TEACHERS' USE OF A VIRTUAL LEARNING ENVIRONMENT AND THEIR DISPOSITION TOWARDS E-LEARNING AT BUDAPEST BUSINESS SCHOOL

© Réka ASZTALOS
(Budapest Business School, Budapest, Hungary)

areka3271@yahoo.co.uk

Today the question is not whether to integrate technology in education but how to do it to serve a pedagogical purpose and to suit students' needs at the same time. In order to achieve this, it is essential that teachers understand the purpose and accept the importance of applying technology in teaching. This study aims to explore these two aspects in one particular context. It focuses on the use of a virtual learning environment (VLE), which is a web-based platform for organisation of teaching and learning, at a higher education institute in Budapest. The aim is to investigate language teachers' use of the VLE at Budapest Business School (BBS), called CooSpace, and their disposition towards CooSpace and e-learning in general. In order to reach this aim, two instruments were designed: a questionnaire and an interview schedule. The second aim of this project was to pilot these instruments. The participants of the questionnaire study were 44 language teachers at BBS and two pilot interviews were carried out with two volunteering teachers. The results indicate that less than 50% of the teachers use CooSpace with very few functions. The fact that the most frequent function is uploading documents shows that the VLE is regarded as a mere administrative and not as a pedagogical tool. The application of a new technology without sufficient methodological training cannot change traditional ways of teaching.

Keywords: Internet, virtual learning environments, teachers' disposition, higher education

Introduction and background

Technology is becoming increasingly important in every aspect of today's world, thus it needs to be integrated in education as well. There is great pressure on teachers and schools to integrate technology in education in many different forms. Computers and interactive boards are encouraged to be used in classrooms, blended and online learning courses are encouraged. However, it is essential that these technologies serve a pedagogical purpose and are not used for their own sake. Another important issue is teachers' disposition towards these tools. Only if they understand their purpose and accept their importance, can they exploit them fully. This study aims to investigate language teachers' use of the virtual learning environment (VLE) at Budapest Business School (BBS) called CooSpace and their disposition

towards CooSpace and e-learning in general. In order to reach this aim, two instruments were designed: a questionnaire and an interview schedule. The second aim of this project was to pilot these instruments.

Current use of technology in the classroom

While in the US every language teacher has used some kind of technology (Garrett, 2009), in Hungary 56% of language teachers claimed in a non-representative survey about primary and secondary schools in 2006 (Hunya, 2008) that they had used computers in class. However, no information is available on how technology was used in these cases and several researchers claim that currently technology's potential is not fully exploited in the classroom (Arnold, 2007; Ertmer & Ottenbreit-Leftwich, 2010; Garrett, 2009; Hoopingarner, 2009). According to Garrett (2009), the use of technology usually means the use of email, word processing, PowerPoint presentations, and authentic materials from the web. Ertmer and Ottenbreit-Leftwich (2010) call these low-level applications, which support traditional, teacher-directed instruction. In the Hungarian context, a study by Lakatosné Török (2010) had similar findings in that the emergence of new technologies in class did not significantly change traditional methodologies.

Virtual learning environments

Virtual learning environments, which are sometimes called learning management systems (LMS) or course management systems (CMS), are web-based platforms for the organisation of teaching and learning, which can be used for different purposes. One of the most popular functions is the administration of the teaching process, missed classes, grades and other aspects of school life. However, they can be much more than a mere administrative tool and recent research on VLE-s has focused on different aspects of their integration into teaching, such as enhancing communication and collaboration, personalised learning and learning styles, as well as fostering autonomy.

Several researchers consider VLE-s as a platform for communication and collaboration among teachers and students, which can facilitate the collaborative knowledge building process (Arnold & Ducate, 2006; Dorner & Major, 2009; Hunya, 2005; Murugaiah & Thang, 2010; Pawan, Paulus, Yalcin & Chang, 2003; Strijbos, Martens & Jochems, 2004).

A further possible area where it can be applied is student-centred and personalised learning that can suit different learning styles (Béres, Magyar & Turcsányi-Szabó, 2009; Broad, Matthews & Mcdonald, 2004; Brown & Schmidt, 2004; Kétyi, 2011; Naimie, Siraj, Abuzaid & Shagholi, 2010).

Finally, a number of studies focus on VLE-s as platforms that can foster autonomy (Figura & Jarvis, 2007; Jones, 2001; Luke, 2006; Sanprasert, 2010; Toyoda, 2001). Most of the results indicate that there is a potential in using a VLE to provide learners with an opportunity for autonomous learning, however, it depends on several factors whether this potential is realised. These include the particular type of activity used, the amount of teacher support, the learning situation and students' perceptions.

