Developing Oral Communication Using Computers: Computer Assisted Language Learning

Colin Painter

This paper presents the author's experience using Computer Assisted Language Learning (CALL) with Japanese university students essentially as an interactive tool for oral communication. On moving to a provincial university the author found, unannounced, a CALL lab., with 30 multimedia computers waiting to be used by teachers and students. Unfortunately, not an equal amount of software was available. Only one software application was available for interactive oral work, colleagues knew little about it, accompanying literature was perfunctory and little time remained before term began. The equipment and software would have to be learnt alongside the students or the opportunity abandoned. With an interest in CALL media it was decided to experiment. Further details about the subsequent development of an oral communication course using multimedia are presented. Anyone perusing the literature will soon notice that CALL research is still in its infancy. However, there have been some serious works and some will be covered while sketching the background to CALL. In addition the place of CALL in the curriculum, the methods used in exploiting software, and the opportunities presented by Internet for CALL exploitation by students and teachers will be discussed. Student evaluation of this author's CALL class will be presented. It is believed that evaluation by students is a part of learner centred curriculum development and a salient aspect of professionalism.

Background

Although the literature on CALL reminds us of its relatively short history, it is impossible to give an adequate coverage in a few paragraphs. Therefore what follows here is only a selective and brief outline. Research directly related to the subject of this study, 'Oral Communication & CALL', is not abundant. A search of the ERIC database of research papers in the field yielded little fruit and CALL special interest groups within the main language teaching societies are still exploring the capabilities of multimedia CALL for oral language use.

Publications as recent as the early eighties reflect the scarcity of ready-made applications which are taken for granted today. Kenning & Kenning (1983) speak of the need for teachers to write programs for language learning. They make an admirable endeavour to tempt teachers to learn to write their own programs using BASIC (Beginners All Purpose Symbolic Instruction Code) a general language which was developed at Dartmouth College by John Kemeny and Thomas Kurtz. At the time it was seen as an important step to use actual English words in programming and avoid the typical bias toward numerical applications.

Inclined as they were to progamming, Kenning & Kenning, enthuse along with Nelson et al., (1976) over the ability of the computer to interact with the student, while they wonder if the fascination with electronic games will last, yet predict the popularity of the graphical user interface (GUI). Revealing their background they point out the computer is only an instructional medium, not tied to any particular teaching method and they emphasize it should not be equated with Skinnerian programmed instruction. Rather, they point to judicious eclecticism in the syllabus (p5). Kenning & Kenning go on to say that today's classroom is geared toward the development of fluency, in particular, oral fluency, at least as much as accuracy and involves activities with intrinsic interest and immediate relevance to students. Originating as it did in the US, Computer Assisted Language Teaching (CALT) was really automated Programmed Learning (PL) with an orientation toward accuracy. Kenning & Kenning point out that the spread of personal computers has democratized and caused the direction of CALT to change. The methodology of PL is no longer appropriate for classroom practice and PL theories of language learning have little place in current views. Soon after, Skehan (Brumfit, Phillips & Skehan,

1985) was urging teachers to be patient and not despair at the lack of software available while suggesting that not all teachers will need to learn programming.

Approaching the present time, we witness how rapidly the field changes. Fantin (1995), about three years ago, tried linking the video tape recorder to computers but found, inevitably, the access time to be a disadvantage while Brett (1995), by digitising his own video clips was able, with university backing, to develop a multimedia CD-ROM product. However, Rope (1995) reports not too much consensus among 71 respondents on what constitutes good CALL usage. The latter emerged from a survey in 1995 by the CALL special interest group of the International Association of Teachers of English as a Foreign Language (IATEFL). Nevertheless, Rope cites a "strong response" of 52% of respondents who were thinking about CD-ROM use. Over half these respondents (56%) work in higher education. Polimac-Dobovisek (1994), with the desire to motivate learners, describes using computers as a teaching aid: learners first matching text with functional labels, trying again with words missing, and finally creating their own functional dialogues from exponents remembered from previous activities.

In a wider context which includes language study and other subjects, computers are being used to link learners in elementary schools on projects such as producing newspapers and joint studies through nationwide computer communications in Japan. Although research is limited in this area, Miller and McInerney (1994) suggest in a US study that it has advantages in the area of motivation. Staley (1995), in a general tertiery context, stresses his concern that computer applications should motivate students, stimulate interest and make learning enjoyable. He describes 42 university projects in the U.K., some of them in language learning, which are receiving funding for multimedia development. In a study in the U.K., on the use of software for school learners with special education needs (SEN), Sepehr and Harris (1995), found "motivation" to be the most frequent comment by teachers to evaluate software. In the same study, teachers rated "effectiveness" of using computers at 3.9 on a scale of 5. They also note that teachers are moving away from using "drill and practice" type software towards the "framework" type. Here "framework" implies content free software such as word processors, spreadsheets and some educational games. Hardisty and Windeatt (1989) have described numerous software programs, activities and ways in which CALL can

be integrated into the language course curriculum.

CALL is also being used to teach Japanese and experience in this area can provide insights for all language learning. In an interview with Auckerman (1995), Miyagawa, who has been working on the development of Japanese language learning multimedia at MIT, feels that although multimedia will motivate and increase efficiency, it is not supposed to replace textbooks, rather it will provide more authentic stimulus particularly for learners who cannot experience the culture first hand.

Another area with obvious CALL implications is learner use of e-mail. Again, Miyagawa at MIT has put most of the Japanese language learning program on the local net and it is intended that Japanese teachers world wide gain access to the resources. Seppo (1992), researching the way English was used in e-mail, found that learners modes of writing became more versatile, and that on-line writing resembled oral communication.

CALL Encounters

In the mid-eighties, this writer first had the opportunity to use computers in the classroom when coordinating a third year program at a Tokyo University. The program was content-based focusing on themes such as: the rise of Japan's economic power, pan-culture, related field trips and culminated in the production of a magazine. In previous years the students had engaged in typing lessons using IBM Selectric typewriters and it was required that some element of typing should continue in the curriculum. This writer felt that the typing requirement could be integrated into the program in a meaningful way, rather than continuing as an isolated subject on the timetable. Around the same time, the department had just received Macintosh computers.

It was decided that the typing part of the curriculum world have students "cover basic business and manuscript applications as well as 'report typing' in connection with the writing activities". As a result, this meant that students would write their magazine copy on the computers. Desktop personal computers had only been around since the beginning of the eighties and this probably helped to create the feeling of excitement among students and staff.

Subsequently, when computers replaced typewriters in the classroom, student motivation augmented considerably. One clear cause was the fascination with the way applications appeared on the screen and the accompanying ease with which text or data could be manipulated: the graphical user interface and the menu driven applications which are now so familiar to users.

Subsequently, during a session when computers were being used by students, it was not an unfamiliar sight to see two or three students grouped around a single computer eagerly helping or learning with the student at the keyboard while using both Japanese and English to interact. A similar event was witnessed with colleagues at the British Council, Tokyo, where students, in groups of three or four around computers, unselfconsciously, interacted in English over language learning games such as "Fastfood" (1994). Teachers made the pleasant discovery that computers provided a 'trigger' for language production. This was in addition to the benefit from the content of the material being used. Scrimshaw (1993) supports the idea that the language used around the computer is more important than the program and Lewis (1986) emphasized the development of tasks which groups of learners would use, not just individual learners, thus increasing the amount of oral communication. Lewis also emphasizes fluency activities and interaction between learners instead of a one directional teacher to learner dimension.

