8.1 Introduction

In this chapter, the observations and findings from the previous chapters will be used to present guidelines which will assist institutions further in implementing IILL. As discussed in chapter 2, the implementation of technology concerns the strategies developed and actions taken to make sure that technologies are actually used and pedagogical principles applied. Getting more staff to use technology in pedagogically innovative ways is the key to bridging the potential-practice gap in the use of ICT for language learning purposes. In this chapter, we will consider some ways in which this may be accomplished.

8.2 From existing practice towards more innovative practice

It is essential for implementers to remember that any type of innovation starts from existing practice and may take several steps or cycles to complete. Pennington (2004), in an adapted version of Rogers’ (1995) innovation-adoption model of change, describes innovation in terms of three innovation-adoption cycles, in which the innovation gradually proceeds from novel addition to existing forms, through evolution and extension of new forms, to replacement or reconstruction of earlier forms. This process is described in Table 50 below:
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase 1 cycle [continuity cycle]</th>
<th>Expansion of old forms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. <strong>Innovation step</strong></td>
<td>Introduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Novel Addition to Existing Forms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. <strong>Adoption step</strong></td>
<td>Familiarization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation to Existing Forms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase 2 cycle [creativity cycle]</th>
<th>Expansion of innovation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. <strong>Innovation step</strong></td>
<td>Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evolution of New Forms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. <strong>Adoption step</strong></td>
<td>Normalization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extension of New Forms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase 3 cycle [discontinuity cycle]</th>
<th>Transformation of forms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. <strong>Innovation step</strong></td>
<td>Contrast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict/Merger of Old and New Forms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. <strong>Adoption step</strong></td>
<td>Recalibration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replacement/Reconstruction of Forms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 50: Innovation-Adoption Cycles, based on Pennington (2004: 11)

She observes that during the innovation process, “there is a decreasing influence of the context of introduction and an increasing influence of the innovation itself, which also gradually changes the context” (p. 12). Proposals like this suggest that there may be a gradual progression of innovation from add-on to add-in uses, which may be accompanied by phases of resistance or rejection. But many innovations do not make it to the final stage, i.e. they fail to become fully integrated. Implementation can be seen as the effort of orchestrating change in the face of these progressive cycles of innovation. It is intended to bring the process full cycle.

Collis and Moonen (2001) acknowledge these dynamics of innovation in their implementation guidelines intended to maximise the chances for future acceptance of educational technology in the institution. They recommend that early on in the implementation process the focus should be on “personally relevant educational problems” and providing “support for the existing curriculum” (p. 55). Simultaneously, however, there should be room for “new forms of learning experiences” (p. 55). These are crucial aspects of pedagogical effectiveness, one of the key factors (4 Es) for the acceptance of technology for learning-related purposes. If teachers cannot relate the use of
technology to how they teach and to the current curriculum, it will be hard to achieve a basis for successful implementation. But, at the same time, providing them with new experiences (rather than dwelling exclusively on existing problems and the status quo of the curriculum) is important for the innovation to become integrated into teaching and learning practices. In order to proceed from the teachers’ present perspectives, they should be made aware of the potential that lies beyond their current horizons.

First and foremost, this requires a reconsideration of current beliefs and convictions about what effective and efficient language learning and teaching is all about. In the preceding chapters, teaching-oriented accounts of TBLT have been used as a guiding methodological framework for assessing the technology options available to teachers and learners. A key aspect of selecting TBLT as the leading pedagogical framework is that TBLT is not widely accepted by teachers as a methodology for language teaching. In acknowledging this problem, the TBLT frameworks that have been used in the previous chapters to outline the scope for technology in a task-based language teaching context have put forward proposals for winning over teachers accustomed to more traditional form-focused, teacher-centred methods. Nunan (2004), Willis (1996) and Willis and Willis (2007) give many illustrations of how traditional materials can be used or adapted as a starting point for task-based work. Similarly, in the treatment of focus on form, differences as well as parallels with more traditional approaches are highlighted. Nunan (2004), for instance, remarks:

Note that in the more traditional synthetic approach, this language focus work would probably occur as step 1. In the task-based procedure being presented here, it occurs relatively late in the instructional sequence. Before analyzing elements of the linguistic system, they [students] have seen, heard and spoken the target language within a communicative context. Hopefully, this will make it easier for the learner to see the relationship between communicative
meaning and linguistic form than when linguistic elements are isolated and presented out of context as is often the case in more traditional approaches.

(Nunan, 2004: 32)

Such strategies are similar to Collis and Moonen’s recommendations on establishing links with existing practice. For instance, in pointing to the need of establishing connections with current methods as an initial stage in the process of achieving new practices, they argue:

Finally, reassuring instructors and students that not all is changing, that valuable continuity will still pertain in terms of core aspects of the study programmes in which they have invested time and effort is important. Not everything should change; the technology initiative should emphasize that things that are popular and work well are not the (initial) candidates for change, unless it is to extend their benefits even further. This can help reduce much of the predictable resistance to technology-mediated learning that has been seen so often in the past.

(Collis & Moonen, 2001: 55)

There is thus strong convergence in the ways in which new pedagogy and new technology may be made acceptable to users.

This strategy of linking up with and extending existing practices can be used to indicate ways for gradually integrating the technologies described in the previous chapters. The observations that the classroom and the classroom teacher should continue to play a central role (since they are valued resources in the setting targeted by this study) fit in well with this perspective of achieving continuity with existing practices. Furthermore, applications that many teachers can readily relate to (e.g. web as resource for input and access
to reference materials, tutorial programs for focused practice) may serve as
good stepping stones to more innovative practices. Focusing on these types
of applications early on in the implementation process may be a good starting
point for innovation. However, to work towards transformation, it is essential
to uphold the afforded pedagogical potential from the beginning. If task-
based language learning is aimed at, an awareness should be created of the use
of these technologies in the context of tasks and the curriculum, as outlined in
the previous chapters. The function of the web in providing opportunities for
working with authentic sources and participating in target language
communities, the use of online reference programs in support of autonomous
learning, and the positioning of tutorial programs at the end of the
pedagogical cycle offer promising perspectives for proceeding from existing
practice to innovative, task-based practice. A key role in bringing these
technologies together is for VLEs which offer many practical benefits in
supporting the existing curriculum, but also provide a basis for pedagogically
more innovative uses.