Students' disposition towards the use of virtual learning environments

Most researchers examining students' perceptions of digital technology including VLE-s report positive attitudes in various settings. Students indicated positive perceptions towards learning with computers in EFL and ESL academic writing classes (Akbulut, 2008; Warschauer, 1996), as well as in an online statistics course at a university (Nikolov & Ottó, 2010), where 57% of the students found the online course more enjoyable and 50% easier than a traditional course. Perceptions were also reported to change over time in a large-scale longitudinal study conducted at several Hungarian higher education institutes by Vig (2008). His findings show that students' attitudes became gradually more and more positive between 2002 and 2007, probably influenced by the improvement of Internet connection and access.

The few records of negative perceptions include the lack of interaction and isolation (Bordonaro, 2003), as well as the lack of personal contact with the tutor (Nikolov & Ottó, 2010).

Teachers' disposition towards the use of computers and the Internet

In order to maximise VLE-s potential in teaching it is essential that teachers have the methodological background, as well as a positive disposition towards using VLE-s (Cope & Ward, 2002; Kim, 2008; Lam, 2000; Lund, 2003; Savery, 2002). Carmean and Haefner (2002) compare VLE-s to chalk, or chairs and tables in a classroom, where it depends on the teacher how to use them. A similar idea is expressed by Hoven, who describes a learning environment as an „intangible conflux" (Hoven, 2006:248) of teachers, learners and physical resources, where learning takes place in the network of these three essential components.

In Hungary, there are very few studies that examine either VLEs' pedagogical role in teaching or teachers' disposition towards them in primary or secondary school teaching (Buda, 2007; Hunya, 2008; Kárpáti & Ollé, 2007; Lakatosné Török, 2010; Lakatosné Török & Kárpáti, 2009). However, no research has been conducted so far in higher education focusing on teachers' perceptions.

Research questions

This research project aimed to explore language teachers' use of the virtual learning environment called CooSpace used at Budapest Business School and their disposition towards it. In order to investigate these two aspects, seven research questions were formulated:

1. How often do language teachers at BBS use CooSpace?
2. Why do some language teachers at BBS not use CooSpace?
3. Which CooSpace functions do language teachers at BBS use?
4. Which CooSpace functions do language teachers at BBS find the most useful for teaching?
5. What influences language teachers' use of CooSpace at BBS?
6. What do language teachers at BBS feel about using CooSpace?
7. What is language teachers' opinion about e-learning?

Methods

The instruments of the current research were an electronic questionnaire with 43 questions and a semi-structured interview schedule developed by the researcher. After continuous peer-checks and piloting with two language teachers, the questionnaire was sent to all language teachers at BBS. 44 language teachers of Budapest Business School, 31 teachers from the faculty of Commerce, Catering and Tourism (CCCT) and 13 teachers from the faculty of International Management and Business (CIMB) returned the questionnaire. Seven teachers volunteered for an interview in the questionnaire, two interviews have been conducted so far.

In this section first the characteristics of the participants will be described. Then the detailed description of the questionnaire and the interview schedule along with their development will be provided, as well as the procedures of their administration and data analysis.

Participants for the questionnaire

The participants for the questionnaire were 44 language teachers of Budapest Business School, 31 teachers from the faculty of Commerce, Catering and Tourism (CCCT) and 13 teachers from the faculty of International Management and Business (CIMB). The original idea was to include all three faculties of BBS in the research and to compare the teachers' use of CooSpace. However, when teachers of the faculty of Finance and Accountancy were approached, it was discovered that neither CooSpace, nor any other virtual learning environment is used there. Consequently, only the other two faculties could be investigated. Nevertheless, proper comparison of these two faculties was neither possible, due to the low return rate of the questionnaire (26%) at CIMB, which prevented collecting representative data for that faculty. The high return rate of the questionnaire at CCCT (84%) can probably be attributed to the fact that the researcher also works there. Table 1 shows details about the participants for the questionnaire.

Table 1 *Participants for the questionnaire*

		CCCT	CIMB	BBS
Gender	Male	12.9%	7.7%	11.4%
	Female	87.1%	92.3%	88.6%
Age	25-35	3.2%	7.7%	4.5%
	36-45	35.5%	38.5%	36.4%
	46-55	29%	15.3%	25%
	Above 55	32.3%	38.5%	34.1%
Language	English	45.2%	38.5%	43.2%
	German	29%	46.2%	34.1%
	French	9.7%	0%	6.8%
	Italian	6.4%	15.3%	9.1%
	Spanish	9.7%	0%	6.8%

Participants for the interview

Although seven teachers volunteered for an interview in the questionnaire, only two interviews have been conducted so far. The selection of the two participants (P1, P2) for the pilot interviews was based on the desire to collect the widest range of data possible. Hence, the two teachers at the two ends of the spectrum were chosen: one, who uses CooSpace very frequently, and another, who never uses it. Details about the two participants can be seen in Table 2.