More recently, upon arrival at a provincial Japanese university this writer was pleasantly surprised to find a CALL laboratory equipped with thirty multimedia computers. However, the only multimedia software available at the university, which could conceivably be used for an oral communication type class, was "Nova City" by Milward (1993), a CD-ROM based multimedia language learning program. Although colleagues had tried the software with students and reported high interest, the Japanese-only documentation accompanying the software was minimal. With little time to study the program in depth, it was decided to trial the program in the second semester of 1994 with once weekly classes for 1st year students in the General Administration and Science Faculties. Subsequently, in 1995, one of the classes, which was now entering its second year, was retained in the CALL program. This would make it possible to view the study longitudinally.

Purpose

The purpose of conducting this program was to discover if language learning could be enhanced using Computer Assisted Instruction (CAI). Additional considerations were: ways of augmenting awareness and experience of communicative functions in meaningful contexts, heightening motivation to study and keeping it raised, increasing enjoyment for learners, given the limited context of classrooms, freeing unstreamed learners of diverse levels from constraints to allow them to proceed at their own level, and consequently freeing the teacher to deal with learners at their particular level. At the same time, it was desired that such a program would consist of content which was relevant and meaningful to the learners and which would equip them with skill immediately discernible as useful to daily communication. Also, as a result of this experience, to discover learners' choices with regard to the form and content of on-going language classes. Moreover, to understand how learners react to software diversity with a view to exploiting that potential.

Program Development

Design

Multimedia Computer software designed for learners of oral English would be used in the Computer Assisted Language Learning Laboratory once weekly in the context of a twice weekly program. The learners would study along conventional lines in the alternate weekly class. Learners would be tested for communicative performance at their level on a demand basis. The results would be announced immediately to learners concerned and contribute to a continuous assessment record which would reflect in the learners grade. Evaluation would be administered to gather information and feedback concerning the success of the program. Whole class surveys would be conducted to seek learners' course content choices for subsequent courses. A similar secondary survey would be conducted to discover the influence of software diversity. Course Descriptions and Software Procedure Guides would be delivered to the learners by the first day of the semester announcing the details of testing and procedure.

Learners

Learners were not streamed by ability but enrolled alphabetically by the university.

In 1994, 71 mixed gender 1st year learners. These consist of two classes of 24 and 23 learners in the Faculty of General Administration (1-1 & 1-2) & one class of 24 learners in the Faculty of Science (1-3), as detailed in Table 1.1

In 1995, 98 mixed gender 1st and 2nd year learners. These consist of two 1st year classes of 25 learners each (1-4, & 1-5) and two second year classes of 22 and 26 learners (2-1 & 2-2) in the Faculty of General Administration, as detailed in Table 2.1.

Table 1.1

Class Designation & Frequency 1994
(inclusive of CAI & Non-CAI)

Class Designation	Description Year	Faculty	Enrollment Total	Class Frequency Semester 1	Hours	Semester 2	Year Hours	Total Classes	Hours
1-1	1st	Admin	24	25 (2 wkly)	37.5	23 (2 wkly)	34.5	48	75
1-2	1st	Admin	23	23 (2 wkly)	34.5	27 (2 wkly)	40.5	50	75
1-3	1st	Science	24	12 (1 wkly)	18.0	14 (1 wkly)	50.0	26	39

Table 2.1

Class Designation & Frequency 1995
(inclusive of CAI & Non-CAI)

Class Designation	Description Year	Faculty	Enrollment Total	Class Frequency Semester 1	Hours	Semester 2	Year Hours	Total Classes	Hours
1-4	1st	Admin	25	25 (2 wkly)	37.5	24 (2 wkly)	36.0	49	73.5
1-5	1st	Admin	25	25 (2 wkly)	37.5	24 (2 wkly)	36.0	49	73.5
2-1	2nd	Admin	22	12 (1 wkly)	18.0	14 (1 wkly)	21.0	26	39.0
2-2	2nd	Admin	26	12 (1 wkly)	18.0	14 (1 wkly)	21.0	26	39.0

Resources

Reference and frequency of use of resources by learners in 1994 can be found in Table 1.2, while that of 1995 can be found in Table 2.2. Multimedia Computer CD-ROM software ("Nova City" by Milward, 1993) was used by both 1st and 2nd year learners.

The Computer Assisted Language Learning (CALL) laboratory, consisted of 30 Multimedia Macintosh Power PCs. The CALL laboratory was equipped with an overhead camera projector connected to a large projected TV screen. The latter could be used to project any ancillary instructions to learners. The layout of the CALL laboratory is conventional in that learners face the front in rows just as in the conventional classroom. There are two aisles front to back and computers and learners are thus positioned in a 2-3-2 seat configuration across the laboratory. The computers at the rear-central part of the laboratory were kept free so that the teacher could circulate freely.

Course Descriptions were distributed in the first class of the first semester in 1994 & 1995. The 1994 Course Description contained no reference to CAI since the use of it had not been anticipated. A 1995 Course Description, an example of which appears in Appendix A, was distributed at the first class containing information about CAI, it indicated how the results of CAI would be assessed. A summarized version of the latter had also previously been published in the students Syllabus manual of 1995.

A Software Procedure guide was also distributed in the first class of 1995 and was used throughout the semester. An example, for 1st year learners, may be found in Appendix B.

Test role-cards were developed and used (in hard plastic covers) from the first semester of 1995. Examples appear in Appendix C. Test results were recorded alongside attendance in the Attendance Register.

A bilingual English-Japanese evaluation questionnaire, without specific reference to CAI, was administered at the end of the first semester 1994 & again at the end of the second semester 1994 (found in Appendix D). It consists of 13 questions, answerable on a scale of 1-5, 1=low, 5=high. Another

Bilingual English-Japanese evaluation, with specific reference to CAI, was developed and administered at the end of the first semester 1995 (found in Appendix E). It consists of 19 questions answerable on a scale of 1-5, 1=low, 5 =high, and one course content question with a Yes/No orientation. Both types of questionnaire encouraged additional written comments, criticisms and recommendations.

A whole class survey referred to as the "Choice of Course Content" was conducted before and after CAI. A secondary survey concerning influence and interest in software diversity was conducted after a semester of CAI.

Table 1.2

Class Resources 1994
For 1st Year Classes in the General Administration & Science Faculties
(inclusive of CAI & Non-CAI)

Class designation	Year	Semester	Total Classes Weekly	Resource	Frequency	Resource Details
1-1 & 1-2	1st	1st	2	Text	2	English Firsthand & Firsthand Plus
1-3	1st	1st	1	Text	1	English Firsthand
1-1 & 1-2	1st	2nd	2	Text/video	1	A Week by the Sea
				CAI based	1	Nova City (CAI software)
1-3	1st	2nd	1	Text	bi-wkly 1	English Firsthand Plus
				CAI	bi-wkly 1	Nova City (CAI software)

Table 2.2

Resources 1995
For 1st & 2nd Year Classes in the General Administration Faculty
(inclusive of CAI & Non-CAI)

Class designation	Year	Semester	Total Classes Weekly	Resource	Frequency	Resource Reference
1-4 & 1-5	1st	1st	2	Text	1	English Firsthand
			2	CAI	1	Nova City (software)
2-1 & 2-2	2nd	1st	1	Text/video	Bi-weekly 1	Face The Music
				CAI	Bi-weekly 1	Nova City (CAI software)

Procedures

Software Procedure

The software used, as its name "Nova City" implies, is about travel to and living in a city. In consists of three CD-ROM disks: Beginner, Intermediate and Advanced. In the present study learners reached the second disk level, Intermediate. The first, Beginner, is centred on traveling by air to the fictitious city. The second, Intermediate, is about living in the same city. Beginner, presents the learner with various video segments each focusing on likely incidents during the flight to the city. These range from introducing oneself, in this case to one's neighbouring passenger, choosing reading material from the stewardess, choosing dinner, comparing family photos, and general conversation. Each of these video segments can be seen in two modes. Either, as a kind of mini-movie, called "Movie Stage", or as "Lets Talk" where the viewing angle of the movie is altered so as to put the learner in the physical position of one of the characters. The other character appears now as if speaking to the learner and the dialogue is heard in the same way except that the learner now has to contribute as a participant. The learner's side of the dialogue is no longer heard and has to be created. The two stages "Movie Stage" or "Lets Talk" may be accessed and alternated at will by the learner through the menu, by clicking the pointing device, in this case called the mouse, at an appropriate button on the screen.