In this perspective on creating favourable conditions for implementing IILL,
CMC has great potential for offering “new learning experiences”. However,
teachers operating in non-distance settings may find it harder to relate it to
their present needs and circumstances. The classroom is the default locus of
instructed language learning in communicative, task-based teaching
approaches. Using CMC to enhance interaction between students in the same
classroom (intraclass CMC) will not be very high on many teachers’ priority
lists if it means giving up valuable face-to-face interaction in the classroom.
Methodological frameworks, such as TBLT, offer many suggestions for
creating cognitively and socially effective classroom interaction for which no
technology is required. In view of the limited time available for classroom
interaction, they may, however, be looking for ways to increase the
opportunities for interaction by using CMC in out-of-class activities. The
IILL Survey results suggest that computer-mediated activities in which
students communicate with each other and work together outside the
classroom are less frequently considered by teachers than computer-
interactive activities in which students work on their own at tasks in which the
computer fulfills the role of provider of input, reference resources and
feedback. For many students and teachers, more communication outside the
classroom provides interesting new learning experiences to which they may
find it easier to relate than to CMC as an alternative mode of communication
between students in the same classroom.

Great potential for offering new learning experiences would be in intercultural
CMC. By establishing direct connections with the foreign culture and
language, intercultural CMC addresses a commonly perceived need for
language learning which may be hard to implement within the confines of the
classroom. Blake (2008a) discusses the added value of such virtual exchanges
in the context of problems in realising real exchanges “as the next best
alternative to actually going abroad” (p. 4). These aspects make intercultural
CMC a particularly apt candidate for realising the new forms of learning that
are needed to get innovative technology-enhanced language pedagogy off the
ground. As with intraclass CMC, the fact that such forms of intracultural
CMC can be realised as out-of-class activities is likely to enhance teachers’
appreciation of the pedagogical effectiveness even more.

In this respect, it should be noted that the more recent CMC tools wiki and
blog offer alternative modes of writing rather than speaking. This puts them
less in competition with classroom-based interaction than CMC forms such as
text-based or voice-based chatting and discussion. Writing is already
traditionally established as an out-of-class activity (i.e. the writing work itself,
not necessarily instruction and feedback). This makes it easy to accommodate
wikis and blogs into existing practice, and to create “new learning
experiences” at the same time, such as writing for real audiences, participating
in or contributing to the target language communities, and collaborating with
others in a collective writing process. This would seem to make wikis and
weblogs another promising point of departure for providing teachers and
students with new perspectives on learning and teaching when their overall focus is still on classroom-based interaction in which technology is only used sparingly.

8.3 Towards a realistic perception of TBLT

One of the most elusive aspects of the potential-practice debate concerns the problem of what constitutes pedagogically innovative practice. Our research has used TBLT as a target for innovation, but the point was made that the projects, or the study programmes and curricula in which they were implemented, could not be said to be characteristic of TBLT in all respects. Although tasks were generally one of the elements, the curricula could not be regarded as “fully TBLT”.

As pointed out in chapter 4, this is a problem addressed by Samuda and Bygate’s (2008) extensive study of the use of tasks in second language education. They argue that researcher and practitioner perspectives on the use of tasks as a leading construct in language pedagogy are radically different. Together with teachers’ perspectives of tasks as being imposed on them top-down (through national or institutional policies) without adequate concern for everyday teaching needs, this makes the use of tasks “highly controversial” and the subject of “heated debate” between researchers and practitioners (Samuda & Bygate, 2008: 192). In assessing the pedagogical perspectives on tasks they conclude that a reinterpretation of the role of tasks in the curriculum is necessary in which tasks are “unhooked” from methodologies in which TBLT is promoted as the single basis for the curriculum. They contend that it is questionable to uphold task-based curricula as the optimal solution for language teaching in all cases, as somehow superior to task-supported pedagogy (as an “incomplete version of the real thing, or a kind of TBLT ‘lite’” (p. 219)), and doubt whether TBLT is a realistic goal for language teaching more generally. In this context, they re-assess the potential of the pedagogical framework used as a primary reference for this study, Willis (1996) and Willis and Willis (2007). Commenting on the sparing evidence of
fully task-based pedagogical practices in Willis’s own publications, they make the following claim:

This suggests that Willis’s framework may be more influential in introducing the use of tasks to supplement and extend current practices than in promoting the fully-fledged task-based learning that Willis herself advocates…

(Samuda & Bygate, 2008: 207-208)

Tasks should be regarded as valuable constructs in their own right, rather than be prescribed as the basis for the entire curriculum. They propose to regard tasks as “pedagogic tools” to be called upon as the need arises. Comparing the use of tasks to the use of tools more generally, they argue:

Similarly with tasks: appraising fitness for purpose involves decisions about whether to use a task over an exercise at a particular point in a lesson, the selection of one task or type over another, adapting or varying the task to respond to local needs, ways of implementing it with a particular group of individuals and ways of enabling connections with previous work. Such decisions come into play regardless of whether the teacher is ‘doing TBLT’ or using tasks on an occasional basis, but the outcomes of those decisions will be shaped by how the potential of the ‘tool’ is understood and how it is actually used.

(Samuda & Bygate, 2008: 207-208)

In view of the current problems in the acceptance of TBLT which may exacerbate potential problems in the adoption of technology, such a conception in which the role of tasks as an overarching methodology for the curriculum is re-interpreted may be essential for establishing the pre-requisite links with existing practice. The comments on the role of Willis’s framework
should not be regarded negatively, but as an opportunity for using this framework for making task-based pedagogy acceptable. As Samuda and Bygate (2008) suggest, this does not imply that this “represents a necessary ‘halfway step’ towards full implementation of TBLT” (p. 207-208). There is great potential for task-as-tool in language pedagogy when not each and every single aspect of learning and teaching has to be task-based. This reconceptualisation may help institutions looking at task-based language pedagogy as a basis for implementing ICT to make language innovation programmes acceptable – perhaps even appealing – to teachers struggling with the question of how to integrate technology and take note of new ways of doing teaching at the same time.

On the basis of this more realistic conception of the role of tasks in the curriculum, the focus in the next sections will be on provisions for institutional vision building, support and teacher training, and project management that must be made to create conditions in which innovative language teaching and learning practices may continually evolve in the face of new educational challenges and technological opportunities.

