their English as well as their interest in the program itself, while external drives or extrinsic motivation was from other reinforcements such as the use of scores and other positive feedbacks like compliments and praises from teachers or peers.

Table 2 shows the students' reactions to statements on levels of their motivation. It was observed that the students' intrinsic and extrinsic motivation was rather high. They had quite a strong intention to improve their language skills and to do well in the courses. This might

be because they realize the importance of English especially as a communication tool and for getting good jobs. The revision of the evaluation scheme to provide scores for the Role play and the Portfolio seemed to be an effective reinforcement to encourage students to do their best. It was noticed that getting high listening test scores, good grades and good jobs were rated very high (4.56, 4.42, and 4.36). This instrumental extrinsic motivation could be a strong drive for learning and, therefore, should be constructively exploited in a language course (Williams and Burden, 1997).

Table 2: Sources of students' intrinsic motivation

Topic	Mean scores
Intrinsic motivation	
I want to know my level of listening.	3.74
I want to know techniques for improving listening.	4.16
I want to know how to speak in different situations.	4.15
I want to improve my listening to boost up my other skills.	4.31
I want to have better listening skills.	4.49
I want to be able to communicate in a short conversation.	4.36
I want to be able to understand movies, songs and other English media.	4.23
I want to be proud of myself for getting higher levels for my English skills from the placement test.	3.81
I enjoyed working on the listening practice in ELLIS.	3.84
I enjoyed doing the listening practice with my friends	3.82
I enjoyed the practice sessions in the computer lab.	3.89
I enjoyed learning from a computer.	3.92
Extrinsic motivation	
I want to get a high score from the listening test.	4.36
I want to get a high score from the role play activities.	4.25
I want to make a good portfolio to get a high score.	4.16
I want to pass LNG 331 and LNG 332 with good grades.	4.42
I want to be praised by people around me.	3.01
I want to have a better opportunity for getting a good job.	4.56

Learning support To enhance students' autonomous learning, supports were provided through technical training which focused on how to use the program, and academic training which focused on learning how to learn and how to prepare for the tasks: Portfolio and Role play.

The students' opinions on the training were positive (see Table 3). They rated their levels of satisfaction for all of the topics in the training, especially the technical one, quite high on the 5-point rating scales questions. The support in terms of training, therefore, seemed to be sufficient to help them learn or get practice on their own.

Table 3: Students' satisfaction on the training

Training topics	Mean scores
ELLIS technical training	4.13
Academic training on learning how to learn and how to be a good language learner	3.89

Preparation and explanation for the portfolios	3.60
Preparation and explanation for the role play tasks	3.98

During their practice in the lab, academic support from teachers was also available when needed. The students were very satisfied with this support. They said that they got sufficient suggestions on listening techniques and how to improve listening skills from the teachers ($\overline{X}$ = 4.2). While practicing, they also received enough help on how to use the program from the teachers ($\overline{X}$ = 4.14). Moreover, they rated the teachers' roles in helping them improve their listening skills very high ($\overline{X}$ = 4.21).

Ironically, the students felt strongly that teachers played a very crucial role to their autonomous learning. The answer to an open-ended question about the most preferable pattern of ICT integration revealed that most of them (93.53%) preferred to learn from both the program and the teacher. They commented that they would like to have freedom to practice or to learn from the program and then get help from the teachers for points that they might not understand or that need more clarification. This group of students would like the teachers to be available during the practice so that they could get academic supports when needed.

Very few students (2.16%) preferred to study on their own from the program and some (4.35%) preferred to study with the teachers in a normal class without using the program. The former group neither liked the teachers to control nor to monitor their practice, while the later one, in contrast, preferred relying totally on their teachers to learning on their own.

Teacher's feedback Teacher's feedback was a part of the academic support regularly provided. The feedback was mainly on their reflection in the Record book, their pronunciation and speaking ability. Table 4 shows the students' satisfaction on the feedback they received.

Table 4: Students' satisfaction on teacher's feedback

Areas of feedback	Mean scores
Feedback on portfolios	
Feedback and suggestions on language accuracy	3.93
Feedback and suggestions on contents of each section	3.89
Feedback and suggestions on clarity of answers	3.82
Feedback and suggestions on amount of information required	3.71
Feedback and suggestions on how to solve listening problems	3.80
Feedback and suggestions on how to plan for further study	3.88
Feedback on pronunciation and speaking practice	
Feedback and suggestions on pronunciation at the word level	3.95
Feedback and suggestions on pronunciation at the sentence level	3.84
Feedback and suggestions on accuracy of general language use in class	3.99
Feedback and suggestions on accuracy of language use in a role play	3.99
Suggestions on how to speak fluently	3.86

As can be seen from the above table, the levels of students' satisfaction on the 5-point rating scale questions were significantly high. They were quite satisfied with all aspects of the teacher's feedback on both activities. Noticeably the feedback helped fulfill learning elements

in the program. ELLIS itself provides the students with language exposure opportunities, while feedback and guidance from the teachers let them know more about the quality of their practice and how to improve it.