The second disk, Intermediate, is similar to the first but presents more complex language typical of: arriving in a new city, finding a hotel, socializing, searching for an apartment, shopping, and so on. These encounters are again presented in mini-movie segments, each of which is located in one of about 20 buildings. This time learners have a much wider choice and access is found by looking at a map and choosing which building to enter directly or by exploring the city streets, turning left or right, and then entering buildings as one finds them. The type of dialogue and language functions encountered is suggested by the type of building. The first building encountered is the Airport with its Tourist Information Counter. Then choices are open for: an hotel, a bar, an estate agency, an appliance store, a condominium building, etc. These might be referred to as the core activities present on the software. However, there are other facilities which were not particularly focused on. Briefly, there is an on-line bilingual dictionary, a voice recording facility where learners may compare their voice with the screen character's voice & tests of a written nature.

Study procedure

It was decided that learners would work in groups of 2 or 3. This would be necessary for initial group work, role-play activities, and testing. At the disposal of users of the CALL laboratory were 10 CD-ROM disks for each level of "Nova City". With a class of 25, assuming full attendance, this would mean 5 groups of 2 and 5 groups of 3. Learners exploited the software in groups with the assistance of the Procedure Guide (Appendix B). Before viewing any video segment, learners as a group (of 2 or 3) would decide which segment of video to exploit next. Having made a decision they would then engage in predicting what kind of language might be used in the target situation. The only cues would be the title of the segment and the still pictures or the segment played without sound. As a group, learners would write down anything they could predict. They were encouraged to construct a dialogue if they wished. In fact, they almost always chose to do this. Next, they would call the teacher to see and hear them act out their predicted dialogue. Now the learners would be free to play the selected video segment, reflecting on how it may relate to what they had predicted, and practise interacting with the characters on-screen. They were also encouraged to change roles. At their own pace and when they felt ready they could call the teacher to see and hear them act out again. On this occasion they would act out among themselves instead of

with the on-screen characters. Now, the learners would reflect about the nature of the language being used in the segment acted out. The teacher would elicit the functional type of language used: what the language was being used for. For example, on closer examination a dialogue about looking for an apartment would turn out to contain functions such as choosing between alternatives. Having identified the functions in this way the learners would now imagine in how many different contexts such a function could be employed. Learners would then select a new context, different from the one in which they had just acted, and create a new dialogue, realizing that they could very well use many of the structures and language exponents previously played with. When learners had successfully, completed this activity they would be tested in their groups, using role-cards.

Assessment and Evaluation Procedures

The intention of this study was to exploit the software for its use in increasing awareness of, and experience in using, communicative functions of language in meaningful situations. Testing of learners communicative performance was developed and implemented in the first semester of 1995. Brief tests of around 3-4 minutes each were administered on a "demand basis", requested by learners themselves, when they had completed the appropriate segment of study.

For the first semester of 1994, no classes in this study received Computer Assisted Instruction. CAI was introduced for 1st year classes in the second semester of 1994 and for 2nd year classes in the first semester of 1995. This would allow a continuing study. In fact, only one class, namely 1-1 of 1994 was retained, becoming 2-1 in 1995.

For the first trial of CAI in the second semester of 1994, learners were asked to proceed through the segments of study and request the teacher to listen after exploiting each segment. However, no tests were administered. In the second stage of CAI in the first semester of 1995, tests had been developed and were administered. At the beginning of the second semester, learners received a Course Outline, which detailed how they would be tested and how this could contribute 20% of their grade over two semesters.

The whole class survey referred to as the "Choice of Course Content" was administered, before and after CAI, to three classes in 1994 and four classes in 1995. Choices of course content were exhibited to learners on the whiteboard. Information was solicited from the whole class concerning their choices and the results were displayed alongside course content categories.

The secondary survey concerning the influence and interest in software diversity was administered to a single class, 1-1, who had experienced CAI for a semester in 1994. The teacher collected the information from pairs while they were working.

Results

Evaluation Results

At the end of the first semester 1994, wherein no CAI had been employed, an evaluation was administered to two 1st year classes designated: 1-1 & 1-2, having class frequencies of twice a week. A third class designated 1-3 at a lower frequency of once a week was not evaluated until the end of the year.

At the end of the second semester of 1994 all three classes, 1-1 & 1-2 & 1-3, had now experienced half of their time in CAI. However, CAI class frequencies were not equal. 1-1 & 1-2, had experienced CAI once weekly but 1-3 had experienced CAI once bi-weekly (Frequencies are also shown in Table 1.1).

The same bilingual evaluation questionnaire was used at both evaluation occasions for purposes of consistency and comparison. This evaluation questionnaire had not been intended to solicit information or feedback about CAI. However, being in nature non-exclusive, it is possible to retrieve some information about CAI. The results of these two evaluations may be seen in Table 3. The questions are abbreviated and the full English version appears in Appendix D.

Table 3

Semester Course Evaluations 1994
(inclusive of CAI & Non-CAI)

Evaluation of 1st semester (no CAI) & 2nd Semester (50% CAI)

Class designation	1-1	1-1	1-2	1-3	1-3*
n	19	21	22	21	17
enrollment	24	24	23	23	24
Semester surveyed	1st	2nd	1st	2nd	1st & 2nd
Date of Survey	6/10	20/12	19/9	19/12	20/12
Classes weekly	2	2	2	2	1
Classes weekly in CAI	0	1	0	1	1 bi-wkly
CAI experience (i.e. half of all classes)	1 demo	1 smstr	1 demo	1 smstr	1 smstr
	m	m	m	m	m
Q1 prior expectations?	4.16	4.24	4.14	4.05	3.82
Q2 now benefitted?	3.73	3.71	3.59	3.66	3.47
Q3 rate the teaching	4.16	4.24	3.82	3.95	3.59
Q4 rate the teacher	4.68	4.62	4.45	4.55	3.94
Q5 benefit from homework?	3.05	3.38	3.54	3.05	3.06
Q8 course changes necessary?	2.68	2.33	3.60	2.65	2.47
Q9 communicate enough in English?	3.05	3.00	3.00	3.24	3.29
Q10 chances to communicate?	4.21	4.23	4.14	3.90	4.35
Q11 prior expectations for materials?	4.00	3.95	3.86	3.81	3.41
Q12 rate materials	3.66	3.80	4.05	3.76	3.29
Q13 rate materials compared with previous	3.83	4.14	3.45	4.05	3.76
Q14 now how much benefit from material	4.63	3.71	3.59	3.70	3.41
Q15 similar materials next time?	3.42	4.05	3.45	4.10	3.76

Key: *   1-3 evaluated once only: at end of 2nd semester
N.B.   The above evaluation was used in the 2nd semester for comparison
    although not originally intended to elicit information about CAI.

The most significant changes concerning CAI between the 1st and 2nd semesters appear connected with question 8 where learners indicate, with their declining rating, that more comfort is felt with the course in the second semester, that is to say after a semester with CAI. Another significant change was in Q13, where a higher rating indicated preference for second semester course materials (i.e. CAI materials) compared with previous materials. Q15, elicited similarly an increased rating in favour of using these materials in the future.