8.4 Building an institutional vision

Collis and Moonen (2001) argue that building an institutional vision is an essential component of technology implementation for learning-related purposes. Ideally, the vision should be established at the initiation stages of implementation, so that project activities aimed at achieving the technology-supported innovation can be related to it. In the institutional vision, they argue, expectations about the use of technology in the institution should be clearly articulated and other issues, such as the technology infrastructure and readiness to change among staff should also be addressed. They comment that the institutional vision on the use of technology often remains underspecified, thus failing to meet their Lesson 1 “Be specific”, which makes it hard to assess successful implementation in measurable terms. As indicated in chapter 5, teachers in the IILL Survey (who make use of ICT in their
teaching practice already) awarded the lowest scores to institutional vision when they were asked how satisfied they were about forms of institutional support for technology-supported language learning and teaching. This suggests that Collis and Moonen's observations about the lack or incompleteness of institutional visions also apply to the use of technology in language learning and teaching.

It was demonstrated in chapter 4 how specific project requirements made by the funding organisation SURF helped to draw out aspects of the institutional environment that can make the vision more specific. The aspects mentioned included the role of e-learning, the importance of internationalisation and the relevance of the CEFR. We now come back to these aspects and place them in the context of establishing an effective institutional infrastructure for integrating these aspects successfully in the curriculum.

One of the key aspects of developing an institutional vision on technology use for educational purposes is that it should identify possible roles of technology in relation to pedagogy. General frameworks, such as the Flexibility-Activity Framework (section 2.6) which we have used for overall guidance, can be applied across the institution to suggest ways in which technology may be deployed to gradually introduce more flexible, active forms of learning. HE teaching is often acquisition-oriented and inflexible (see Laurillard, 2002 for similar arguments) and institutions should encourage flexible ways of teaching and learning with active student involvement. Since more specific language-oriented accounts such as TBLT were used as primary point of departure for spelling out the pedagogical options for making language learning more (inter)active, no specific reference was made in the preceding chapters to how this progression from inflexible, acquisition-oriented to more flexible, participatory or contributory learning arrangements might be achieved in terms of the Flexibility-Activity Framework. But at the institutional level, such an overarching framework may be extremely useful for bringing out essential aspects of learning and teaching that apply to the institution as a whole,
regardless of the discipline concerned. This provides a valuable pedagogical perspective on the use of VLEs, which are also typically introduced at the institutional level and which, without proper guidance, would otherwise often be implemented by staff relative to their existing beliefs and teaching practices (frequently based on knowledge-transmission, acquisition-oriented models). Such principled approaches to e-learning, integrated into the institutional vision on the use of learning technology, may stimulate “far-reaching, novel ways of teaching and learning, facilitated by ICT” across the institution, which large-scale educational studies, such as OECD (2005), have found to “remain nascent or still to be invented” in technology-enhanced HE to date (OECD, 2005: 13-14).

In relation to the role of technology in language teaching and learning, the vision must be augmented with perspectives on the importance of teaching and learning languages in the institution. Such perspectives, as has been demonstrated in the context of the INTUIT project, are closely intertwined with views on internationalisation, and should include considerations on the role of language teaching in accommodating foreign students in the institution and of preparing resident students for international exchanges and careers. This may involve more than resorting to English as the sole target for language education. Frameworks such as the CEFR help to express language learning outcomes by using descriptors that facilitate comparisons between languages and across borders. The institutional vision should integrate the role of this framework. In relation to the CEFR, the vision might consider, for instance:

- for students entering the institution, the implications of the use of the CEFR as a basis for pre-university secondary school exams (e.g. in the Netherlands, cf. CEVO (2008));

or:
• for students studying at the institution (not just language students), the consequences of describing curriculum modules in terms of CEFR-based proficiency levels (e.g. how are these levels related to the institutional practice of assigning marks (grades) for academic achievement);

or:

• for students leaving the institution, the role of the CEFR in defining and documenting competences relevant for future employment.

The vision might also consider a place for instruments such as the European Language Portfolio in the context of general assessment and evaluation procedures in the institution (including the use of portfolios for other disciplines). Much work in establishing the prerequisite institutional language policies is already in progress, as is evidenced by the activities of the Language Policy Division of the Council of Europe (http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/linguistic/) and related professional organisations, such as the European Language Council (ELC, http://www.celelc.org/). Institutions need to take heed of such developments and integrate them into their overall vision and strategies on education. In doing so, it is essential that they also take into consideration critical perspectives on the implementation of the CEFR, particularly in regard of the crucial aspect of integrating the Framework at the level of the curriculum by changing educational practices (see section 7.3.1 above). They should also consider the implications of the CEFR for teacher training (section 8.6.2).

It stands to reason that for outlining the required elements of an institutional vision close cooperation is necessary with administrators, management and policy makers working at the institutional level at which language provision is offered. Collis and Moonen (2001) emphasise that involvement of decision makers at the appropriate institutional levels in building the vision and
commitment to that vision throughout the implementation process is essential for successful integration. This requires working with language centres, language departments or other groups and individuals who can contribute to developing an institutional vision on language learning and teaching and the role that technology may fulfill in it.

Another crucial aspect to be addressed in the institutional vision, according to Collis and Moonen (2001), is the readiness to change among staff. Personal engagement, one of the key factors (4 Es) for effecting successful change, relates to the individual’s response to technology and change. Personal engagement can be enhanced by rewards such as “extra financial support, released time, incorporation of participation [in technology innovation projects] in staff evaluation procedures that relate to promotion, and other forms of pay-off such as funding for conference attendance” (p. 62). The relevance of such reward mechanisms is acknowledged more generally as an aspect of the technology integration process (Laurillard, 2002; Levy & Stockwell, 2006), but it has particular relevance for language teaching, which has relatively low academic prestige, especially in university contexts (Liddell & Garrett, 2004), where professional development is primarily measured in terms of research performance.

Collis and Moonen (2001) conclude that such reward mechanisms are not often utilised as instruments in the change process. The projects discussed in chapters 3 and 4 indicate that releasing staff from regular tasks to involve them in developing pedagogically innovative materials and tasks can be well established by setting up strategic innovation projects in which teachers are given a key role.
8.5 Setting up teacher training

8.5.1 Teacher training as an institutional process

Teacher training is a vital component in the successful implementation of ICT for language learning and teaching. Whereas pioneers will largely determine their own agendas, discover new forms of teaching and learning with technology of their own accord, and find ways of integrating these successfully into their own teaching with minimal support, familiarising larger groups of teachers, whole language sections, departments, or faculties with technology applications and actually getting them to use these on a more permanent basis requires setting up strategies and making provisions for teacher support and teacher training within the institution.

