



**THE LANGUAGE FLAGSHIP**

*Creating Global Professionals*

Technology Innovation Center



# Stakeholder Views of the Place of Technology in the Flagship Programs

James Dean Brown, Jonathan Trace, & Julio Rodriguez  
University of Hawai'i at Mānoa



**THE LANGUAGE FLAGSHIP**

*Creating Global Professionals*

# Purpose

Gather information from different stakeholders within The Language Flagship regarding:

- Technology use
- Professional development, collaboration, and the development of technology-based tools
- Technology for use in the Capstone Year
- Promoting language maintenance for graduating learners
- Adaptive technologies

## ***Research Questions***

1. What are the types and common uses of technology that The Language Flagship directors, instructors, and students are familiar with for second language learning purposes?
2. In what ways is technology used for training and professional development purposes in The Language Flagship?
3. In what ways might technology be used to enhance second language learning and teaching in the future in The Language Flagship?

# Participants

## ***LC Directors*** (4 responses)

- Three current directors, one former director

## ***Flagship Directors*** (14 responses)

- Languages taught included included: Chinese (8), Russian (2), one each for Swahili, Turkish, Hindi, and Korean
- Average number of years of teaching experience: Face-to-face 22.54 (14 responses); Fully online = 5.00 (1 response); Hybrid = 5.50 (6 responses)
- All 14 rated their technology familiarity on a four-point scale (with 1 = very unfamiliar to 4 = very familiar) to be on average 2.93 ( $SD = 0.80$ ; ranging from 1 to 4). Average class size was reported by all 14 respondents to be 14.07 ( $SD = 5.57$  ranging from 7 to 25). Three were on a quarter system and 11 on a semester schedule.

## ***Flagship Instructors*** (34 responses)

- Languages taught included Arabic (5), Chinese (15), Korean (7), Russian (4), Swahili (2), and Turkish (2).
- Years of teaching experience: Face-to-face = 9.42 (34 responses); Fully online = 0.89 (7 responses); Hybrid = 2.11 (16 responses)
- All 34 rated their technology familiarity on a four-point scale to be on average 2.91 ( $SD = 0.74$ ; ranging from 1 to 4), which is very similar to what the Flagship directors reported. Average class size was reported by all 34 to be 11.87 ( $SD = 4.93$ ; ranging from 1 to 22). Three on a quarter system and 31 reporting a semester system.

## **Flagship Students (100 responses)**

- Average age: 21.57 years old ( $SD = 5.04$ ; ranging from 17 to 58 years)
- Gender: 45 female, 49 male, and 6 did not answer.
- Academic status: 95 undergraduates, with the other 5 reporting something else (post-bac, alumni, adult special, graduate student, and future graduate student)
- Flagship status: 96 reported that they were flagship students while 4 were not.
- Student self-reported levels in each of the four skills were as follows:

Level	Reading	Writing	Listening	Speaking
Advanced High	11	7	9	11
Advanced Mid	19	20	15	18
Advanced Low	23	20	30	27
Intermediate High	20	21	19	17
Intermediate Mid	21	26	21	23
Intermediate Low	6	6	6	4

- Only six responded that they have taken a fully online course in the last two years for an average of 1.33 years ( $SD = 0.47$ ; ranging from 1 to 2 years). Seventeen answered that they had taken a hybrid course in the last two years for an average of 2.18 years ( $SD = 1.50$ ; ranging from 1 to 6 years). All 100 rated their technology familiarity on a four-point scale to be on average 2.74 ( $SD = 0.89$ ; ranging from 1 to 4), which is a little lower but similar what the Flagship directors and instructors reported.

# Materials

## ***Questionnaires***

- Four questionnaires were developed for each (a) university Language Center directors, (b) The Language Flagship directors, (c) The Language Flagship instructors, and (d) The Language Flagship students.
- Each contained sections for: technology-based teaching and learning tools; open-ended questions related to the challenges and availability of using technology; and demographic questions.

Each questionnaire also contained unique sections aimed at each of the specific populations.

- Flagship directors were asked about collaborations with other institutions, as well as on the use of technology during the Capstone Year.
- Flagship instructors were asked about technology use during the Capstone Year.
- Flagship students were asked about technology use both within and outside of the classroom.

## ***Design***

- Designed by two experts in second language survey research
- Revised based on feedback from Language Center staff and one Flagship director via *Google Docs*

# Procedures

## ***Administration***

- Administered online using *Google Forms*.
- Sent to 23 Language Center directors and 72 Flagship directors
- Also sent out to Flagship instructors and third- and fourth-year Flagship students via Flagship directors
- Included email cover letters describing the study, a link to the questionnaire, and details regarding informed consent.
- Approved as exempt research by the University of Hawaii Human Studies Program internal review board (IRB).