Table 2 *Participants for the interview*

	P1	P2
Age	44	58
Teaching experience	22	36
CooSpace use	no	yes

Instruments and procedure

The choice of a mixed method research project was based on several reasons. Firstly, the aim of this study was to investigate two areas which are very different in nature. Language teachers' use of CooSpace is an issue that can well be described by numerical data. How often they use the different functions and how useful they find them, are questions that can be answered by choosing from values on a scale. Thus, to answer research questions 1-5, which are rather quantitative, a questionnaire was designed. However, research questions 6 and 7 focus on feelings and opinions, which are difficult to describe by numbers. For that reason a semi-structured interview schedule was developed for the second phase of the project. Secondly, data yielded by the interview was hoped to complement and expand on the questionnaire data, providing underlying reasons for participants' answers. Finally, the validity of research can be improved by using mixed methods and corresponding evidence can also increase the transferability of the results (Dörnyei, 2007).

Originally, after the piloting phase, when two interviews were recorded, five more interviews were planned, as seven teachers volunteered for being interviewed. However, both phases of the project proved to be more time-consuming than it had been anticipated. It took three weeks and two reminder emails to reach a good return rate of the questionnaire at CCCT. After that data from the questionnaires needed to be entered into SPSS. A preliminary analysis of the data was also necessary to refine the questions of the interview schedule. Then, as it was the busiest period of the term at the college, it was very difficult to find a suitable time for conducting the interviews. Finally, transcribing and analyzing the interviews took more than twice as long as it had been expected. It seems wise to follow the advice Delamont, Atkinson and Parry (1997) give to novice researchers to halve the estimated volume of data and double the time to reach a realistic and feasible plan.

The questionnaire

The link to an electronic questionnaire with 43 questions was sent to the participants by email. In the first part 10 questions were asked about the participants' background and the use of CooSpace in general. The second part contained 14 Likert-scale questions about the frequency of use of 14 functions, while the third part 14 Likert-scale questions about their usefulness, where participants had to indicate on a five-point scale how often they use a function and how useful they find it. In the second part two additional open-ended questions were asked about additional and problematic functions.

As the participants were teachers of different languages, the questions were in Hungarian to make sure that all teachers understood them. The choice of language excluded one native English teacher, who does not speak Hungarian. However, as the language of CooSpace is also Hungarian, he is not able to use it anyway.

The reason for choosing an electronic questionnaire was that it can reach participants more easily and it is convenient to fill it in and send it back. The possibility to skip questions on the basis of previous answers makes it more user-friendly than a paper-based questionnaire. Nevertheless, the option of filling in the paper-based version was also offered to the participants and one teacher asked for it. When data from the two versions were compared, an ambiguity was discovered. In the third part of the questionnaire about the usefulness of CooSpace functions the questions were meant for teachers who use those functions. Thus, in the electronic questionnaire these questions were skipped when a participant indicated that they never use CooSpace. However, the participant who filled in the paper-based questionnaire answered the questions about the usefulness of the different functions, despite the fact that she never uses CooSpace. It seems that the wording of the question was not clear enough, which did not result in misunderstandings in the electronic version, where this question was only presented to those teachers who use CooSpace. The paper-based version of the questionnaire can be seen in Appendix A.

Semi-structured interview

In the second phase of the research project a semi-structured interview was piloted with two participants. As both of them are Hungarian, the interviews were conducted in Hungarian. The aim of the interviews was to discover the underlying reasons behind the answers to the questionnaire, as well as to answer research question 6 and 7 about the teachers' feelings towards using CooSpace and e-learning in general. The interview questions were grouped around four topics. First, questions about the teachers' professional background and teaching experience were asked to establish rapport. Next, teachers' answers to the questionnaire were looked at and they were asked to clarify any ambiguous answers, as well as to provide reasons for their answers. In this part questions about their feelings about using CooSpace were also included. Then, differences between students and teaching methods in the past and today were discussed in order to introduce the topic of e-learning. In the last part teachers' opinions about computers and the internet in general and their suitability for teaching (including language teaching) were in the focus of the questions. The interview questions can be seen in Appendix B.

Initial steps to validate the instruments

The questionnaire was developed by the researcher and it was peer-checked by an expert and five fellow-students at each stage of the process. As a next step it was piloted by two teachers of the college (a male and a female), who were asked to think aloud while filling in the questionnaire. Problematic items, which included some questions, instructions and scale labels, were reworded. The order of the questions was also modified to make it more logical.

Similarly to the questionnaire, the interview schedule was peer-checked continuously. Then, in the second phase of the project, the schedule was validated by the two pilot interviews.