Recent publications on teacher training, such as Hubbard and Levy (2006a) and Kassen, Lavine, Murphy-Judy, and Peters (2007), discuss many different options and critical aspects of setting up teacher training in a wide range of educational settings. From the institutional perspective, an important focus of attention is the way in which teachers already employed at the institution can be trained and supported. As Collis and Moonen (2001) indicate teacher training in technology integration is best provided by offering just-in-time support rather than short courses or workshops, since this provides the best opportunities for linking training and support to the context that is “meaningful to the instructor” (p. 63).

8.5.2 Teacher training and professional development

This perspective places teacher training and support in the broader context of staff development. Regarding teacher training as an aspect of staff development is essential since learning about technology is an ongoing process, which in spite of Bax’s views on normalisation (Bax, 2003; Chambers & Bax, 2006) will never reach an end state where it becomes completely invisible, at least not for technology as a whole. Technology is not a
monolithic tool (Blake, 2008a), and although individual technologies may become normalised at some point, there will always be new technologies on the horizon, put into focus by pioneers and ready to be considered by larger groups of users at a later stage.

Drawing teacher training (or teacher learning) into the perspective of staff development is also necessary to establish the prerequisite links with personal rewards and promotion schemes, which have been shown to be generally lacking in relation to technology use and which are also frequently absent for language teachers in academic environments, where research performance is a prime indicator of personal achievement. As indicated above, personal rewards are vital in promoting personal engagement, which is a key predictor of successful implementation. Linking teacher training to professional development also helps in establishing the culture change needed to create favourable conditions for the long term use of innovative technology-supported practices (Oxford & Jung, 2007). Therefore, providing teacher training and support from this wider perspective of professional development in the institution is one of the keys to the sustained use of technology for learning-related purposes. Although teachers are to be made responsible for their own professional development, it is the institution’s responsibility to make sure that appropriate conditions for such development are created.

8.5.3 Situated teacher learning

A critical aspect of teacher training is that it must be linked to real teaching and learning conditions. According to Hubbard and Levy (2006a), one of the recurring themes in teacher training is “the need to connect CALL education to authentic teaching settings, especially one where software, hardware, and technical support differ from the ideal” (Hubbard & Levy, 2006a: xi). This is what Egbert et al. (2002) and Egbert (2006) refer to as creating opportunities for “situated learning”. Egbert et al. (2002) argue that teachers need ample opportunities for practicing what they learn, for “coursework alone, devoid of
the opportunities to practice, apply, and see evidence of student improvement, may lead to technology learning but not necessarily to its use” (p. 111).

In the institutional context it is relatively easy to link teacher training in the use of technology to the courses that teachers teach, particularly when (project) funding is available which temporarily releases them from other duties, so that they can be given sufficient time for preparation and experimentation. Most of the projects that have been described in this study involved the use of ICT in the context of actual course work, in which teachers engaged students in piloting and evaluating new forms of learning supported by technology. An added benefit of this approach is that it involves the real technology and support infrastructure available at the institution as recommended by Hubbard and Levy (2006a). Situating teacher learning in authentic learning contexts raises the stakes for providing adequate levels of technology and support. This may serve to put the institutional vision on technology provision and support to the test, and if problems occur, put ownership of such problems with the organisation rather than with the individual teacher.

8.5.4 Designing for use

One of the most commonly applied strategies in the Dutch HE context for linking technology to real teaching involves the use of VLEs. Teachers are typically asked to redesign their courses and implement the new design (the course syllabus, the actual tasks and exercises to be completed by students, the links with various resources and technologies) in the institutional VLE (usually Blackboard). Not only does this emphasise aspects of design relative to the entire language learning environment and not just the classroom, it also helps to make the design more transparent and open to inspection by others (cf section 7.2.2). This allows teacher trainers to provide advice on consistent designs (between different courses and between different teachers teaching
the same language), but it also makes it possible for teachers to work on course design collectively. In many institutions, particularly with the more “popular” languages (e.g. English and Spanish in our context), teaching a single course is the joint responsibility of a group of teachers, who are required by internal and external evaluation and quality control schemes to provide comparable teaching and equal opportunities to all. As indicated, VLEs may help to create a common core of language learning materials, supported by a common set of tools, to which each teacher can contribute and which may be a basis for greater uniformity and continuity in the provision of language learning than traditionally prepared materials and methods residing to a considerable extent in the PCs, filing cabinets and heads of individual teachers. In terms of Willis and Willis’s Japanese teacher, getting teachers “to work out of the same box” remains one of the important challenges for implementation.

8.5.5  Communities of practice

This opportunity to work with and learn from colleagues is of particular importance in professional development. Colleagues are one of the primary sources of information and inspiration for teachers interested in applying new technologies (Egbert et al., 2002; Kessler, 2006; cf. also HIL Survey results above). Implementation can build on this by facilitating exchanges between teachers. As argued above, such exchanges are essential for developing joint courses with fellow teachers, but interaction between teachers should not remain restricted to teachers working on the same course. For establishing a common pedagogy (see section 8.4 above), it is essential that teachers of the same language or across languages regularly meet and exchange ideas about the use of technology in supporting innovative teaching and learning practices. Such exchanges across languages are further encouraged when language-independent frameworks such as the CEFR are applied.
As pointed out in the discussion of the INTUIT project, setting up contacts, collaborative tasks and information exchanges may be a first step towards establishing communities of practice (Lave & Wenger, 1991; Wenger, 1998). The foundation for such communities may be laid by regular meetings, and formal and informal contacts “on the ground”, while continued support by colleagues and experts may be offered through online communication and collaboration tools. Hanson-Smith (2006) points out that setting up online communities of practice (CoPs) locally (i.e. as part of an institutional implementation strategy) “may well become an important feature of an institution’s total program” (p. 313). Although she discusses CoPs from the perspective of teacher-training institutes, such local CoPs would be a valuable instrument in support of professional development in the institutional environment too. From the perspective of institution-wide implementation, global CoPs for language teachers, such as Webheads-in-Action (http://www.wiaoc.org/), documented in Hanson-Smith (2006), Franklin (2007) and Stevens (2004), might be too far removed from many language teachers’ present concerns and contexts of use. From the perspective of implementation, many participants in these global CoPs would be regarded as pioneers, or at least as language teachers needing support that is not available in the institutional environment (Stevens (2004) explicitly describes Webheads-in-Action as serving that function). So there is great potential in complementing these global CoPs with local CoPs in the context of technology implementation projects. This may help to create a basis for sustained peer and expert contacts and collaboration after the projects have come to a close. Hanson-Smith (2006) offers practical advice on how the social fabric of such communities may be established and on the technology tools available for supporting them. Arnold, Ducate and Lomicka (2007), who investigated the cognitive and social aspects of interaction in CoPs for language teacher education, found that teacher perceptions of cognitive benefits (helping them to understand new perspectives and learning activities better) were generally higher than their perceptions of social benefits. The
researchers attribute this to the fact “that online exchanges were the only channel for communication” (p. 126). This may be all the more reason for combining online CoPs with face-to-face exchanges in the institutional setting where opportunities for such contacts in the form of project meetings, teacher presentations and conferences are not too difficult to organise, particularly in a project context.

