**Lecture Eight: The Implementation of CALL**

1. **Pedagogical Concerns for Classroom Practice**

The use of computers as alternatives of teachers was heavily criticized, therefore, the computer has become to be seen as a complementary tool in the classroom that needs human intervention if the aim is an efficient and effective language teaching/ learning. Both teachers and learners should keep in mind the following considerations while being involved in CALL:

**a) Software Objectives**; to find out which skills each software package aims to develop is an important task for both teachers and learners. Therefore, teachers should, as a starting point, discuss with learners their needs and preferences to be able to decide about the kinds of CALL software programs to be included in the classroom. Sharing the decision-making process with learners allows them to organize their own learning, and helps in establishing an effective CALL environment. The latter necessitates different interfaces to suit different learning styles and the requirements of different skills.

**b) Making better Use of Existing Material;** learners’ and teachers’ discussions should not be limited to assessing the needs and setting the objectives, however, reflection on the effectiveness of the CALL program or online resource used is of salient importance. When a CALL program is not suitable, teachers and learners need to examine ways for adaptation and improvement. This feedback could be of major significance for other users of the material together with the material designers.

**c) Establishing an environment where CALL may take place;** CALL activities have a social and interactive nature. Henceforth, flexible learning environment is necessary for collaboration on the computer to take place. In other words, learners’ use of the computer should not be restricted by time and space, as the environment should not be unwelcoming to collaboration (Beatty, 2010).

**2. Material Selection and Use**

 CALL or CBI (computer based instruction) refers simply to the use of computers in different manners to facilitate the process of teaching and learning. Designing computer-based instruction is referred to as ‘instructional design’ (ID) (Jordan et.al. 2008, p. 229). In order for the latter to satisfy the needs and objectives of the competency-based learning, the material selected should be

* designed to meet a specific audience with specific learning needs;
* adaptable to different learning styles;
* broken down into discrete modular components;
* ‘chunked’ into discrete sub-sections to suit short-term memory;
* structured and organized to meet specific learning outcomes;
* enriched with hypermedia (sound and pictures) to assist dual coding;
* hyperlinked extensively to allow self-directed exploratory learning;
* sequenced appropriately;
* supported by formative assessment for feedback and for self-regulated learning.

 (Jordan et.al. 2008, p. 230)

 Besides material selection, Collins (1991) described pedagogical practices and shifts that characterize CALL and differentiate it from traditional learning as follows:

• a shift from whole class to small-group instruction,

• a shift from lecture and recitation to coaching,

• a shift from working with better students to working with weaker ones,

• a shift toward more engaged students,

• a shift from assessment based on test performance to assessment based on products, progress, and effort,

• a shift from a competitive to a co-operative work structure

• a shift from all students learning the same things to different students learning different things

• a shift from the primacy of verbal thinking to the integration of visual and verbal thinking

(Collins, 1991 cited in Beatty 2010 p. 201)

The integration of technology alone does not produce the promising results; it depends on how this technology is integrated and its relationship and suitability to the pedagogy. The technology selected must be easy to access and use without much training so that the focus of both learners and teachers is on the learning process, not on the technology. As the choice of technology tools needs to be evaluated, the number of technologies used should be also carefully decided about to avoid increasing workloads for staff and students unnecessarily. Ultimately, the extent of student engagement in the learning process will not be affected by the instruction or the technology; instead, it will depend on individual learner differences and motivation (Corder &U-Mackey, 2011).

* 1. **Designing a Telecollaborative Project**

In the age of Social Media, telecollaborative projects are common. The design of telecollaborative learning includes finding out partners, the selection of the tool, and the design of the tasks. Finding out collaborating partners may take place through personal communication, or through some online platforms such as google (+), [www.uni-collaboration.eu](http://www.uni-collaboration.eu) (O’Dowd, 2015, Edelstein, 2015).

 The chosen tool should be selected in a way that suits learners’ and teachers’ learning process, not the opposite, because “new technologies and telecollaboration is not a cure –all, nor can telecollaboration be perceived as a one-size-fits all effort” (Dooly, 2007 p. 214). To decide about a tool the teacher should decide about the possible way of delivery (synchronous or asynchronous) in the institution that suits learners’ levels and interest.

 Although the selection of the tool is of paramount importance, the benefits gained from telecollaboration depend more on the extent to which the designed tasks are suitable (Dooly, 2007). In telecollaboration, a combination of the task type is beneficial but necessitates a careful sequencing. O’Dowd & Waire (2009) argued for three stages/phases. The first is introductory in which learners represent themselves and cultures to get familiar with the partner. The second phase is comparative in the sense that learners are required to establish similarities and differences between the native and the target culture. The final phase, the production of a piece of work requires learners to negotiate meaning and to reflect critically.
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