# Results – The Language Flagship Directors

Table 1: *Flagship Directors' Responses on Technology Tools in Language Flagship Classes (in Mean Order)*

How often do you use the following technology-based tools and resources in your language classes in a typical academic year?							
<i>Item</i>	<i>Description</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Never</i>	<i>Sometimes</i>	<i>Often</i>
Q10	General websites	14	2.93	0.26	0.00	7.10	92.90
Q03	Online resources	14	2.86	0.35	0.00	14.30	85.70
Q01	Course Manager	14	2.64	0.61	7.10	21.40	71.40
Q11	Lang. Websites	14	2.29	0.70	14.30	42.90	42.90
Q16	Vocab tools	14	2.21	0.56	7.10	64.30	28.60
Q04	Audio/Video Conferencing	14	2.14	0.64	14.30	57.10	28.60
Q18	Media editing	14	2.07	0.70	21.40	50.00	28.60
Q09	Social Networking	14	1.79	0.77	42.90	35.70	21.40
Q17	Assessment tools	14	1.79	0.67	35.70	50.00	14.30
Q08	Blogs	14	1.57	0.62	50.00	42.90	7.10
Q06	Discussion Boards	14	1.50	0.50	50.00	50.00	0.00
Q07	Corpus Resources	14	1.50	0.63	57.10	35.70	7.10
Q02	Class Website	14	1.43	0.73	71.40	14.30	14.30
Q05	Chat/Messaging	14	1.43	0.49	57.10	42.90	0.00
Q13	Lang. Software	14	1.43	0.49	57.10	42.90	0.00
Q14	Mobile Apps	14	1.43	0.49	57.10	42.90	0.00
Q12	Lang. Exchange	14	1.36	0.48	64.30	35.70	0.00
Q15	Role-play games	14	1.14	0.35	85.70	14.30	0.00



# Results – The Language Flagship Directors

Table 2: *Flagship Directors' Responses on Language Flagship Interactions with Others (in Mean Order)*

Please describe your Language Flagship program's interactions with other groups in a typical academic year.							
<i>Item</i>	<i>Description</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Never</i>	<i>Sometimes</i>	<i>Often</i>
Q21	Government Programs	14	2.36	0.48	0.00	64.30	35.70
Q20	Other Flagship Programs	14	2.29	0.45	0.00	71.40	28.60
Q23	Language Centers	14	2.29	0.59	7.10	57.10	35.70
Q22	Private Programs	14	1.71	0.59	35.70	57.10	7.10

# Results – The Language Flagship Instructors

Table 3: *Flagship Instructors' Responses on Technology Tools in Language Flagship Classes (in Mean Order)*

How often do you use the following technology-based tools and resources in your language classes in a typical academic year?							
Item	Description	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Never</i>	<i>Sometimes</i>	<i>Often</i>
Q01	Course Manager	34	2.68	0.53	2.90	26.50	70.60
Q03	Online Resources	34	2.68	0.47	0.00	32.40	67.60
Q10	General Websites	34	2.68	0.53	2.90	26.50	70.60
Q11	Lang. Websites	34	2.15	0.65	14.70	55.90	29.40
Q16	Vocab tools	34	2.15	0.60	11.80	61.80	26.50
Q18	Media editing	34	1.97	0.62	20.60	61.80	17.60
Q02	Class Website	34	1.91	0.85	41.20	26.50	32.40
Q09	Social Networking	34	1.79	0.63	32.40	55.90	11.80
Q04	Audio/Video Conferencing	34	1.76	0.69	38.20	47.10	14.70
Q17	Assessment tools	34	1.71	0.57	35.30	58.80	5.90
Q06	Discussion Boards	34	1.65	0.64	44.10	47.10	8.80
Q07	Corpus Resources	34	1.62	0.64	47.10	44.10	8.80
Q05	Chat/Messaging	34	1.53	0.61	52.90	41.20	5.90
Q14	Mobile Apps	34	1.47	0.55	55.90	41.20	2.90
Q08	Blogs	34	1.41	0.49	58.80	41.20	0.00
Q12	Lang. Exchange	34	1.26	0.44	73.50	26.50	0.00
Q15	Role-play games	34	1.26	0.44	73.50	26.50	0.00
Q13	Lang. Software	34	1.24	0.42	76.50	23.50	0.00

# Results – The Language Flagship Students

Table 4: *Flagship Students' Responses on Usefulness of Technology Tools in Language Classrooms (in Mean Order)*