Methods of analysis

All the questionnaires were computer coded and SPSS (Statistical Package for Social Sciences) 17.0 was used to analyse the results with the significance level set for $p<.05$. The interviews were transcribed, categorised and coded. Then the categories were analysed to see if the questions yielded meaningful results.

Results and discussion

CooSpace use

To answer the first research question about the frequency of CooSpace use, first it had to be examined how many teachers use it at all. Since the return rate of the questionnaire was low at the faculty of CIMB, only data from CCCT will be analysed in detail. However, all data will be shown in the tables. Table 3 shows the percentage of teachers who use CooSpace.

Table 3 *Teachers' use of CooSpace*

CooSpace use	CCCT	CIMB	BBS
Yes	45%	54%	48%
No	55%	38%	50%
Other VLE	0%	8%	2%

The fact that only 45% of teachers at CCCT claimed that they use CooSpace is surprising, considering that several teaching materials are only available there. Although it is possible to download these contents and send them to the students via email, it seems rather complicated. The frequency of teachers' use at CCCT (Table 4) shows a fairly even distribution of answers in four groups, ranging from use before each class to monthly use.

Table 4 *Teachers' frequency of CooSpace use*

Frequency of CooSpace use	CCCT	CIMB	BBS
before each class	28.6%	42.9%	33%
weekly	21.4%	14.3%	19%
every second week	28.6%	14.3%	24%
monthly	21.4%	14.3%	19%
once in a term	0%	14.3%	5%

Reasons for not using CooSpace

Research question 2 aimed to find out why some teachers do not use CooSpace. As it can be seen in Table 5, the two most common reasons given are that traditional ways are faster and teachers do not know how it works. Both can be traced back to the lack of knowledge or experience about the use of CooSpace. If teachers are not competent in using a VLE, it can result in a slow use, which can be discouraging. Similarly, the reasons that it would take too much time to learn it or to use it can also be linked to the lack of expertise. These findings also support previous studies' results that the lack of time is one of the main deterrents to using any kinds of technology in the classroom (Arnold, 2007; Jones, 2004; Pleasance, 2010).

Table 5 *Teachers' reasons for not using CooSpace*

Reasons for not using CooSpace	BBS
traditional ways are faster	43.5%
don't know how it works	30.4%
too much time to learn it	13%
technical problems	13%
too much time to use it	8.7%
the activities are traceable	8.7%
not useful	4.3%
students don't like it	0%

Note: As it was possible to choose more than one answer, percentages do not add up to 100%

An external reason for not using CooSpace is technical problems. According to one of the participants, "you can't be expected to use CooSpace on a daily basis, as long as we don't have enough computers at the department, and the ones we have are very slow". The moral reason of traceability was given by two teachers. A comment by one of them revealed that the fact that the head of department can follow how often teachers signed in and what they did on CooSpace was found disturbing.

Table 6 *Non-CooSpace using teachers' participation in training sessions*

Training participation		BBS
has taken part in a training session	YES	50%
	NO	50%
would like to take part in a training session	YES	68%
	NO	32%
have not taken part AND would not like to take part in a training session		18%

The majority of language teachers who do not use CooSpace (68%) would be interested in a training session about its application (Table 6), which means that they are open to find out more about CooSpace. It is only 18% who have not taken part and would not take part in a training session, probably meaning that they will never consider using it.

Functions of CooSpace

To answer research questions 3 and 4 the mean values for the frequency and usefulness of the 14 functions were calculated. For the frequency 1 indicates that the function is never used, while 5 is for very frequent use. Similarly, for usefulness 1 means not useful at all, while 5 means very useful. Paired samples T-tests were computed to compare the mean values of the frequency and usefulness scores of each function with the significance level (p) set for .05.

Table 7 *Frequency and usefulness of functions*

Functions	Frequency Mean	Usefulness Mean	t	p
Uploading documents	4.00	4.85	-3.847	.001
News forum	3.00	4.00	-3.823	.001
Forum	1.65	2.60	-2.967	.008
Chat	1.00	1.35		
Tasks	2.80	3.90	-3.240	.004
Tasks correction	2.20	3.35	-3.359	.003
Homework	3.10	3.80	-3.199	.005
Grading	1.80	3.10	-5.378	.000
Summarizing grades	1.35	2.55	-4.060	.001
Attendance register	1.50	2.35	-2.482	.023
Summarizing registers	1.40	2.30	-2.781	.012
Sending messages	2.60	3.75	-2.881	.010
Tests	1.30	2.70	-3.687	.002
Diary	1.10	1.65		

Note: t and p values are only shown if the difference between mean values is significant