At the same time all three classes were surveyed for their choices concerning course content in the future. In each case information was solicited from the class as a whole. This occurred for the first time at the end of the first semester in 1994. Learners were presented with choice categories concerning course content and asked to vote for one category. The categories and votes were displayed on the whiteboard at the front of the classroom or CALL laboratory. The atmosphere was informal and students were able to discuss among themselves as they made their choices. No partiality was indicated by the teacher. At first in 1994, the cycle of opportunity to participate in this kind of course content choice was three-fold, occurring first (i) before any CAI, then (ii) after an initial single class-period demonstration in the CALL laboratory, and then (iii) at the end of a semester of CAI.

The results of the first survey in 1994 may be seen in the Table 4.1. For each class there are records for three categories: (i) pre-CAI, (ii) post-CAI demo & (iii) post-one semester of CAI. Furthermore, the entries for the three classes have been combined for each of the categories and appear in Table 4.2. to give an overall view.

Table 4.1

Pre & Post CAI Class Comparison of 1994
1st Year Student
Choice of Course Content

Students course content choices were solicited on three occasions:
(i) Pre-CAI (ii) Post-CAI demo & (ii) Post-one semester with CAI

Class designation	1-1	1-1	1-1	1-2	1-2	1-2	1-3	1-3	1-3
n	21	21	21	21	22	19	19	19	17
enrollment	24	24	24	23	23	23	24	24	24
Semester of survey	1st	1st	2nd	1st	1st	2nd	1st	1st	2nd
month of survey	7	7	12	7	9	12	9	9	12
Classes weekly	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	1
Classes weekly in CAI	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1 bi-wkly
CAI experience	none	demo	1 smstr	none	demo	1 smstr	nome	demo	1 smstr
Chronology of Choice									
(i) Pre demonstration	(i)			(i)			(i)		
(ii) Post demonstration		(ii)			(ii)			(ii)	
(iii) Post one semester			(iii)			(iii)			(iii)
Choice Categories:									
computer & text+video	07	14	08	17	05	15	13	02	12
computer	14	07	12	04	17	04	04	17	05
text+video	00	00	01	00	00	00	02	00	00

Table 4.2

Pre & Post CAI Overall Comparison of 1994
1st Year Student
Choice of Course Content

n	61	62	57
enrollment	71	71	71
Semester of survey	1st	1st	2nd
Date of survey	7-9mth	7-9mth	12mth
CAI experience	none	demo	1 smstr
Chronology of Choice	(i) Pre-CAI demo	(ii) Post-CAI demo	(iii) Post-1 smstr
Choice Categories			
computer & text+video	37 (61 %)	21 (34 %)	35 (61 %)
computer	22 (36 %)	41 (66 %)	21 (37 %)
text+video	02 (03 %)	00 (00 %)	01 (02 %)

The overall comparison "Choice of Course Content" indicates at the first stage, (i) pre-CAI, a high general interest in CAI with the majority 61% opting for a balanced course of CAI plus text & video. The next stage, (ii) post-CAI demo, indicates a swing to sole use of CAI at 66%. The last stage, (iii) post-one semester of CAI, indicates a return to the 61% in favour of a balance. It is perhaps understandable that after experiencing a demonstration of CAI learners would be attracted by impressive images and graphics on a screen. However, the more serious choices made after a semester of CAI, less influenced by fascination factors, indicate no less commitment to this type of instruction in a balanced form.

In the first semester of 1995 the focus of this study turns to a further four classes which experienced CAI. Specifically these were, two new first year classes, designated 1-4, and 1-5. Additionally, one second year class, designated 2-2, was newly assigned, while another second year class designated 2-1, continued with CAI, having already experienced one semester as a first year class (designated then as 1-1).

At the end of the first semester 1995 a new bilingual evaluation questionnaire was administered. This questionnaire was designed to elicit information and feedback about CAI. The results of this evaluation may be seen in Table 5. The questions are abbreviated and appear in full in Appendix E.

Table 5

The CAI Class
Semester Course Evaluations 1995
1st & 2nd Year Students in the General Administration Faculty

	1-4	1-5	2-1	2-2	All	
Class designation	1-4	1-5	2-1	2-2	All	
n	24	24	22	26	96	
enrollment	25	25	22	26	98	
Semester surveyed	1st	1st	1st	1st	1st	
Date of survey	4/7	4/7	5/7	5/7		
Classes weekly	2	2	1	1		
Classes weekly in CAI	1	1	bi-wk 1	bi-wk 1		
CAI experience x semester	1	1	2	1		
	m	m	m	m	m	
Ability & Feeling						
Q1 present English ability	2.50	2.50	2.23	2.08	2.28	
Q2 ease of studying English	2.58	2.54	2.27	2.65	2.47	
Q3 usefulness of studying English	4.71	4.50	4.82	4.54	4.54	
Q4 faculty need for English	4.46	4.08	4.00	3.92	4.03	
Q5 benefit expected studying English here	4.17	3.37	4.00	3.53	3.68	
CALL for Oral English						
Q6 pre-course perception of effectiveness	3.92	3.33	3.64	3.65	3.56	
Q7 perception now of effectiveness	3.75	2.79	3.45	3.42	3.28	
Q8 enjoyment	3.71	3.04	3.59	3.69	3.43	
Q9 future CAI: less 1/same 3/more 5	3.08	2.62	2.59	3.19	2.82	
Q10 Choice of Class Content / Frequency						
a 1 wkly CAI + 1 wkly text/video	18	12	15	18	63	(66 %)
b every lesson CAI	02	00	01	02	05	(05 %)
c every lesson text/video	04	12	06	05	27	(28 %)
d none of a-c	00	00	00	01	01	(01 %)
The Software for Oral English						
Q11 effectiveness of software used	3.37	3.17	3.18	3.31	3.19	
Q12 enjoyability of software used	3.37	3.00	3.23	3.42	3.19	
Q13 interest in other software	4.37	4.00	3.91	3.65	3.90	
Teaching Oral English in the CALL lab						
Q14 teachers effective use of time	4.00	3.33	4.00	3.62	3.65	
Q15 teachers assistance with software	3.83	3.42	3.86	3.58	3.59	
Q16 learning environment: encouraging	4.17	3.58	3.86	3.62	3.72	
Q17 CALL lab more effective than classrm	3.25	3.08	3.05	3.00	3.03	
Testing Oral English in the CALL lab						
Q18 testing was effective	4.21	3.58	3.77	3.62	3.71	
Q19 testing encouraged learning	3.62	3.33	3.91	2.96	3.37	
Q20 testing method encouraged hard work	2.87	2.79	3.36	2.77	2.88	

Key: bi-wk: bi-weekly

Since this was the first time to ask most of these particular evaluation questions, it will only be possible to make a comparison at future evaluations. Nevertheless, concerning the future, "Benefit expected studying English here" (Q5), the one class experiencing CAI for a second term, 2-1, gives a positive rating. It is possible, however, that ratings in the section on ability and feeling have nothing to do with CAI. In the section "CALL for oral English", although learners do not rate the section highly their Q9 response remains around the "same" level, indicating their desire for a continuance of CAI at the same frequency. Under the "Choice of Class Content / Frequency" section, 71% of learners opt for CAI in some form, either (a) 66%: "1 wkly CAI + 1 wkly text/video", or (b) 5%: "every lesson CAI". Under the "Software for Oral English" section there is a strong interest in trying other software. Under "Teaching Oral English in the CALL lab", it seems that learners do not perceive the laboratory to be more or less effective than the classroom. The section "Testing Oral English in the CALL lab" indicates that learners felt no great pressure from the continuous testing.