8.5.6 **Differentiation and blended teacher learning**

The need for differentiation is a key aspect of teacher training and support. Language teachers are likely to have disparate levels of technological expertise or familiarity in applying innovative pedagogical concepts. This calls for setting up forms of teacher training and support that can meet these different requirements effectively. In many respects, this requirement for offering language teachers diversified opportunities for learning resembles the need for offering such opportunities to language students. It should therefore come as no surprise that many of the solutions that have been proposed for language teachers mirror those put forward for language students. Several chapters in Hubbard and Levy (2006a) and Kassen, Lavine, Murphy-Judy, and Peters (2007) testify to that. Debski (2006), for instance, argues that having teacher trainees set up their own self-defined projects may be an important element in CALL teacher education. Cummins (2007) and Van Olphen (2007) make a case for using digital teacher portfolios, Franklin (2007) promotes the use of online resources (including communities of practice) as an important element in teacher education. Robb (2006) emphasises the importance of teachers learning to assess and use such resources independently. And Bauer-Ramazani (2006) deals with the potential and challenges of offering CALL teacher training online.

The benefits of technology in enhancing the flexibility of learning that we have seen to be associated with the use of CALL also apply to the use of technology in CALL teacher education. Just as with technology use in the
context of language learning by students, ICT in teacher education must be matched by pedagogical principles which will help language teachers use technology to maximum effect. A task-based approach and fostering learner autonomy may be as important in teacher education as they are in student education. As indicated in the context of language learning by students, this does not mean that we must forego the opportunities for face-to-face interaction and collaboration in the classroom. The importance of face-to-face exchanges in making teachers learn from each other was already commented on above. Face-to-face meetings in the classroom may also be valuable for situating certain forms of expert-novice teaching, e.g. sessions in the computer lab for hands-on training in the use of a particular program. As Hegelheimer (2006) emphasises, such technology training remains necessary, also if methodological aspects of CALL teacher training are covered in broader educational programmes.

By and large, the advantages of combining these opportunities for learning in the classroom with options for learning online in teacher education correspond to the benefits of making such combinations in student education. Needless to say there is also a role for the teacher trainer in the process, not only to provide guidance and feedback in the classroom, but also as a designer of tasks in teacher education, a provider of resources and an assessor of competences that must be met.

8.6 Topics in teacher training

8.6.1 Focus on pedagogy

The focus in professional development should be on developing sound pedagogical practices rather than on promoting the use of technology as such. Blake (2008a) underscores this aspect by emphasising “that how any given technological tool is used far outweighs the importance of which tool is selected to carry out a particular activity” (p. 133). If task-based pedagogical practices are found to be lacking in current manifestations of CALL, this may
signal problems in applying tasks rather than in applying technology. Such problems need to be addressed by setting up professional development programmes in which establishing contemporary language pedagogy is a major component. In our discussion of using TBLT in this context, a gradualist approach was proposed in which connections with and departures from more traditional approaches were central points of attention and in which a realistic conception of the role of tasks in the curriculum was advocated. The teaching-oriented TBLT-textbooks used in this study suggest natural points of contact with the use of technology and may therefore be suitable points of departure for introducing task-based pedagogy and praxis. Alternatively, more comprehensive resources on professional language teacher development, such as the University of Birmingham’s online Delphi course (http://www.delphi.bham.ac.uk/), which has a strong task-based orientation, may serve the same function.

8.6.2 Learning to use the CEFR

A core component in teacher development in the proposals we have made would be the CEFR. As critical evaluations of this framework have pointed out (e.g. Little, 2007; Stoks, 2009; Westhoff, 2007), integration of this framework at the level of the curriculum remains one of the greatest challenges to date. The CEFR is resonant of TBLT principles at several points, and linking the CEFR to TBLT as Nunan (2004) and Willis and Willis (2007) have suggested may not only add an outcome-based dimension to TBLT, which is essential in the institutional, instructed language learning environment, but it may also complement the action-oriented CEFR approach with procedures for pedagogy, which are only succinctly covered by the CEFR (which tries to be as pedagogically neutral as possible). These mutually reinforcing aspects are an important target for teacher education. A solid foundation in TBLT will make it easier for teachers to relate to tools such as DIALANG and the ELP, in which student self-reflection and learner autonomy are guiding principles. In the context of the American LinguaFolio
project, Cummins (2007) demonstrates how tools such as the ELP and Europass (http://europass.cedefop.europa.eu/) may be used in teacher training to raise a critical awareness with teacher trainees on how to interpret essential aspects of the CEFR. In a similar fashion, during CEFR workshops at the University of Groningen teachers are made to use DIALANG in assessing their proficiency in a foreign language other than the language they teach. This approach helps them to get accustomed to the language level descriptions and interpret the advisory feedback as learners rather than teachers, offering them first-hand experience as students of the utility of the program. A daunting challenge, however, remains to help teachers interpret student performance in terms of the CEFR descriptive mechanism. For examination purposes an extensive manual on relating language examinations to the CEFR, recently updated to a new version (http://www.coe.int/T/DG4/Linguistic/Manuell_EN.asp), is available. As North (2007) points out, this will help educational institutions and testing institutes in setting up adequate procedures for achieving common reference points in language examinations. This will give institutions a sense of direction to introducing the CEFR for testing purposes. The Manual can be used as a reference in teacher training programmes, but it is not a teaching tool itself. Individual teachers may be better served by the sample materials available on DVD and the Council of Europe website (http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/linguistic/Illustrations_EN.asp) Of particular relevance for acquainting teachers with the actual assessment procedures are European initiatives such as CEFTrain (http://www.ceftrain.net) and WebCEF (http://www.webcef.eu). A brief description of these is given in Example 7:

**EXAMPLE 7: CEFTrain and WebCEF**

CEFTrain provides an online introduction to the CEFR for different groups of user groups (language teachers, student teachers, language learners, textbook writers, test writers and educational planners and administrators) and guides them to the full text of
the Framework. It also has a fairly extensive familiarisation section, which guides readers through various aspects of the CEFR, particularly the use of the illustrative scales. While this presentation of the CEFR is useful for making the CEFR more accessible to prospective users, the interactive training area is particularly convenient for use in teacher education. It provides users with sample tasks, which they are asked to rate according to different CEFR scales. Immediate feedback is provided on whether the scales selected match the judgment of the group of experts who originally designed the training materials. An example of interactive training in learning to apply the CEFR illustrative scales is shown in Figure 29 below.