Lesson learnt: Putting theories into practice & dealing with constraints

It could be seen that the survey on students' attitudes and feedbacks on different aspects of ELLIS integration revealed positive results. The students were satisfied with the program, the preparation for their learning, the amount of practice time, the activities designed to foster language application from the practice, and supports from the teachers.

Harmer (2001) states that learners need 3 elements for success in their language learning: exposure, motivation and opportunities. All these elements were included in the integration of ELLIS into the courses. The students got a lot of exposure to English in the program. Moreover, apart from reinforcing their strong desire to improve their English skills, extrinsic motivation was also provided through the use of scores in the evaluation procedure. They also had opportunities, especially in Role play, to use English in the ways the native speakers normally do, which is one condition for creating the optimal language learning environment mentioned in Egbert, Chao, and Hanson-Smith (1999). The only concerns among students are logistic problems and the need for more feedback and guidance from teachers to help them monitor their learning. As Arends (1989:380) said "without knowledge of results, practice is of little value to students", the course designer and the teachers at KMUTT need to find ways to give more feedback to the students.

In conclusion, the findings of this study prove that a CALL program offers a potential but does not in itself guarantee a desirable result. The real effectiveness of a program lies not just in its inherent logic and potentiality, but in the approach of using it (Jones, 2001; Tudor, 2001). A key concept is the integration or a close correlation between the course objectives and the program (Chambers and Bax, 2006; Sharma and Barney, 2007). From our direct experiences in CALL integration, the followings are what course designers should be aware of.

1. Despite the high quality of a program, the integration must be done in a way where learning goals are not deviated from the course objectives. We must ensure that the teaching is driven by the pedagogy and supported by the technology, since putting pedagogy before technology can insure quality learning (Ascough, 2002; Sharma, and Barney, 2007). At KMUTT, after we got ELLIS from the Stock Exchange of Thailand, we primarily analyzed the objectives of all foundation courses and picked up only those where the program could serve the learning goals.

2. To deal with constraints, course designers must be creative and flexible in managing available resources. In addition, they must have enough authority to make decisions on course management and adjust available facilities to suit the needs. The constraint of logistics in this study is a good example. Since ELLIS runs on the Intranet system and could be accessed only in one building, such an inconvenience certainly obstructed students' learning. Fortunately, the designer of the courses was the head of the teaching group and had authority to reserve the laboratory for the students to access the program in their free time. This could undoubtedly reduce tension.

3. The elements of the CALL program must be studied closely. Most CALL programs provide practice rather than teach language strategies. The learning management system in a program mainly enables a teacher to organize course components and track student's learning, but does not help students to manage their own learning. Also, a program can give explanations and feedback only to a certain extent, while students always have unexpected questions and problems. All of these result in the requirement for support from teachers.

In addition, new activities and related materials must be carefully designed to enhance the use of the program and to make the students gain most benefits from the program. This certainly affects the evaluation scheme as what happened to our courses. In deed, when integrating technology into a course, learning activities need to be revised to facilitate autonomous learning.

4. Guidance and feedback from teachers are vital to students' success. According to Jones (2001), when a computer program is regarded as part of a course, teachers have to provide assistance in a number of ways e.g. identifying the right level for the learners, and organizing pairs at each terminal for greater communicative value. In our case study, academic support is required throughout the course, not just at the beginning or in the orientation sessions. The findings show that the students expected more feedback on their performances and clarification of uncertain points in their self-study. This might be due to the belief that the teachers know best and they could get useful and understandable comments and suggestions on their performance from the teachers (Zacharias, 2007). In addition, teacher's feedback can demonstrate a teacher's interest in and attention to their work (Harmer, 2001).

In terms of motivation, the students of this case study seemed to have strong intrinsic motivation to learn both English and CALL. Most students enjoyed learning and like the atmosphere in the computer lab. This kind of motivation is an influential learning factor and it should be used to foster learning. Extrinsic motivation should also be exploited as an extra reinforcement as students usually pay attention to grades. However, extrinsic motivation should not be over emphasized since it might lead to 'loss of real interest', 'stress' and competitiveness.

Conclusion

There are many aspects that course designers need to be cautious about, when integrating technology into a course. They need to not only have sufficient knowledge of related learning theories, but also to be flexible and capable of adjusting the theories to suit their situations. More importantly, they must have an insight into the strengths and weaknesses of the program as well as the objectives of the course.

As for learners, integration of CALL requires a lot of preparation and guidance on both how to learn and how to use CALL as a learning tool. Technical and academic supports are certainly essential, and are needed from the beginning to the end of the course.

Lastly, technology can be a wonderful tool or even a magic wand only if it is in the hands of good teachers, since the effectiveness of CALL depends greatly on teachers' abilities and efforts. In fact, teachers have more roles in the course with ICT components i.e. they need to not only teach, but also prepare pleasant learning atmospheres, pave convenient ways for students to monitor their learning, and provide tailored scaffolding for individual student's needs.