In 1995 the survey on "Choice of Course Content" became a two-fold cycle, with the first occurrence (i) before any CAI, and then (ii) at the end of a semester of CAI. The results of this survey appear in Table 6. In addition the results of the previous, 1994 "Choice of Course Content" survey (Table 4.2), have been combined with those of 1995 (Table 6) and presented in Table 7.

Table 6

Pre & Post CAI Class Comparison of 1995
1st & 2nd Year Student Choice of Course Content

Students' course content choices were solicited on two occasions:
(i) Pre-CAI (ii) Post-one semester with half the classes in CAI

Class Designation	1-4	1-4	1-5	1-5	2-1*	2-1	2-2	2-2
n	25	24	25	24	21^	22	26	26
enrollment	25	25	25	25	24^	22	26	26
Semester of survey	1st	1st	1st	1st	2nd^	1st	NA	1st
month of survey	4	7	4	7	12^	7	NA	7
Classes weekly	2	2	2	2	2^	1	1	1
Classes weekly in CAI	0	1	0	1	1^	1 bi-wk	0	1 bi-wk
CAI experience x semester	none	1	none	1	1^	2	none	1
Chronology of Choice								
(i) Pre-CAI	(i)		(i)		(i)		(i)	
(ii) Post-one semester		(ii)		(ii)		(ii)		(ii)
Choice Categories								
(a) computer & text+video	15	18	21	12	08	15	NA	18
(b) computer	10	02	04	00	12	01	NA	02
(c) text+video	00	04	00	12	01	06	NA	05
(d) none of a-c	00	00	00	00	00	01	NA	01

Key: *   designated 1-1 in 1994
    ^   1994
   NA   Not Available
   bi-wk   bi-weekly

Table 7

Post CAI Comparison of 1994-95 & Overall View
1st & 2nd Year Students Choice of Course Content

Year	1994	1995	1995	All 94-5
Ss Year of Study	1st	1st	2nd	1st & 2nd
Class designations	1-1, 1-2, 1-3	1-4, 1-5	2-1, 2-2	All
n	57	48	48	153
enrollment	71	50	48	169
Semester of survey	2nd	1st	1st	
Date of survey	12/94	7/95	7/95	
CAI experience x semest	1	1	2-1=2, others=1	
Chronology of Choice	Post-1 smstr	Post-1 smstr	Post-2 & 1 smstr	
Choice Categories				
computer & text+video	35 (61 %)	30 (63 %)	33 (69 %)	98 (64 %)
computer	21 (37 %)	02 (04 %)	03 (06 %)	26 (17 %)
text+video	01 (02 %)	16 (33 %)	12 (25 %)	29 (19 %)

The CAI course had been modified at the beginning of 1995; more exploitation of the material and continuous testing was introduced. This may have influenced the choices made in 1995. Nevertheless, combining the post-CAI "Choices of Course Content" (Table 7) reveals that the post-CAI learners in 1994 and 1995 had similar feelings about course content for the future. In sum 81% in their post-CAI experience indicated a choice of CAI for half of the time or more and of those, 64% chose a balanced content of CAI for at least half of the time, 17% opting for full time CAI. The figures were, 98%, 61% and 37% for 1994 and 71%, 66% and 5% for 1995 (Table 5), when continuous testing had been introduced. A drop from 98% to 71%, comparing the global figures for 1994 and 1995 might be attributed to the more pervasive testing which had been introduced. However, the figure for a balanced course content with CAI at least half the time, rises from 61% in 1994 to 66% in 1995.

The secondary survey concerning the influence and interest in software diversity was conducted to understand how learners react to software diversity with a view to exploiting that potential. It was not intended as an evaluation of software brands, nor could it qualify as such. The survey was administered to a

single class, 1-1, who had experienced CAI for a semester in 1994. Information was solicited from the class as a whole. This was done informally at the end of 1994. All learners in the class were asked to try another multimedia software: "Dynamic English" disk 2a, lower intermediate. 10 CD-ROM disks were available, and towards the end of a standard lesson period learners were requested to think about how they would rate the software on a scale of 1-5, 1=low, 5=high. They were also requested to do this for the software they had been using for the semester. It was .understood that this was only an informal inquiry, since the two pieces of software had not been exposed to equal use by the class. The learners were surveyed in pairs while they were working. The results, which appear in Table 8.1, indicate a class rating mean of 3.66 for both software. When asked which software they would like accessible in the future they indicated a preference toward the new, as shown in Table 8.2. Three lessons later, having been free to use either kind of software for those three lessons, the same class was observed again. As illustrated in Table 9, interest in new software had diminished slightly.

Table 8.1

Influence of Software Diversity

N.B.   DE had been used for one class, NC had been used for one semester

Class designation	1-1
n	21
enrollment	24
Semester of survey	2nd
Date of survey	20/12/94
Classes weekly	2
Classes weekly in CAI	1
CAI experience x semester	1 smstr

		Individual pair scores (scale 1-5, 5=high opinion, 1=low opinion)									
Software Title	m	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
NC disk 1 (beginner) & 2 (intermediate)	3.66	5-4	5-4	3-3	4-3-3	4-5	3-3	4-4	3-3	4-3	4-3
DE disk 2a (lower intermed)	3.66	2-4	4-3	5-5	4-5-4	2-3	4-4	2-2	5-5	3-3	4-4

Key: DE = Dynamic English, NC = Nova City   N.B. Ss work in pairs with a single CD-ROM disk

Table 8.2

Interest In Software Availability

N.B. DE had been used for one class only, NC had been used for one semester

Class designation	1-1
n	21
enrollment	24
Semester of survey	2nd
Date of survey	20/12/94
Classes weekly	2
Classes weekly in CAI	1
CAI experience x semester	1 smstr

Software availability during class	Ss expressing interest
Both NC & DE	11
DE	08
NC	02

Key: DE = Dynamic English, NC = Nova City   N.B. Ss work in pairs with a single CD-ROM disk

Table 9

Exploitation of Software Availability

N.B. by 17/01/95, NC had been used for one semester, DE had been available for 3 class periods

Class designation	1-1
n	21
enrollment	24
Semester of survey	2nd
Date of survey	20/12/94 & 17/01/95
Classes weekly	2
Classes weekly in CAI	1
CAI experience x semester	1 smstr

Date	Conditions of use	Ss using DE	Ss using NC	n
20/12/94	learners requested by teacher to try DE	21	00	21
17/01/95	learners free to choose DE or NC	11	10	21

Key: DE = Dynamic English disk 2a (lower intermed) NC = Nova City disk 1 (beginner) & 2 (intermediate)

N.B. Ss work in pairs with a single CD-ROM disk

Assessment Results

Performance testing was first implemented in the first semester of 1995. Tests were administered on a demand basis. Since learners were free to study at their own pace, it was a logical consequence to assess when they were ready. Testing occurred when learners had completed the relevant segment of the software and created an alternative situation in which the language functions could be used, as explained in the "Study procedure" above. The learners would be accommodated in a section of the CALL laboratory, away from other activity, and given role-cards (examples appear in Appendix C.1 & C.2). The scoring principle had been indicated to learners in a procedure guide (Appendix B) as follows:

communication is meaningful &
grammatically correct: 2 points for each section

communication is meaningful but
contains grammatical errors: 1 point for each section

communication was meaningless: 0 point for each section

Test result data for a single first year class, 1-4, experiencing CAI, for the first time in 1995, is shown in Table 10. Frequency of testing for four classes appears in Table 11.