Table 7 shows the mean values and the results of the t-tests. It can be seen in the table that there is only one function which is used frequently: *uploading documents*. *Homework* and *news forum* are the next two functions in the rank order, and the only ones that have a mean value above 3. All the others score lower than 3 with eight functions below 2. That shows that even those teachers who use CooSpace fail to exploit its potential. The functions they use are mostly for sharing information or communication, while interactive or collaborative functions, such as *forum* or *chat*, are very rare. A comparison of usefulness scores with the frequency scores of the functions shows that the former is higher for each function, where the difference is significant for 12 out of 14 functions. The two functions, *diary* and *chat*, where the differences are not significant, are the ones at the end of the frequency list and are hardly ever used. The higher usefulness scores might mean that teachers do not feel competent at using several functions, although they would find them useful. This is supported by several comments as well: "I don't use many functions so my judgments about usefulness are just opinions", "a training session would be useful" and "it would be interesting to see what other teachers do with it". These comments illustrate the fact that the teachers' limited use of the functions is probably caused by their lack of knowledge, which could be changed by providing training sessions for them.

Influences on teachers' use of CooSpace

To find out if any of the individual characteristics which were asked about in the first part of the questionnaire have an influence on the teachers' use of CooSpace, independent samples t-tests for questions with two possible answers and one-way ANOVA tests for questions with more than two choices were carried out. Age, gender, the frequency of teachers' internet use and participation in a training session about CooSpace use do not have a significant influence on teachers' use of CooSpace. Although teachers whose perceived internet skills are better use CooSpace more frequently, the difference is not statistically significant.

The only factor that was found to have a significant influence is language. Table 8 shows the results of the one-way ANOVA test comparing the mean values of CooSpace use of teachers of different languages, where 1 means *yes*, and 2 means *no.*

Table 8 *The influence of language on teachers' use of CooSpace*

Language	N	Mean*	St. dev.	*F*	*p*	Sequence
1. English	19	1.21	.419			
2. German	15	1.73	.594			
3. French	3	1.67	.577	4.621	.004	1,2,3<2,3,4,5
4. Spanish	3	2.00	.000			
5. Italian	4	2.00	.000			

**Note: 1 = yes, 2 =no*

The closest mean score to 1 (1.21) indicates that English teachers use CooSpace the most frequently. However, there is no significant difference between English, German and French teachers. The only significant difference was found between English teachers and Spanish and Italian teachers, where the latter two groups do not use CooSpace at all. This finding corresponds with the general experience that English teachers apply more innovative tools and methods than teachers of other languages.

Preliminary results from the pilot interviews

Since only two interviews were conducted, only preliminary results can be reported. Data was analysed using the constant comparative method by Maykut and Morehouse (1994). As a first step an attempt was made to identify emerging themes and patterns (Table 9).

Table 9 *Emerging themes*

Teachers	**Teaching**	**Students**	**E-learning**	**Problems**
personality	style	language skills	at home	technical
feelings	content	expectations	during classes	competence
habits		disposition towards learning	teacher's role	availability
			students	time

Next, I focused on research questions 6 and 7 to find out if the interviews provide answers to them. It was discovered that no data was available about teachers' feelings about CooSpace. They talked about their feelings about e-

learning and the use of computers in general, but not specifically about CooSpace. Thus, I decided to eliminate research question 6. This is not uncommon practice in qualitative research, which is characterised by emergent research design (Dörnyei, 2007).

As for teachers' opinion about e-learning, they agree that e-learning has several positive aspects that could be exploited. First of all, it can suit today's students' needs and expectations better than any traditional method, because it provides a variety of tools that are familiar to them from their everyday life. This can be an important motivating factor for students, who come to the college after 10-12 years of studying English with not much enthusiasm.

However, e-learning without any face-to-face lessons would not be feasible at the college for several reasons. The two teachers think that all students need the presence of a teacher, without whom no learning is possible. In fact, Teacher 2 suggested that e-learning is only suitable for teachers, because they know how to organise their learning. On the other hand, elements of e-learning could be integrated into language teaching in different ways. Although the use of computers in the classroom could be useful, both teachers agree that this is not possible because the lack of facilities at the college. The only aspect of e-learning that is feasible and has already been applied by the two teachers is for homework. Searching the web for information, practising grammar or vocabulary, watching videos on YouTube and talking about them in class can all help students practise language use in an authentic setting.

Conclusion and implications

This study aimed at investigating teachers' use of CooSpace, a virtual learning environment at Budapest Business School and to explore their opinion about e-learning. A further aim was to pilot two instruments: a questionnaire and an interview schedule. The results indicate that less than 50% of the teachers use CooSpace with very few functions. The fact that the most frequent function is *uploading documents* shows that the VLE is regarded as a mere administrative and not as a pedagogical tool. Similarly, e-learning is considered to be a collection of tools that can be applied either in class or at home. Its collaborative nature or the opportunity of personalised learning is not familiar to teachers. The results support Lakatosné Török's (2010) findings that the application of a new technology without sufficient methodological training cannot change traditional ways of teaching. Its use can only be meaningful if it has a clear pedagogical purpose which is known to the teachers as well.