In a CLASSROOM setting, how useful do you consider the following technology tools for language learning?							
<i>Item</i>	<i>Description</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Not Useful</i>	<i>Somewhat Useful</i>	<i>Very Useful</i>
Q16	Vocab tools	100	2.51	0.57	4	41	55
Q03	Online Resources	100	2.50	0.57	4	42	54
Q01	Course Manager	100	2.45	0.61	6	43	51
Q10	General Websites	100	2.36	0.59	6	52	42
Q11	Lang. Websites	100	2.30	0.67	12	46	42
Q02	Class Website	100	2.19	0.64	13	55	32
Q04	Audio/Video Conferencing	100	2.09	0.60	14	63	23
Q14	Mobile Apps	100	2.00	0.65	21	58	21
Q09	Social Networking	100	1.99	0.66	22	57	21
Q17	Assessment tools	100	1.97	0.57	18	67	15
Q12	Lang. Exchange	100	1.89	0.61	25	61	14
Q05	Chat/Messaging	100	1.88	0.62	26	60	14
Q08	Blogs	100	1.82	0.57	27	64	9
Q06	Discussion Boards	100	1.78	0.59	31	60	9
Q13	Lang. Software	100	1.70	0.69	43	44	13
Q18	Media editing	100	1.70	0.64	40	50	10
Q07	Corpus Resources	100	1.69	0.63	40	51	9
Q15	Role-play games	100	1.53	0.64	55	37	8

# Results – The Language Flagship Students

Table 5: *Flagship Students' Responses on Use of Tools for Language Learning Outside of Class (in Mean Order)*

OUTSIDE of the classroom, how often do you use the following tools for language learning purposes?							
<i>Item</i>	<i>Description</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Never</i>	<i>Sometimes</i>	<i>Often</i>
Q27	General Websites	100	2.46	0.62	7	40	53
Q33	Vocab tools	100	2.46	0.73	14	26	60
Q20	Online Resources	100	2.22	0.59	9	60	31
Q26	Social Networking	100	1.95	0.68	26	53	21
Q28	Lang. Websites	100	1.83	0.76	39	39	22
Q31	Mobile Apps	100	1.71	0.73	45	39	16
Q21	Audio/Video Conferencing	100	1.70	0.71	45	40	15
Q34	Assessment tools	100	1.67	0.69	46	41	13
Q22	Chat/Messaging	100	1.64	0.77	54	28	18
Q25	Blogs	100	1.40	0.65	69	22	9
Q35	Media editing	100	1.37	0.63	71	21	8
Q23	Discussion Boards	100	1.32	0.56	73	22	5
Q29	Lang. Exchange	100	1.31	0.59	76	17	7
Q24	Corpus Resources	100	1.28	0.55	77	18	5
Q30	Lang. Software	100	1.28	0.49	74	24	2
Q32	Role-play games	100	1.20	0.49	84	12	4

# Qualitative Analyses: The Present Situation

Main findings from open-ended, qualitative responses regarding current technology use:

- Large degree of variation in responses across both topics and participant groups
- Indication that people are using very different technologies to accomplish similar things
- Useful for creating an inventory of the kinds of technologies being used by different programs

Major Themes:

- Availability of technology *training* and professional development opportunities
- Use of technology for *advising* students
- Use of technology for *assessment* purpose

# Qualitative Analyses: The Present Situation

## *Training*

### **Flagship directors** (10 responses)

- Most indicated that technology-related teacher training orientations and workshops are regularly provided within their institutions.
- Attendance at conferences also an avenue for teacher training
- Two respondents clearly found the item unclear, e.g., “the meaning of this question eludes me.”
- One response indicated the need for support:

“The key thing about adopting new technology is TIME. Adding technology to classes (and the whole program in a comprehensive manner) requires a huge learning curve, and lots of experimentation. It would be great if TIC could relieve some of that pressure, by previewing, testing, and packaging technological resources for us to put into practice.”

### **Flagship instructors** (22 responses)

- Responses listed opportunities including: workshops, webinars, and other training at their institutions (or in one case at another institution during summer).

# Qualitative Analyses: The Present Situation

## *Advising*

### **Flagship directors** (9 responses)

- Three said either that no technology was used for advising, that advising was face-to-face, or it was not practical given the low number of students
- Five replied that resources are made available online that help with advising
- One pointed out that students apply online
- Other responses indicated the use of email and *WeChat* communications with advisees

### **Flagship instructors** (25 responses)

- Technology used for:
  - Providing information (e.g., websites, *YouTube*, etc.)
  - Communicating with students (e.g., email, *Skype*, etc.)
  - Keeping track of records (e.g., *Google Drive* is used “to track every student’s record,” *Filemaker Pro*, etc.).