Table 10

Test Results (class 1-4)

L 1 Ss	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	Test qty	Test av %	Test qty quot	Test av quot	Total as %
01		90in			80re		90cd	100fp			4	90	5.3	12.0	87
02	80in		60re	R						90cd	3	77	4.0	10.3	71
03		90in			60re			80cd			3	77	4.0	10.3	71
04		100in			60re			100cd			3	87	4.0	11.6	78
05		80in	80re				90cd	80fp			4	83	5.3	11.1	82
06		80in	60re				70cd		80fp		4	73	5.3	09.7	75
07		90in								80cd	2	85	2.6	11.3	70
08	80in	R			70re		70cd		70fp		4	73	5.3	09.7	75
09		70in							70cd		2	70	2.7	09.3	60
10		80in			70re					90cd	3	80	4.0	10.7	73
11	90in		90re				80cd		80fp		4	85	5.3	11.3	83
12		100in			50re				100cd		3	83	4.0	11.1	75
13		90in			80re				100cd		3	90	4.0	12.0	80
14	70in		60re				80cd		70fp		4	70	5.3	09.3	73
15	90in		30re		50cd				100fp		4	68	5.3	09.1	72
16		80in									1	80	1.3	10.7	60
17	90in				60re		80cd		80fp		4	78	5.3	10.4	79
18		70in			50re				80cd		3	67	4.0	08.9	65
19		90in			80re				100cd		3	90	4.0	12.0	80
20		100in			60re				100cd		3	87	4.0	11.6	78
21	40in	50re		70cd			80fp	90g			5	66	6.7	08.8	78
22		90in			60re				100cd		3	83	4.0	11.1	75
23	70in		50re		60cd			80fp			4	65	5.3	08.7	70
24	80in	90re		60cd			80fp	90g			5	80	6.7	10.7	87
25	100in			90re		70fp		100fp			4	90	5.3	12.0	87
Average											3.4	79	4.5	10.5	75

Key:

L	Lesson (top horizontally 1-11)
Ss	Student (left vertically 1-25)
Lower case initials	Test titles abbreviated (e.g., in, re, cd, fp & g)
R	Repeat
quot	quota

Table 11

Frequency of Testing

1st Year

CAI Lesson (1 wkly)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	Total tests	Average per class
Date (m/d)	4.18	4.25	5.9	5.16	5.23	5.30	6.6	6.13	6.20	6.27	7.4		
1-4, test per lesson	00	02	09	16	07	06	11	10	04	17	03	85	08.5
1-5, test per lesson	00	02	06	10	13	16	09	12	08	17	00*	93	10.3**
Total (1-4 & 1-5)	00	04	15	26	20	22	21	22	12	34	03	178	09.4

2nd Year

CAI Lesson (1 bi-wkly)	1	2	3	4	5	Total tests	Average per class
Date (m/d)	4.26	5.17	5.31	6.14	6.28		
2-1, test per lesson	00	00	04	07	05	16	04.0
2-2, test per lesson	00	07	14	10	13	44	11.0
Toatl (2-1 & 2-2)	00	07	18	17	18	60	07.5

N.B.	Averages are given from the 2nd class
*	No testing time available to students
**	Average excludes the 11th class

Present CAI assessment policy rewards both the average performance over a semester as well as the pace. As pointed out in the "Course Description" (Appendix A) concerning (i) performance: two thirds of the total score will be awarded for the communicative performance on each unit, while for (ii) pace: one third of the total will be awarded for the number of units covered.

Since present CAI assessments count towards 20% of the learners grade, this means that the scoring is distributed as follows:

(i) for performance	13.3 %
(ii) for pace	06.7 %
Total	20.0 %

Learners who completed 5 performance tests would receive the full 6.7% in addition to their average scores in performance. Learners completing less than 5 tests would receive a prorated score. These values appear in Table 10 as a

"quota". In practice this policy means that learners are rewarded for attempting to perform. A failure to excel need not be a cause of failure.

As is shown in Table 10, student number 21 (numbered thus for this study only) attempted 5 tests and received an average of 66%. However, having completed 5 tests, the final value expressed as a percentage equals 78%. Similarly, student number 16 attempted 1 test and received a score of 80%, however with only a single test completed, the prorated score results in a final value of 60%.

In the central area of Table 10, the lower case letters next to test scores indicate the abbreviated titles of tests. From the sequence of titles it is evident that all students completed tests in the same linear sequence. This is not actually required and in the second year classes, when students work with the second level, Nova City Intermediate disk 2, they usually follow a path of their own making.

The frequency of testing, as in Table 11, reveals class characteristics and trends. First year classes indicate two peaks for tests in the 4th and 9th lesson. Second year class, 2-1, appears reluctant to perform. This may correlate to the conditions prevailing during the previous second semester of 1994, when 2-1 experienced CAI for the first time, but testing was not available on demand. Among written comments to the evaluation was a suggestion for a semester of CAI only followed by a semester of non-CAI type lessons. The rationale being that in the second year classes, CAI is experienced presently at bi-weekly intervals which can inhibit attention to the tasks and commitment to perform.

The test weighting proportions could be adjusted, allotting half the weight equally to both performance and pace. This would imply that learners not keeping pace may be penalized to a greater degree than now. The average pace, for example at 3.4 tests per student in class 1-4 (Table 10), was acceptable. There were few cases of students not keeping pace and while this has to be considered, it is as likely that it would happen here as in non-CAI classes. This phenomenon is revealed more clearly when testing is frequent. Another consideration, from the angle of the test administrator, is the amount of attention which is required for continuous testing. Tests are conducted in groups of two or three learners. This should be recalled when considering the

quantity of tests performed per lesson. However, conducting an average of 9-10 tests per lesson occupies a significant portion of time. When demand is high, this may rise to a maximum, seen in Table 10, of 17 tests. While it is advantageous to answer the demands of as many as possible there is a limit on how many can be satisfied in a ninety minute class period when there is more to be done besides testing.

Conclusion

It is significant that at the first evaluation learners indicated more satisfaction when CAI had been included, valued CAI over previous resources and desired to use them again. In 1994, a majority of CAI learners, indicated a preference for the inclusion of CAI balanced with other types of course content. A semester of CAI experience failed to diminish this interest. In 1995, satisfaction with CAI might be a factor in seasoned CAI learners optimism for future benefits from studying English at the university. Similarly, in 1995 a majority of seasoned learners expressed a desire to continue with CAI at the same level of frequency and desired CAI for at least half the time. Also, interest was high in alternative software. All this was regardless of perceiving the CALL lab as no more or less effective than the classroom. Whether or not the introduction of continuous testing influenced opinion, learners reported no pressure from testing, in contrast with the administrator. Significantly, from 1994 & 1995, 124 out of 153, or 81%, of all learners surveyed who had experienced at least one semester of CAI, expressed a future choice of CAI for at least half of the time. Regarding software diversity, an experienced class of learners showed sustained enthusiasm for new software.

With regard to assessment, policy should clearly encourage a student to perform and go beyond the minimum level necessary to receive the equivalent of a pass. It may be necessary to encourage commitment by adjusting the test weightings for performance and pace.

The requirement to attempt to perform and thus enter testing and the consequent quantity of testing signifies that the test administrator's time is well occupied. With sufficient energy, this is manageable with the class sizes studied. However, it would become an inhibiting factor with larger classes.

From the point of view of the teacher/test administrator, the amount of attention which is required for continuous testing is an important issue. Although "on demand" testing provides the learner with instant feedback concerning performance it has to be balanced against the need for the teacher to give pedagogical attention. Moreover, the sum of opportunities for contact have to be judiciously distributed among tutorial as well as assessment needs. A consideration for reducing the time taken up by administering tests, is to decrease the amount of tests which count towards the final score, without curtailing the motivation to study at a reasonable pace.

Concerning the study environment, the area should provide enough space for movement. This is important if teachers are to be able to assist learners at their computers. Space between rows of computers is necessary for this to be possible. It may well be that designers of CALL language laboratories do not envisage teacher or learner movement within the laboratory. The laboratory area used in the present study did not provide easy unrestricted movement, although it would appear it did not seriously jeopardize the exercise. It is unlikely that many educators would have the opportunity to define the size of an area needed for a specific number of CAI learners. Nevertheless, this factor has to be given consideration when evaluating the success of a program.