As for the piloting of the two instruments, the questionnaire proved to provide meaningful information for the project. However, the interview schedule did not yield any data that could answer research question 6, which was consequently eliminated.

As a further step of research, additional interviews could be made with the volunteering five teachers at the college. Furthermore, if the aim of CooSpace use is e-learning, training should be provided for teachers about its pedagogical applications.

References

AKBULUT, Y. (2008). Exploration of the attitudes of freshman foreign language students toward using computers at a Turkish state university. *The Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology, 7* (1), 18-31.
ARNOLD, N. (2007). Technology-mediated learning 10 years later: Emphasizing pedagogical or utilitarian applications? *Foreign Language Annals, 40* (1), 161-181.
ARNOLD, N., & DUCATE, L. (2006). Future language teachers' social and cognitive collaboration in an online environment. *Language Learning & Technology, 10* (1), 42-66.
BÉRES, I., MAGYAR, T., & TURCSÁNYI-SZABÓ, M. (2009). KÉPKE – Tanulási stíluson alapuló vegyes tanulási környezet az egyetemi oktatásban. *Oktatás-Informatika, 1* (2), 24-38.
BORDONARO, K. (2003). Perceptions of technology and manifestations of language learner autonomy. *CALL-EJ Online, 5* (1). Retrieved from http://callej.org/journal/5-1/bordonaro.html [10.02.2012]
BROAD, M., MATTHEWS, M., & MCDONALD, A. (2004). Accounting education through an online-supported virtual learning environment. *Active Learning in Higher Education, 5* (2), 135-151.
BROWN, D., & SCHMIDT, K. (2004). A model to integrate online teaching and learning tools into the classroom. *The Journal of Technology Studies, 30* (2), 86-92.
BUDA, A. (2007). Az infokommunikációs technológiák és a pedagógusok. *Iskolakultúra, 7* (4), 8-13.
CARMEAN, C., & HAEFNER, J. (2002). Mind over matter. Transforming course management systems into effective learning environments. *Educause Review,37* (6), 27-34.
COPE, C., & WARD, P. (2002). Integrating learning technology into classrooms: The importance of teachers' perceptions. *Educational Technology & Society, 5* (1), 67-74.
DELAMONT, S., ATKINSON, P., & PARRY, O. (1997). *Supervising the PhD. A guide to success.* Buckingham, UK: The Society for Research into Higher Education & Open University Press.
DORNER, H., & MAJOR, É. (2009). Evolving collaboration among teacher trainees – analysis of collaborative discourse. *Working Papers in Language Pedagogy WoPaLP, 3,* 76-96.
DÖRNYEI, Z. (2007). *Research methods in applied linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
ERTMER, P. A., & OTTENBREIT-LEFTWICH, A. T. (2010). Teacher technology change: how knowledge, confidence, beliefs, and culture intersect. *Journal of Research on Technology in Education, 42* (3), 255-284.
FIGURA, K., & JARVIS, H. (2007). Computer-based materials: A study of learner autonomy and strategies. *System, 35* (4), 448-468.
GARRETT, N. (2009). Computer-assisted language learning trends and issues revisited: integrating innovation. *The Modern Language Journal, 93* (1), 719-740.
HOOPINGARNER, D. (2009). Best practices in technology and language teaching. *Language and Linguistics Compass, 3* (1), 222-235.
HOVEN, D. (2006). Communicating and interacting: An exploration of the changing roles of media in CALL/CMC. *Computer Assisted Language Instruction Consortium Journal, 23* (2), 233-256.
HUNYA, M. (2005). Virtuális tanulási környezetek. *Iskolakultúra, 5* (10), 53-69.
HUNYA, M. (2008). Országos informatikai mérés. A pedagógusok válaszainak elemzése. *Új Pedagógiai Szemle, 2008* (1), 69-100.
JONES, A. (2004). *A review of the research literature on barriers to the uptake of ICT by teachers.* Becta. (British Educational Communications and Technology Agency). Retrieved from http://dera.ioe.ac.uk/1603/1/becta_2004_barrierstouptake_litrev.pdf [10.02.2012]
JONES, J. (2001). CALL and the teacher's role in promoting learner autonomy. *CALL-EJ Online, 3* (1). Retrieved from http://callej.org/journal/3-1/jones.html [10.02.2012]
KÁRPÁTI, A., & OLLÉ J. (2007). Tanárok informatikai képességeinek és pedagógiai stratégiáinak integrált fejlesztése. *Iskolakultúra, 7* (4), 14-23.