# Qualitative Analyses: The Present Situation

## *Assessment*

### **Flagship directors** (12 responses)

- All responded that they do some form of online testing:
  - 7 indicated that they use some form of OPI
  - 4 said they use tests made available by BYU
  - 3 listed American Council tests
  - 3 indicated using STAMP tests.
  - A few additional home-grown or other tests were indicated by one respondent each

### **Flagship instructors** (19 responses)

- 8 indicated that they use some form of online testing:
  - 3 listed STAMP tests
  - 2 indicated using a form of OPI
  - A few additional home-grown or other tests mentioned by one respondent each
  - Instructors also mentioned classroom test development tools



# Qualitative Analysis: Future Possibilities

Main findings from open-ended, qualitative responses regarding future technology use:

- Again, a large degree of variation in responses across both topics and participant groups
- Indications that The Language Flagship is still exploring new options regarding technology

Major Themes:

- Use of technology for enhancing:
  - *Teaching/learning of languages generally*
  - *Before, during, and after The Language Flagship Capstone Year*

# Qualitative Analysis: Future Possibilities

## *How Could Technology Generally Be Used Aid Teaching/Learning?*

### **Flagship directors** (8 responses)

- Responses varied greatly:
  - “A website with graded readings”
  - “Move our live classroom platform onto apple and android devices”
  - “Some kind of platform so that we could easily share this kind of developed work product with other schools”
  - “We need to develop technology based instruction materials that make foreign language learning more engaging”
  - As one pointed out more generally: “Technology changes all the time. My main interest is keeping abreast so that students know we are not behind the times in our use of technology.”

# Qualitative Analysis: Future Possibilities

## *How Could Technology Generally Be Used Aid Teaching/Learning? (cont.)*

### **Flagship instructors** (19 responses)

- Some requested faster internet service or access to useful websites
- Several wanted more access to equipment (e.g., iPads, a color printer)
- Some suggested specific software they would like to use in the future (e.g., *WordSmith*, *Wimba*)
- One other argued that “for young college students, we need to develop technology-based instruction materials that make foreign language learning more engaging.”
- Overall, instructors did not offer very concrete ideas for new technology. As one indicated:
  - “I'd like more information on what's being used in other institutions”

# Qualitative Analysis: Future Possibilities

## *How Could Technology Generally Be Used Aid Teaching/Learning? (cont.)*

### **Flagship students** (59 responses)

- Overall more specific, concrete suggestions for technologies, such as:
  - Calls for more software in Chinese, Persian, and Russian.
  - Touch screen devices and software that could be used to practice character writing (and account for stroke order in Chinese)
  - Subscriptions to websites like *Pimsleur* and *Rosetta Stone*
  - More use of websites like *WeChat*, *Groupme*, and *FluentU*, as well as programs like *Skritter*, *Anki*, *Quizlet*, and *Pleco*
  - More language input sources like websites, recordings, podcasts
  - Some mentioned technologies at their institutions that worked well
  - One student raved about the usefulness of *Google Docs* for sharing documents and providing feedback.

# Qualitative Analyses: The Capstone Year

## *Before The Language Flagship Capstone Year*

This question centered on technology that would be useful in preparation for the capstone year.

### **Flagship directors** (13 responses)

- “Specifically for capstone preparation? That is hard to distinguish from our general use of technology for language learning purposes.”
- Others responses mentioned videos (4), PowerPoint (3), GLOSS (2), and a variety of other single-mention tools used for things like a pre-departure videoconference where students make presentations to and meet with their overseas host faculty, and a “semester-long series of preparatory talks relating to the Overseas program.”
- In one case, all preparation was handled as a regular part of the language classroom (including etiquette in the host country and cultural differences from America).
- One director pointed out that they do not call their overseas program a *capstone* because it occurs in the penultimate year of their program.

## ***Before The Language Flagship Capstone Year (cont.)***

### **Flagship instructors (18 responses)**

- Several responses indicated a lack of information regarding Capstone preparation:
  - 4 indicated that they did not know; 3 wrote N/A
  - One said that they were not aware of any capstone preparation
  - One said that “American councils administers the overseas program.”
- Other responses indicated specific tools they used:
  - 3 said they use WeChat for preparation
  - 3 mentioned videos for that purpose; 2 cited websites developed to accompany their textbook
  - Other technologies included “PowerPoint presentation pre-departure,” and a preparation “Webinar.”
  - In one case, all preparation was handled as a regular part of the language classroom (including etiquette in the host country and cultural differences from America)

### **Flagship students (75 responses)**

- A wide variety of suggestions were provided by students about what they would like to see used for Capstone preparation purposes, far too many to list here

# Qualitative Analyses: The Capstone Year

## *During The Language Flagship Capstone Year*

This question centered on technology that would be useful during the capstone year, while the students are abroad.