This CAI program encouraged learners to frequently perform communicatively in meaningful situations and therefore could be considered to have ameliorated language learning. It also sustained learners to study and achieve. 124 seasoned CAI learners out of 153, or 81%, choosing CAI for at least half their future course lends further credibility to the belief that they were motivated and experienced enjoyment. That CAI, self accessible in nature, empowers learners of different levels to learn at their own level, freeing the teacher to manage other learners, is a compelling characteristic. Content in CAI will depend on software writers and therefore the majority of teachers are dependant on the ready made software applications which are available. As evidenced in this study, educators can use available software and develop resource material to exploit the desired aspects. Software diversity may well further sustain learner interest, motivation and enjoyment.

Acknowledgements

The Author

Colin Painter is Associate Professor at the Prefectural University of Kumamoto. He has taught at universities in Asia for the last 12 years. His interests include research in language acquisition and teaching, curriculum development, and computer assisted language learning.

References

Auckerman, W. (1995). Multimedia language learning: An interview with Professor Shigeru Miyagawa of MIT. *Computing Japan*, May, 26-28.

Brett, P. (1995). Making a CD-ROM, *CALL Review,* March, 3-5.

Brumfit, C., Phillips, M. & Skehan, P. (Eds.) (1985). *Computers In English Language Teaching.* Oxford: The British Council/Pergamon Press.

Fantin, J. P. (1995). CALL in the classroom (1) : Brazil. *CALL Review,* March 1995. 6-7.

Hardisty, D. & Windeatt, S. (1989). *CALL.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kenning, M. J. & Kenning, M. M. (1983). *An Introduction to Computer Assisted Language Teaching.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lewis, R. (1986). Computers and language teaching. In G. Leech & C. N. Candlin (Eds.), *Computers in English Language Teaching and Research* (pp. 56-59). London: Longman.

Miller, M. D. & McInerney, W. D. (1994). Effects on Achievement of a Home/School Computer Project. *Journal of Research on Computing in Education, 27* (2), 198-210.

Milward, M. (1993). *Nova City.* (CD-ROM software) Tokyo: Nova Information Systems.

Nelson, G. E., Ward, J. R., Desch, S. H. & Kaplow, R. (1976). Two new strategies for computer-assisted language instruction (CALI). *Foreign Language Annuls, 9,* 28-37.

Polimac-Dobovisek, K. (1994). A touch of technology. *The Language Teacher,* 18 (6), 18.

Rope, A. (1995). Report on the MUESLI members questionnaire. *CALL Review,* March, 19-20.

Scrimshaw, P. (1993). *Language, Classrooms & Computers.* London: Routledge.

Sepehr, H. & Harris, D. (1995). Teachers' use of software for pupils with specific learning

difficulties. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning, 11* (2), 64-71.

Seppo, T. (1992). Talking shop via e-mail: a thematic and linguistic analysis of electronic mail communication. *Research Report 99*. Helsinki: University of Helsinki, Dept. of Education. (ERIC ED 352 015)

Staley, A. (1995). An introduction to multimedia and interactive video in higher education. *Computer Education, 80*, 8-13.

Software Reference

Dynamic English. CD-ROM. (1995). Tokyo: DynEd, K.K.

Fastfood. Diskette. (1994). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Nova City. CD-ROM. (1993). Tokyo: Nova Information Systems.

Appendices

Appendix A

1st Year English: Course Description

1 Text

New English Firsthand, A Week By The Sea and available computer software.

2 Classwork

In this two semester course we will develop communication skills while activating existing language skills & passive knowledge. We will do this by using pairwork and groupwork activities. Lessons will take place in the classroom and the computer assisted language laboratory.

3 Homework

A review of the lesson & usually the self study pages. A completion of reading and writing exercises as assigned. Other tasks may be assigned throughout the year.

4 Tests

1st semester
(i) There will be oral assessment for computer units as they are covered.
(ii) A test derived from material covered in the text will occur in the last week of June.

2nd semester
(i) There will be oral assessment for computer units as they are covered.
(ii) A test derived from material covered in the text will occur in the 2nd week of December.

Tests and assessments will derive from similar material to that covered in the lesson (either computer based or text based). For example they may involve improvising dialogue from a given cue or supplying the missing parts of a dialogue.

5 Grades

Grades will be calculated as follows:

(i)   Classwork & tests   40%
(ii) Attendance   40%
(iii) Homework   20%

N.B.
(i) Classwork & tests: half of the total score will result from computer based lessons and the other half from text based lessons.

For computer based assessments a third of the total score will be awarded for the number of units covered and the other two thirds will be awarded for the communicative performance on each unit.

6 Attendance

Absences beyond 8, for the academic year, require evidence of a valid reason. For example; (a) letter from a doctor or, (b) about a serious family

matter. Only 3 such absences are allowed.

7 Lateness

Lateness will be recorded as follows: 2 late attendances = 1 absence.

Appendix B

CALL Unit Procedure (1) :
How To Use The Software

1   Write down some dialogue phrases you would expect to hear in the "Movie Stage". The 1st "Movie Stage" is called "In the Airplane: The Introduction". In this scene the two main characters meet for the first time on an airplane.

2   Practise saying the dialogue phrases you have written with you partners. Call the teacher to see & hear what you have done. Please put your hand up to show the teacher you are ready. If the teacher is busy with another group please continue practising for a while.

3   Only when the teacher has heard you, listen to the "Movie Stage" and practise the dialogue. Learn by listening. Please do not use the text! You can practise by using "Lets talk". One of the characters will talk to you from the computer screen and one of you will take another part. You will have to answer questions and talk to the character on the screen. Switch roles to learn each of the character parts.

4   You may now perform with your partners instead of the computer. If you are 3 students, take turns to perform. When you can perform the dialogue smoothly, call the teacher to listen. Please put your hand up to show the teacher you are ready. If the teacher is busy with another group please continue practising for a while.

5   Working together with your partners, originate your own dialogue. Your dialogue should take place in a situation which is similar to the one in the

"Movie Stage" which you have just finished. (For example, the first situation will be similar to "In the Airplane: The Introduction") Call the teacher to listen to your own dialogue. Please put your hand up to show the teacher you are ready. If the teacher is busy with another group please continue practising for a while.

6　　The teacher will give you a role card and ask you to play the part of a character. You will have a few moments to read the card then you should perform the task written on the role card. You will receive a score for your performance. The scoring is as follows:

communication was meaningful &
grammatically correct:　　　　　2 points for each section

communication was meaningful but
contained grammatical errors:　　1 point for each section

communication was meaningless.　0 point for each section

The total points will be converted to a percentage score and recorded.

Appendix C.1

Test N1 in

Student A:

You are Leslie Smith, a Canadian engineer living in Tokyo.
You are on a plane.
You are going to Hawaii for a relaxing holiday. It is your first visit.
Introduce yourself to your neighbour on the plane.
Find out: where he/she is going & why.

N1 in

Student B:
You are Sandy Jones, a Jamaican journalist living in San Francisco.
You are on a plane.
You have just done a story in Tokyo and now you are returning to
San Francisco.
You are going to spend one day in Hawaii writing your report.
Introduce yourself to your neighbour on the plane.
Find out: Where he/she is going & why.

N1 in

Appendix C.2

Test N1 fp

Student A:

You are a postgraduate student in Singapore.
You are doing your weekly shopping at a supermarket.
You have taken some things from the shelves and you are carrying them.
You accidentally collide with another customer and <u>both</u> of you drop everything.
Everything gets mixed up.