![Figure 29: CEFTrain: Interactive training in applying scales](image)

WebCEF, a project involving partly the same participants as in the CEFTrain project, takes authentic assessment and learning to use the CEFR scales for reference one step further. WebCEF leverages the potential of collaborative evaluation. It allows evaluators to assess oral language proficiency in a community of users. Video and audio can be
uploaded and rated according to the CEFR scales in collaboration with peers across Europe, using a tool specifically developed for this purpose. The tool may be used for real assessment of spoken production and spoken interaction tasks, but the database of samples rated collectively may also be used for realistic practice in using the CEFR scales in oral assessment, since it allows users to compare their ratings with ratings made by others.

8.6.3 Developing language learner autonomy

Fostering learner autonomy is another crucial element in professional language teacher development. It has been argued above that the potential of ICT for flexible, time, place and teacher independent learning will not be harvested unless students are effectively equipped in taking responsibility for the learning that the technology affords. In view of the vital importance of offering students learning opportunities outside the traditional classroom space, this is a key aspect of the successful application of technology for language learning. Achieving a balance between letting go and taking control (the former is often more difficult for teachers than the latter) is an important point of attention. Publications such as Benson and Voller (1997), Little (1991), Little et al. (2003), Oxford (1990), O’Malley and Chamot (1990) and Scharle and Szabó (2000) may assist teacher learners in understanding essential principles of autonomous language learning and learning strategies. The Innovation in Teaching website, maintained by Hayo Reinders, contains a very extensive section on learner autonomy ([http://www.innovationinteaching.org/autonomy_bibliography.php](http://www.innovationinteaching.org/autonomy_bibliography.php)) [sic].

The use of technology is now commonly associated with learner autonomy and learning strategies (some examples are, for instance, Benson, 2005; Figura & Jarvis, 2007; Little, 2001; Littlemore, 2001; Mozzon-McPherson, 2007; Ulitsky, 2000) From a somewhat broader perspective, Hubbard (2004) provides principled guidelines and practical suggestions on achieving effective
CALL learner training. It comprises aspects of general computer training, training for specific applications, learner control, learner strategy training, training for learner autonomy and develops principles that teachers may apply in setting up learner training. This makes it one of the most useful introductions to learner training in teacher education.

8.6.4 Instructional design

One of the most important aspects of successful integration of technology is an effective learning design. In HE the types of learning activities offered to students are largely determined by teachers themselves. Levy and Stockwell (2006) describe this pivotal role of teachers as designers as follows:

In many respects, language teachers may be considered designers. Not only do many language teachers design or adapt materials, and develop tasks and courses to match the needs and goals of their students (online and offline), they are also designers in the way they organize and manage their classes, programs, time and resources. The role of the language teacher as designer is often underestimated or overlooked;[…]

(Levy & Stockwell, 2006: 10).

The approach advocated in this study promotes an activity-based design, in which teachers integrate multiple technologies and techniques (including face-to-face classroom teaching) into a coherent whole from the theory-based perspective of TBLT and related frameworks. The emphasis is less on creating multimedia materials than on using existing resources and tools in the context of the teaching they provide. To prepare teachers for this task, professional development and forms of training that are incorporated in it should involve a strong instructional design component in which TBLT is one of the guiding frameworks. It has been noted that current perspectives on TBLT have a strong emphasis on designing classroom tasks, whereas ICT
may be particularly effective in supporting tasks outside the classroom. This aspect of design merits special attention. It has also been suggested that focusing on VLEs as a tool for designing all the tasks pertinent to the course or curriculum (in and out of class, with or without technology) may be conducive to promoting this broader perspective on the use of tasks for language learning. Possibly, this may also link TBLT-based design to more general task-based instructional design approaches, such as 4C/ID model (Janssen-Noordman & Van Merrienboer, 2002; Van Merrienboer, Clark, & De Croock, 2002) which is used quite regularly as a basis for competence-oriented learning in the Netherlands. Task-based design proposals for language learning seem to have been developed largely independently of such general educational approaches to task-based instructional design. Linking such proposals might also shed more light on the difficult issue of sequencing tasks on the basis of task complexity (for a summary, see Ellis, 2003: 220-229). The great importance of instructional design for developing effective language learning activities strongly suggests that language teachers would profit from being offered these more general educational perspectives on instructional design as they seek to develop their expertise and skills in designing effective learning tasks. An interesting avenue of exploration would also be to examine the role that the newly developed LAMS methodology and tools might play in this context (Dalziel, 2008). One of the primary functions of LAMS (Learning Activity Management System, http://www.lamsfoundation.org) is to assist teachers (individually or collaboratively) in laying out learning activities for students in the overarching VLEs. The learning activities supported may consist of combinations of online and offline activities, supported by technology or relying on non-technology-supported forms of human interaction, as the situation requires.
8.7 Technology provision

8.7.1 VLEs as basis

A leading argument in the preceding discussion has been that combinations of technology are needed to enhance the flexibility of learning and teaching and to implement principles associated with TBLT and related frameworks. This highlights the question of which technologies must be supported in the institution and how. As Levy and Stockwell (2006) point out, there are strong restrictions to the level of “individual choice and variation” that educational institutions may be able to support in terms of hardware and software (p. 231). As has been argued in Jager (2004b), this has strengthened the case for general-purpose VLEs rather than individual tools for each of the functionalities present in VLEs. In the present study, the use of VLEs was more closely examined from the perspective of achieving institution-wide implementation on the basis of a task-based approach to language teaching. Although they are no guarantee for innovative pedagogy, VLEs may enhance aspects of flexibility and design, provide a convenient springboard to other applications, and meet various other critical aspects of implementation of technology for learning-related purposes. This suggests that VLEs are a key technology that institutions should (continue to) support. This would most likely imply releasing permanent budget, installing and maintaining the required server infrastructure, and making provisions for technological and pedagogical support.