Authors

Kasamaporn Maneekhao is Assistant Professor working at the Department of Language studies, School of Liberal Arts, King Mongkut's University of Technology Thonburi, Thailand. She has a Master's degree in Linguistics from Chulalongkorn University, Thailand. She teaches both at the undergraduate and graduate levels. Her main interests lie in the area of using technology in language learning, autonomous learning, and writing self-access materials for computers.

Saowaluck Tepsuriwong is Assistant Professor working at the Department of Language Studies, School of Liberal Arts, King Mongkut's University of Technology, Thonburi, Thailand. She has a Ph.D. from the University of Reading and a Master's degree in Applied Linguistics (EST) from KMUTT. Her interests include task-based learning, language learning strategies and autonomous learning.

References:

Arends, R. I. (1989). *Learning to Teach*. Singapore: McGraw-Hill.

Ascough, R. S. (2002). Designing for Online Distance Education: Putting Pedagogy before Technology. *Teaching Theology and Religion*, 5(1), 17-29.

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

Chambers, A. & Bax, S. (2006). Making CALL work: Towards normalization. *System*, 34(4), 465-479.

Chamot, A. U. (2004). Issues in Language Learning Strategy Research and Teaching. *Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*, 1(1), 14-26.

Chamot, A. U., Barnhardt, S., El-Dinary, P. B., & Robbins, J. (1999). *The learning strategies handbook*. White Plains, NY: Addison Wesley Longman.

Cole, P. G. & Chan, L. K. S. (1987). *Teaching Principles and Practice*. Sydney: Prentice Hall.

Cunningsworth, A. (1995). *Choosing Your Coursebook*. Oxford: Heinemann.

Egbert, J., Chao, C., & Hanson-Smith, E. (1999). Computer-enhanced language learning environments: An overview. In Egbert, J. & Hanson-Smith, E. (Eds.), *CALL Environments: Research, Practice and Critical Issues* (pp. 1-13). Alexandria: TESOL.

Ellis, R. (2007). Individual differences in second language learning. In Davies, A. & Elder, C. (Eds.), *The Handbook of Applied Linguistics* (pp. 525-551). Oxford: Blackwell.

Harmer, J. (2001). *The practice of English language teaching*. Essex: Pearson Education Limited.

Hegelheimer, V. & Tower, D. (2004). Using CALL in the classroom: Analyzing student interactions in an authentic classroom. *System*, 32(2), 185-205.

Jones, J. F. (2001). CALL and the responsibilities of teachers and administrators. *ELT Journal*, 55(4), 360-367.

Murray, L. & Barnes, A. (1998). Beyond the "wow" factor: evaluating multimedia language learning software from a pedagogical viewpoint. *System*, 26(2), 249-259.

O'Malley, J. M. & Chamot, A. U. (1990). *Learning Strategies in Second Language Acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Oxford, R.L. (1990). *Language Learning Strategies: What Every Teacher Should Know*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Richards, J. C. (2001). *Curriculum Development in Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sharma, P. & Barney, B. (2007). *Blended Learning: using technology in and beyond the language classroom*. Oxford: Macmillan Education.

Stepp-Greany, J. (2002). Student perception on language learning n a technological environment: implications for the new millennium. *Language Learning & Technology*, 6(1), 165-180.

Tudor, I. (2001). *The Dynamics of the Language Classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Watson Todd, R. (1997). *Classroom teaching strategies*. New York: Prentice Hall.

Williams, M. & Burden, R. (1997). *Psychology for Language Teachers: A Social Constructivist Approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Zacharias, N. T. (2007). Teacher and student attitudes toward teacher feedback, *RELC Journal*, 38 (1), 38-52.

Appendix: Record Book

Section 1: Personal Information

Name: _____ Code:_____

Placement test: Listening level = _____ Vocabulary level = _____ Grammar level = _____

Overall level = _____

Section 2: Study Plan

Date/time	Topic planned to learn	Time planned (min/hr)

Section 3: Record of work done

Plan achievement		Quality of work (e.g. good writing /explanation, less use of dictionary	Your feeling (Satisfied? Unsatisfied?)
Yes	No		

Reflection form

Date: ……

Instructions: Reflect on your work by answering the following questions.

1. What topic(s) did you study?

_____

2. Why did you choose them?

_____

3. How did the lessons/exercises help improve your English?

_____

4. Did you have any problem(s) during this task?

○ Technical problems e.g. _____

○ Language problem

○ The length of the material(s) ○ Lack background knowledge about the topic

○ Difficult words e.g._____

_____

○ Others _____

5. How did you solve the stated problem(s)? Please explain

_____

Score of lesson quiz: …….

Self-evaluation

☐  ☐  ☐  ☐  ☐ 

Comments on your work

_____