You have dropped the following:
washing powder, some bread rolls, 3 bags of rice & your wristwatch.

Also on the floor are the following:
a box of yogurt, some apples, 2 packets of spaghetti & some sunglasses.

Help the other customer to find her/his things.

N1 fp

Student B:

You work in a bank in Singapore.
You are doing your weekly shopping at a supermarket.
You have taken some things from the shelves and you are carrying them.
You accidentally collide with another customer and <u>both</u> of you drop everything.
Everything gets mixed up.

You have dropped the following:
a box of yogurt, some apples, 2 packets of spaghetti & your sunglasses.

Also on the floor are the following:
washing powder, some bread rolls, 3 bags of rice & a wristwatch.

Help the other customer to find her/his things.

N1 fp

Appendix D

Course Evaluation (non-CAI specific)
Student version was bilingual (not shown)

Course Type: Date:

Please assist in improving/designing a good course by answering the following questions:
Some questions should be answered by circling a number on a scale from 1 to 5.
1 = a low score (or a negative impression) 5 = a high score (or a positive impression)

1   Before the course began, what were your expectations?   1 2 3 4 5
    Please circle a number from 1 to 5:
    (for example: 5 for a high expectation or 1 for a low expectation)
    Then, please explain here in writing what you expected:

2   Now, at the end of the course, how much do you feel   1 2 3 4 5
    you have benefited? Please circle a number:
    Please explain here in writing how you have benefited:

3   How do you rate the teaching? Please circle a number: 1 2 3 4 5
    Please explain in writing your impression of the teaching:

4   How do you rate the teacher? Please circle a number: 1 2 3 4 5
    Please explain in writing your impression of the teacher:

5   How much did you benefit from the homework?   1 2 3 4 5
    Please explain in writing how you benefited?

6   What did you benefit most from in the course? Please explain
    in writing:

7   What did you benefit least from in the course? Please explain:

8   Do you think any changes are necessary in the course?   1 2 3 4 5
    What would you suggest changing in the course next year?

9   Did you communicate enough in English during the course?   1 2 3 4 5

If you did not, please say why you think you did not:

10 How much did you have the chance to communicate   1 2 3 4 5
in English compared with previous courses?

11 Before the course began how much did you expect to   1 2 3 4 5
benefit from the materials: (course-books, videos, etc.)?

12 How do you rate the materials (course-books, videos,   1 2 3 4 5
audio-tapes, etc.,) used during the course?
Please explain how you feel about the materials?

13 How do you rate the materials in comparison with other   1 2 3 4 5
materials you use or have used?

14 Now, at the end of the course, how much have you   1 2 3 4 5
benefited from the materials?

15 Would you like to use similar materials next year?   1 2 3 4 5
If not then please say why not. Please say what kind of
materials you would like to use.

Please give further comments, criticisms, recommendations,
about the course below.
Thank you for your kind co-operation.

Appendix E

Course Evaluation (CAI specific)
授業評価

Course name_____   Date_____

 For each question below, please circle a number which matches your opinion

Ability and Feeling
能力　及び　感想

1　I feel that my present ability in English is good (5)－poor (1)　　1 2 3 4 5
現在の自分の英語の能力は，高いと思う(5)－低い(1)と思う

2　Studying English is easy (5)－difficult (1)　　1 2 3 4 5
英語の勉強は，簡単である(5)－困難である(1)

3　Studying English is useful (5)－not useful (1)　　1 2 3 4 5
英語の勉強は、有益である(5)－有益でない(1)

4　In this faculty the need for English is high (5)－low (1)　　1 2 3 4 5
本学部では、英語の必要性は高い(5)－低い(1)

5　I expect to benefit from future English lessons at this　　1 2 3 4 5
　　university a lot (5)－not a lot (1)
本大学での今後の英語の授業から得るものが多いと思う(5)－多くないと思う(1)

Computer Asssisted Language Learning (CALL) for Oral English
CALL（コンピューターを利用した英会話学習）について

6　Before this course, I expected using computers to learn oral　　1 2 3 4 5
　　English would be effective (5)－not effective (1)
授業が始まる前には，英会話学習のためにコンピューターを使うことは効果的
だと思っていた(5)－効果的でないと思っていた(1)

7　Now, after using computers to learn oral English,　　1 2 3 4 5

I feel computers are effective (5)－not effective (1)
英会話学習のためにコンピューターを使ってみた現在では, コンピューターは, 効果的だと思う(5)－効果的でないと思う(1)

8 Using Computers to learn oral English is enjoyable (5)－not 1 2 3 4 5
enjoyable (1)
英会話学習のためにコンピューターを使うのは楽しい(5)－楽しくない(1)

9 I would like to use computers to learn oral English, 1 2 3 4 5
more often than now (5)－the same as now (3)－less than now (1)
英会話学習のために現在より多く(5)－現在と同じくらい(3)－現在より少なく(1)コンピューターを使いたい

10 I would like to use oral English class time as follows:
英会話の授業は以下のような形で行ってほしい

(a) One lesson with computers and one lesson with Yes No
text and video
1レッスンをコンピューターを使って, 1レッスンをテキストとビデオを使って

(b) Every lesson with computers Yes No
全てのレッスンをコンピューターを使って

(c) Every lesson with text and video Yes No
全てのレッスンをテキストとビデオを使って

The Software for Oral English:
英会話のソフトウェアについて

11 The software I use to learn oral English is effective (5)－not 1 2 3 4 5
effective (1)
英会話学習のために利用しているソフトウェアは、効果的である(5)－効果的でない(1)

12 The software I use to learn oral English is enjoyable (5)－not 1 2 3 4 5
enjoyable (1)

英会話学習のために利用しているソフトウェアは、楽しい(5)－楽しくない(1)

13 Using different software for oral English would be   1 2 3 4 5
interesting (5)－uninteresting (1)
英会話学習のために別のソフトウェアを使ってみるのがおもしろいだろう(5)－
おもしろくない(1)だろう

Teaching Oral English in the Computer Laboratory:
情報処理室での英会話授業について

14 The teacher used class time in the computer laboratory   1 2 3 4 5
effectively (5)－ineffectively (1)
教師は，情報処理室での授業時間を効果的に使っている(5)－効果的に使ってい
ない(1)

15 The teacher helped me to use the software   1 2 3 4 5
effectively (5)－ineffectively (1)
教師は，ソフトウェアの利用について，効果的に手助けしてくれる(5)－効果的
には手助けしてくれない(1)

16 The learning environment in the computer laboratory   1 2 3 4 5
was encouraging (5)－not so encouraging (1)
情報処理室の学習環境は良好だった(5)－それほど良好ではなかった(1)

17 Learning oral English in the computer laboratory instead   1 2 3 4 5
of the classroom was more effective (5)－less effective (1)
教室ではなく情報処理室で英会話学習をするのは、より効果的である(5)－より
効果的でない(1)

Testing Oral English in the Computer Laboratory:
情報処理室での英会話授業のテストについて

18 To measure my oral English ability the testing in the   1 2 3 4 5
computer laboratory was effective (5)－ineffective (1)
英会話能力をためすための情報処理室でのテストは効果的である(5)－効果的で
ない(1)

19 The method of testing   1 2 3 4 5

    encouraged me to learn (5)−did not encourage me to learn (1)

テストのやり方は、学習の励みになった(5)−学習の励みにならなかった(1)

20 The method of testing   1 2 3 4 5

    made me work harder (5)−did not make me work so hard (1)

テストのために，一生懸命勉強した(5)-それほど勉強しなかった(1)

Please give any further comments, criticisms & recommendations
below & on the back of this paper
コメント、批判、勧告等、お書きください。
Thank you for your kind co-operation.　ご協力ありがとうございました。