### **Flagship directors (12 responses)**

- Several felt that technology might not be as readily available or flexible in the host country as it is in the US
- One seemed very clear about their current requirements during the capstone year:
  - “These comprise (1) job application portfolio; (2) interactive blog or website; (3) workplace video; (4) two essays describing the internship; and (5) multimedia Powerpoint and final presentation.”
- Most respondents listed what they wanted students to do during this time:
  - Two listed reading online news in target language,
  - Two listed e-portfolios
  - Several listed activities such as: doing online assessment; video-conferencing to “help us to better keep track of students [*sic*] progress and monitor their condition;” and using social media to create online community

## ***During The Language Flagship Capstone Year (cont.)***

This question centered on technology that would be useful during the capstone year, while the students are abroad.

### **Flagship instructors (20 responses)**

- Online activities were suggested by 11 teachers
  - One suggested “A Flagship mobile app which includes (1) messaging tools to communicate with Flagship centers and other Flagship students (2) student discussion forum to post questions or share tips: e.g., Phrase of the day, Cultural tip of the day, How do I say this? (3) Shareable glossary/ notebook for students to keep a record of professional language they use on a daily basis during the internship.”
  - Several others suggested using online chat or Skype to report back to teachers or to avoid “emotional isolation.”

### **Flagship students (67 responses)**

- Most responses centered around what students would like to use during their Captstone Year.
- Many referred to online resources, such as:
  - 16 suggested online dictionaries
  - 4 mentioned Pleco
  - 2 advocated using WeChat



# Qualitative Analyses: The Capstone Year

## *After The Language Flagship Capstone Year*

This question centered on technology that would help with maintenance of the students' language proficiency after the capstone year is completed.

### **Flagship directors** (12 responses)

- Several mentions of online websites and resources for continued “learning and assessment”
- Several responded with specific website ideas
- One director had a fairly comprehensive set of specific ideas: “An idea we’ve been floating for years! A series of online modules for language maintenance would be great. Offered along with alumni services— job opportunities and placement, get togethers, events, etc.”
- Two others specifically mentioned the idea of an alumni network

## ***After The Language Flagship Capstone Year (cont.)***

This question centered on technology that would help with maintenance of the students' language proficiency after the capstone year is completed.

### **Flagship instructors (21 responses)**

- Most suggestions centered around earlier identified technologies such as *Google, Skype, WeChat, and Pleco*
- However, their goals were for the students to continue learning and practicing the language

### **Flagship students (58 responses)**

- Most responses references language maintenance strategies during the Capstone Year
- Many referred to online resources and suggested using many websites, resources, and tools for continuing to learn and practice their language skills:
  - 4 mentioned using videos
  - 3 suggested podcasts, movies, and online dictionaries
  - 2 mentioned using mobile applications

# Conclusions

## **Technology use in the classroom**

- Wide variety of technologies used by all participant groups, but mostly limited to web-based technologies
- Interactive and adaptive technologies were less frequently used
- Similarities between classroom-based technology uses and what students use regarding technology
- However, a lack of innovation in classroom settings may be limiting how much students are aware of technological resources for language learning on their own

## **Trade-offs**

- Technology is difficult to access and implement for many instructors and directors in a way that is both efficient and able to keep up with the changing pace of technology
- Innovation requires resources and training, but value relative to the number of students and its overall usefulness remains uncertain
- Students seem to be a valuable resource for both locating and learning about new kinds of technology

# Conclusions

## **Standardization**

- One way to possibly account for the difficulties in implementing and learning about new technologies for language purposes is to develop shared platforms and tools for learnings collaboratively across Flagship programs
- While the practicality of this remains unexplored, the pooling of resources would seem to be one way to address some of the resistance and challenges for using more interactive and adaptive forms of technology

## **Communication**

- Collaboration and professional development activities seem to be numerous across Flagship programs
- However, communication within programs for the individual stakeholders (directors, instructors, students) might be limiting the availability and buy-in of technology use in the classroom
- All of the suggestions offered by the directors, instructors, and students will be listed and discussed in much more detail in the final report; hopefully, this comprehensive listing and analysis will serve as a valuable resource for all Flagship stakeholders.



**Mahalo!**