KÉTYI, A. (2011). *Nyelvtanulók tanulási stílusa, motivációja, IKT kompetenciája virtuális tanulási környezetben – egy utómérés tanulságai*. Paper presented at the III. Oktatás-Informatikai Konferencia, Budapest, 14-15 January 2011. Budapest: ELTE Pedagogikum Központ & ELTE Pedagógiai és Pszichológiai Kar.
KIM, H. K. (2008). Beyond motivation: ESL/EFL teachers' perceptions of the role of computers. *CALICO Journal, 25* (2), 241-259.
LAKATOSNÉ TÖRÖK, E. (2010). *Az informatikai eszközökkel támogatott tanulási környezet hatása a pedagógusok által használt módszerekre*. Paper presented at the II. Oktatás-Informatikai Konferencia, Budapest, 22-23 January 2010. Budapest: ELTE Pedagogikum Központ & ELTE Pedagógiai és Pszichológiai Kar.
LAKATOSNÉ TÖRÖK, E., & KÁRPÁTI, A. (2009). Az informatikai kompetencia, a pedagógiai gyakorlat és az innovációs sikeresség összefüggései az európai digitalis tananyagportál magyar kipróbálói csoportjában. *Magyar Pedagógia, 109* (3), 227-259.
LAM, Y. (2000). Technophilia vs. technophobia: A preliminary look at why second-language teachers do or do not use technology in their classrooms. *The Canadian Modern Language Review, 56* (3), 389-420.
LUKE, C. L. (2006). Fostering learner autonomy in a technology-enhanced, inquiry-based foreign language classroom. *Foreign Language Annals, 39* (1), 71-86.
LUND, A. (2003). The teacher as interface. Teachers of EFL in ICT-rich environments: Beliefs, practices, appropriation. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Oslo, Sweden:The University of Oslo.
MAYKUT, P., & MOREHOUSE, R. (1994). *Beginning qualitative research: a philosophic and practical guide*. London, UK & Bristol, US: Routledge.
MURUGAIAH, P., & THANG , S. M. (2010). Development of interactive and reflective learning among Malaysian online distant learners: An ESL instructor's experience. *International Review of Research in Open and Distance Learning, 11* (3). Retrieved from http://www.irrodl.org/index.php/irrodl/article/view/842/1601 [10.02.2012]
NAIMIE, Z., SIRAJ, S., AHMED ABUZAID, R., & SHAGHOLI, R. (2010). Hypothesized learners' technology preferences based on learning style dimensions. *Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology, 9* (4), 83-93.
NIKOLOV, M., & OTTÓ, I. (2010). E-learning a CooSpace rendszerben: egy kísérleti kurzus tapasztalatai. *Iskolakultúra, 10* (2), 23-33.
PAWAN, F., PAULUS, T. M., YALCIN, S., & CHANG, C. (2003). Online learning: Patterns of engagement and interaction among in-service teachers. *Language Learning & Technology, 7* (3), 119-140.
PLEASANCE, S. (2010). The impact of a virtual learning environment (VLE) system on a group of adult ESOL learners and its implications for syllabus design. *Language Issues, 21* (1), 35-52.
SANPRASERT, N. (2010). The application of a course management system to enhance autonomy in learning English as a foreign language. *System, 38* (1), 109-123.
SAVERY, J. R. (2002). Faculty and students' perceptions of technology integration in teaching. *The journal of interactive online learning, 1* (2), 1-16.
STRIJBOS, J. W., MARTENS, R. L., & JOCHEMS, W. M. G. (2004). Designing for interaction: Six steps to designing computer-supported group-based learning. *Computers & Education, 42* (4), 403-424.
TOYODA, E. (2001). Exercise of learner autonomy in project-oriented CALL. *CALL-EJ Online, 2* (2). Retrieved from http://callej.org/journal/2-2/toyoda.html [10.02.2012]
VIG, Z. (2008). *A felsőoktatásban tanulók Internet használatának és attitűdjének vizsgálata*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Budapest: BME.
WARSCHAUER, M. (1996). Motivational aspects of using computers for writing and communication. In M. Warschauer (Ed.), *Telecollaboration in foreign language learning: proceedings of the Hawai'i Symposium*. Honolulu: Second Language Teaching & Curriculum Center, University of Hawai'i at Manoa. Retrieved from http://www.nflrc.hawaii.edu/networks/NW01/NW01.pdf [10.02.2012]

Appendix A
Questionnaire translated from Hungarian

Dear Colleague,
I would like to ask you to help us by answering the following questions concerning your use of CooSpace. This is not a test so there are no right or wrong answers and the questionnaire is anonymous. However, if you are interested in the results of the study or you would take part in a 30-minute follow-up interview, please give your email address at the end of the questionnaire or send me an email. Thank you very much for your help.