8.7.2 Support of other applications

As to the other applications that must be supported by the institution, the technology-enhanced activities that have been described in the context of the technology-innovation projects demonstrate that much can be accomplished by resorting to externally available applications and resources (often available for free). The current trend toward Web 2.0 technologies and open software and content initiatives will reinforce this tendency to rely on externally
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provided applications. The support for such technologies will be less in terms of technology provision as in terms of guidance in how to use them. There is greater need for pedagogical support than for technology support. This is an important aspect of technology-enhanced learning and teaching more generally, as was also evidenced by the outcomes of the IILL Survey.

As some of these applications become more fully integrated into pedagogical practices, the need for integration at the administrative levels may increase as well. Using wikis as part of the institutional learning environment may be more convenient than relying on external sites, when the number of students using them is increasing and wikis are becoming part of institutional assessment schemes. For organisational and strategic purposes, institutions will continue to develop this vertical dimension of integration. Provided this type of organisational efficiency is not at the expense of pedagogical effectiveness (e.g. allowing external participants, such as native speakers, to contribute), teachers’ general perceptions of the benefits of technology and the overall importance of ease-of-use suggest that heightening such types of institutional efficiency will also be rated positively by individual teachers. In discussing this issue in relation to the role of VLEs in sections 4.3.4 and 7.2.2, it was argued that integrating ICT along this vertical dimension need not be at the expense of horizontal integration, which offers a particularly convenient way for pioneers to explore new modes of technology-supported learning, while the vertical line gives them (and larger groups of less technology-minded staff) a relatively stable institutional base to work from.

8.7.3 Technology standards and open software

An essential requirement for technology integration by institutions is the use of technology standards. In the discussion above, this has been shown to be a critical aspect of applications such as Ellips and digital language portfolios. If particular applications are crucial to realising specific aspects of the learning process and there is a need for providing ongoing institutional support for
them (or facilitating their use across institutions), it is essential that technology standards, such as IMS or SCORM are met. This is important for institutions to ensure continued use of such applications in the future. Increasingly, the use of open software standards is regarded as vital for achieving sustained use of such applications and making technological integration into the institutional infrastructure possible.

8.7.4 Towards open learning

It should also be noted that a strong reliance on external applications and resources makes teachers and institutions vulnerable to websites disappearing, changing ownership, or revising licensing policies. This may be an additional reason to establish a basis for technology-supported learning and teaching in the institutions. It may also call for negotiated or shared uses of applications that are considered particularly valuable for language pedagogy. A case in point, as we have seen, is DIALANG, an indispensable resource for many language teachers across Europe. It is through close contacts with the owners and developers that a basis for sustained use of this program has been accomplished. This may be another area where institutions can work together to establish a more secure future for the use of the applications and resources concerned. This may even take the form of joint development or maintenance. In fact, the very ability to fashion a great deal of learning on the basis of resources provided for free by others would almost seem to oblige educational institutions to make the resources that they develop themselves (often in the context of government-funded projects) available to others at no cost. Open learning initiatives, such as the Openlearn website of the British Open University (http://openlearn.open.ac.uk/) or the MIT Open Courseware site (http://ocw.mit.edu/), both of which also contain valuable language learning materials, offer promising models that institutions might want to aspire to in this context.
8.8 From project to institutionalisation

In making their proposals for implementation of technology for learning-related purposes, Collis and Moonen (2001) particularly consider the role of setting up projects for accomplishing the required changes. Implementation is a concerted effort at introducing new technologies for learning, and projects are a proven method of orchestrating this. Projects provide a goal-directed approach or methodology to specifying the point of departure and need for the innovation process, defining the scope and envisaged results, and describing the action plan, budget and anticipated time frames for achieving those results. The relevance of a project-based approach for placing the innovation in the institutional context and for planning and tracking anticipated results was already commented on in the description of the SURF innovation projects in chapter 4. Different levels of expertise may be leveraged in the composition of the project team and a leader may be appointed to make sure that the project will actually keep on track. Such leadership is regarded as vital for the successful integration of technology (Collis & Moonen, 2001; Laurillard, 2002; Oxford & Jung, 2007). This is a role, for which, as Collis and Moonen (2001) emphasise, pioneers may not be optimally equipped (see also section 3.3.4).

The project team should take on the task of effecting the desired changes step-by-step, following the recommendations on linking up with existing practice and gradually moving towards new practices (section 8.2) as closely as possible. They should operate on the basis of a clearly articulated vision on language learning and teaching (section 8.4), in which realistic expectations and attainable targets for the innovation are set (section 8.3) and in which options for staff development (section 8.5) are outlined.

Of great relevance for achieving the successful transformation is a keen awareness with the project team of essential differences between the project phase (implementation) and the phase after the project has come to a close (institutionalisation). Of particular concern is the hand-over to units not
originally involved in the project and achieving continuity of the project results after the special funding has ended. This requires taking into account models of change, such as that presented in section 8.2, which invariably predict phases of opposition and rejection by parties not originally involved in the project.

The importance of looking forward to the institutionalisation phase and the problems that may be encountered even when many provisions for future use have been made will be illustrated by making one more excursion to a project that the author has been involved in. This concerns the *Taal Vaardig* project, conducted at the University of Groningen between 2006 and 2008. Although the project was based on largely the same principles as the projects described in chapter 4, the description of this local project helps to bring out the complexity of transfer to the institutional setting and the difficulties in attuning factors of technology, pedagogy and the institutional environment in such a way that true integration becomes possible.

**Example 8: Taal Vaardig**

*Taal Vaardig*, the Dutch term for ‘language proficient’ with a secondary meaning ‘ready for language’, was an internal project of the Faculty of Arts, University of Groningen. It aimed to change language learning in the entire university by:

- Restructuring language learning programmes (courses/modules);
- Re-thinking teaching practices;
- Reinforcing the use of technology.

The project involved over 30 teachers from the university language centre and academic language departments, teaching 12 different languages. The project was conducted in two different phases. In the first year, 2006-2007, the focus was on English, Spanish, French, Italian and German. In the second year, 2007-2008, the languages involved were Finnish, Russian, Swedish, Danish, Norwegian, Hebrew and Arabic. The project was motivated
by the following considerations, ordered by the key dimensions for integration used in this study:

**Institutional environment:**

- The need to strengthen collaboration between language centre and language departments;
- The desire to offer new language modules as part of the introduction of a flexible Ba-programme (30 ECTS credits);
- The need for staff development in the use of ICT in support of innovative language teaching.