Réka Asztalos, Budapest Business School, Faculty of Commerce, Catering and Tourism
areka3271@yahoo.co.uk

I. In the first part please put an X in the appropriate box or write the answer on the given line.

1. What language(s) do you teach? _____
2. Age: □ 25-35 □ 36-45 □ 46-55 □ above 55
3. Sex: □ male □ female
4. How often do you use the Internet?
   □ almost never □ monthly □ weekly □ every day
5. How competent do you feel yourself using the Internet?
   □ I have problems using the Internet
   □ it can take quite long before I find something
   □ I rarely have a problem
   □ I can use it quickly and efficiently
6. Have you taken part in a training session about CooSpace?
   □ yes, at the college □ yes, at the faculty □ no
7. Would you take part in a (further) training session about CooSpace?
   □ yes □ no
8. Do you use CooSpace in language teaching?
   □ yes □ no □ I use another VLE (eg.. Moodle, Ning): _____
9. Why do you NOT use CooSpace? (you can choose more than on answer)
   □ technical problems
   □ don't know how it works
   □ not useful
   □ too much time to learn it
   □ the activities are traceable
   □ too much time to use it
   □ traditional ways are faster
   □ students don't like it
   □
   other:_____
10. How often do you use CooSpace?
   □ once in a term □ monthly □ every second week□ weekly □ before each class

II. In the following section please give marks from 1 to 5 depending on how often you use the following applications.
5 = very often 1 = never You can choose any number from 1 to 5. Choose 0 if you do NOT know the given function.
How often do you use the functions of CooSpace?

11. Uploading documents	**5**	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**	**0**
12. News forum	**5**	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**	**0**
13. Forum	**5**	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**	**0**
14. Chat	**5**	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**	**0**
15. Tasks	**5**	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**	**0**
16. Tasks correction	**5**	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**	**0**
17. Homework	**5**	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**	**0**
18. Grading	**5**	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**	**0**
19. Summarizing grades	**5**	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**	**0**
20. Attendance register	**5**	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**	**0**
21. Summarizing registers	**5**	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**	**0**
22. Sending messages	**5**	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**	**0**
23. Tests	**5**	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**	**0**
24. Diary	**5**	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**	**0**

5 = very often

4 = quite often

3 = sometimes

2 = rarely

1 = soha

0 = I do NOT know this function

25. Do you use CooSpace for any other purposes?
_____
_____
_____
_____

_____

26. Is there any function that is missing from CooSpace or does not work properly? Why?
_____
_____

III. In the following section please give marks from 1 to 5 depending on how useful you find the following applications.
5 = very useful 1 = not useful at all You can choose any number from 1 to 5. Choose 0 if you do NOT know the given function.
How useful do you find the following functions?

27. Uploading documents	**5**	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**	**0**
28. News forum	**5**	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**	**0**
29. fórum	**5**	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**	**0**
30. Chat	**5**	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**	**0**
31. Tasks	**5**	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**	**0**
32. Tasks correction	**5**	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**	**0**
33. Homework	**5**	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**	**0**
34. Grading	**5**	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**	**0**
35. Summarizing grades	**5**	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**	**0**
36. Attendance register	**5**	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**	**0**
37. Summarizing registers	**5**	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**	**0**
38. Sending messages	**5**	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**	**0**
39. Tests	**5**	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**	**0**
40. Diary	**5**	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**	**0**

5 = very useful

4 = useful

3 = somewhat useful

2 = not very useful

1 = not useful at all

0 = I do NOT know this function

If you are interested in the results of the study or you would take part in a 30-minute follow-up interview, please give your email address:

email: _____

□ I am interested in the results of the study
□ I would take part in an interview

Appendix B
Interview schedule

Where do you teach? What languages do you teach?
How long have you been teaching?
Do you speak any other languages? At what level?
How competent do you feel yourself using the Internet?
What functions of the Internet do you the most frequently?
Do you use it for teaching? Why (not)?
How has the use of the Internet influenced your life? And your professional life?
About CooSpace – on the basis of the answers given in the questionnaire.
How are today's students different from the previous generations?
How are today's teachers different from the previous generations?
How have you changed?
What do you consider as milestones during your career?
How do you think today's students need to be taught?
How can the Internet and computers be used in language teaching?
What are drawbacks?
What do you think of e-learning? And blended learning?
Would you take part in an e-learning course as a student? Why (not)?
What about an e-learning language course as a student? And as a teacher?
How could e-learning or blended learning be applied at college language teaching?
Which aspects could be applied?
For which subjects within language teaching? (study skills, essay writing)
What could be the advantages/disadvantages?
What practical problems could arise? What do you think of the future of e-learning?