**Pedagogy:**

- The application of the CEFR in all language programmes, not only at the level of course descriptions but as an element in the curriculum;
- The establishment of more task-based, communicative language learning practices;
- The need to encourage independent learning (or self-study), primarily to achieve more time-on-task for language students.

**Technology:**

- The use of Blackboard for all language modules;
- The use of Blackboard for exchanging and consolidating materials;
- The integration of newly established multimedia language labs.

Several provisions were made to enhance the chances of successful progression from project initiation, through implementation to the eventual institutionalisation of the redesigned language teaching practices. There was strong commitment from the Faculty Board from the start, participating teachers were released from regular duties for one day a week during one year and the required technological infrastructure was available from the start of the project. Participation of the language departments and language centre in the project was mandatory and commitment was obtained from the departments to
implement the redesigned teaching modules during the year following the project. The teachers participating in the project were predominantly permanent staff.

Regular meetings (weekly during the first half year, once a month during the second) were organised during which exchanges of perspectives on teaching practice and a cross-fertilisation of ideas took place. This procedure worked particularly well during the first year, when for most languages more than one teacher participated in the project and when the languages represented in the project had more aspects in common than the languages focused on in the second year. The subjects dealt with during the project meetings were negotiated with the teachers and included thorny issues such as the role of explicit grammar and vocabulary instruction. As predicted by the models of innovation discussed above, the project met with resistance particularly from staff not involved in the project. This focused particularly on the project emphasis on communicative language teaching, which in its most extreme form may involve the absence of any attention to formal language aspects. Although there was no support for this stance with the project team, and the need for attention to grammar, vocabulary and other formal language aspects found general acclaim with the project members, dealing with this issue was one of the most tenacious aspects of project management. It should be noted that the TBLT-frameworks used for this study where focus on form(s) is addressed from a communicative, task-based perspective were only referenced in the reading material provided for the course. No explicit mention was made to these frameworks during the teacher exchanges in which teachers primarily taught and learned from each other.

The CEFR was used to define module outcomes in terms of the CEFR levels for communicative activities (previously such levels had been made explicit mainly in the outcome level at the end of the curriculum (Ba-Phase)). The level-descriptions were also attached to the module titles, so that they would appear on the supplements to the Bachelor degree certificate. Finally, teachers were asked to assess which CEFR communicative activities were covered by the curriculum at which levels and to make adjustments in the redesign of course modules if needed.

Thus aspects of institutional organisation and language pedagogy were prominent in the
design of the project. Technology played a supporting role and was promoted as a means, never as a goal of the project. By and large the project produced the intended results. More than 50 renewed language learning modules were delivered, although some of these did not cover the tasks and assignments for the entire module when the project closed. The usefulness of the project was confirmed during come-back sessions for teachers after formal participation had ended.

Nevertheless, three years after the project was initiated, the institutionalisation of the innovations is insecure in several respects. Student access to the multimedia labs specifically set up for language learning, a critical factor for integration (Levy & Stockwell, 2006: 233-234), had been arranged in principle, but could not be guaranteed in practice. A key aspect of the design, a PC booking system which would allow language students privileged access to the multimedia labs in the university library, could not be integrated into the university infrastructure. Although the design was based on realising flexible, time and place independent learning facilitated through the use of Blackboard for all the modules, the lack of a booking facility impeded the use of the newly established multimedia labs for private study and joint work by students in the institution.

A more serious problem for the hand-over to the institution of the project results was caused by changes of staff. Staff changes were caused by:

- Policies disallowing non-research staff to take permanent positions in academic departments;

- Financial obstacles or unwillingness to hire language centre teachers to teach on these programs;

- Low academic prestige, which makes language teaching unattractive to permanent staff doing research, while providing a convenient stopover for non-permanent staff aspiring to do research.

While the project had anticipated the importance of these aspects for successful integration of the innovation, these problems could not be addressed at the project level.
and the faculty commitment to the project to date has not resulted in changes in staff policies which would provide a more solid base for continuity of the project results. The severity of these problems is different for each of the departments involved and seems to have left the language centre largely unaffected.

The hand-over to staff not originally involved in the project turned out to be particularly problematic in cases where the teacher(s) who had taken part in the project had left the institution. The teachers involved were meant to be the coordinators of the renewed programmes in their departments and to serve as bridgeheads for further innovation. In some cases, their departure has led to different uses of technology than anticipated and planned for in the context of the project. For instance, some departments allocated more time for teacher-supervised sessions in the language lab than the project had anticipated (since the focus was on promoting individual or joint use by students of technology outside the classroom). Since the project had envisaged only a modest role for teacher-supervised sessions in the language lab, innovative language learning tasks for supervised technology use in this context were generally lacking.

Another factor which disfavoured the institutionalisation of innovative teaching practices was related to insufficient financial compensation for providing teaching to students from other degree programmes. Dealing with this influx of new groups of learners had been one of the main reasons for developing flexible and pedagogically innovative language learning modules. When it turned out that departments would not be fully compensated for teaching these groups, they were less inclined to implement the innovation. In addition, it had the effect that fewer new staff were needed, which may also be negative for the speed of innovation.

The Taal Vaardig project took into account critical factors of the 4-E model and yielded satisfactory results in terms of project outcomes. Nevertheless, these results have not become fully embedded in the organisation to date. Problems of continuity can be attributed to insufficient staff permanence in key positions for implementation, with additional issues arising from technical
difficulties and planning problems. It should be noted that these problems of institutionalisation are due to factors at the institutional level (inadequate policies, technologies, etc.), which Collis and Moonen (2001) argue should have been taken into account early on in the implementation process (see section 8.4). If such institutional problems cannot be adequately addressed, it will be more difficult to deal effectively with resistance at the grassroots level that the innovation-adoption models of change predict will almost inevitably occur as innovations proceed beyond the original circle of users. As Collis and Moonen (2001) point out it is essential to establish a sense of ownership of the innovation with staff not originally involved in the project (p. 65). The institution has not yet been successful in establishing such ownership with teachers outside the original project, particularly in cases where the linchpin between the project and the institution has disappeared.

In view of the time needed for innovations of this kind to become fully embedded (estimated by Collis and Moonen (2001) to be a process of approximately 5 years), it is too early to make predictions about the likelihood of successful integration of the results of this particular project. But the chances of success will be enhanced if any outstanding problems of implementation at the institutional and individual levels can be addressed by an appropriate balance of top-down and bottom-up strategies. Some suggestions on how this may be achieved have been given in this chapter.