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Abstract

Utilization of information and communications technology (ICT) has become a prevailing practice in language education. However, the level of ICT adoption is contingent on an array of elements including teachers’ willingness and their digital literacy. Drawing on the construct of agency, this study aims to explore the extent to which teachers regulate their ICT application in language teaching. Narrative frames were employed to obtain the perspectives and agentive utilization of ICT of three Vietnamese teachers of English (two females and one male) working at three universities in Vietnam. They were invited to reflect on the three different stages of ICT adoption including pre-adoption, actual adoption, and future projections. Findings show that all three participants complimented on the versatility of technology in terms of resources and opportunities for learners’ language practice within and beyond the classroom. Major challenges confronting these teachers involve the lack of dedicated facilities, their adaptability to change in ICT-mediated settings, and time constraints. This study concludes with implications for teachers and education stakeholders in terms of policies and approaches to ICT in language learning and teaching.
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Introduction

Utilizing technological advances in language education is an indispensable trend aiming at enhancing the quality of language learning and teaching and diversifying spaces for language practice (Chun et al., 2016; Richards, 2015; Warschauer, 2000; Warschauer & Healey, 1998). Information and communications technology (ICT) has enabled language teachers to optimize the effectiveness and efficiency of language teaching through a vast supply of teaching resources and platforms for interaction with learners. However, technology remains to be seen as an additional element that provides learners with further language resources and practice. Egbert (2018) points out:

While computer use in language teaching and rapid developments of new technologies have increased the access that students have to language and content, there has not
been a radical change in language teaching methods due to the advent of these new tools. (p. 1)

In other words, there is a lack of systematic approaches to adopting technology that detach themselves from other established methodologies. Further, teachers’ digital literacy may impact on their degrees of confidence in integrating technology in their teaching as well as guiding learners to use it in their learning within and beyond the classroom (Hockly, 2012). These facts have led language teachers to develop their strategies for utilizing technological components based on the availability of such tools and in ways that best suit their own contexts. In low-resource contexts such as Vietnam, the implementation of ICT in language teaching and learning is confronted with numerous limitations in terms of time, facilities and especially teachers’ digital literacy and willingness to adopt ICT in their teaching (Le & Vo, 2014; Nguyen, 2011; C. Pham, 2018). Gaining understandings of English language teachers’ ICT experiences and practices in Vietnam provides significant glimpses of current approaches, challenges and ways forward for language teachers, course coordinators, program designers, and other stakeholders in implementing policies that take advantage of the versatility of the technology. This study draws on the construct of agency and employs narrative frames as the primary instrument for data collection to explore language teachers’ perspectives on and agentive integration of technology in their teaching.

Review of Literature

ICT in Language Teaching

ICT has been applied in language learning and teaching since its inception in the 1960s (Warschauer & Healey, 1998) and has undergone drastic changes along with technological innovation (Chun et al., 2016; Hu & McGrath, 2011). The advent of the computer and then the Internet has brought about significant shifts in the way language is taught and learned (Chao, 2015; Ghasemi & Hashemi, 2011; Warschauer, 2000). Generally referred to as Computer-Assisted Language Learning (CALL), this field has made substantial contributions to diversifying the modes and spaces for language education, incorporating both synchronous and asynchronous platforms. Whereas synchronous communication entails real-time interaction, the asynchronous interface occurs in delayed time and does not require concurrent access among participants (Oztok et al., 2013). Within this study, *ICT* is defined as a “diverse set of technological tools and resources used to communicate, and to create, disseminate, store, and manage information”, specifically for language learning and teaching (Ghasemi & Hashemi, 2011, p. 3098).

According to Hu and McGrath (2011), the implementation of ICT in language education not only supports and enhances the quality of language learning and teaching but also caters to the needs of an increasing number of language learners through self-access learning. This also takes a significant role in providing learners with access to a wide range of authentic materials as well as fostering their autonomy in language learning, subsequently
resulting in lifelong and life-wide learning (Ghasemi & Hashemi, 2011). However, it is important to assess the values of technology about classroom practice as language teaching is highly situated and CALL is strictly contingent on the availability of technological facilities (Beatty, 2013). In other words, the feasibility of ICT-mediated language programmes is mitigated by the existing infrastructure of the language institutions and the adaptability of language teachers to shifts in technological use which may be formidable challenges in certain contexts. These barriers can be attributed to external factors such as the lack of dedicated ICT equipment, access to the Internet and training, or internal factors including teachers’ beliefs and confidence in ICT use, inadequate technical and administrative support, long-term institutional visions for implementing ICT programmes in language education. It is, therefore, necessary to examine ICT practices in specific settings in which it is utilized as a way to shed light on the differing perspectives on the adoption of technology in language learning and teaching.

In Vietnam, the integration of ICT in language education commenced in the 1990s and has seen its proliferation in recent years (Nguyen, 2016). However, ICT-mediated language programs remain in experimental phases in specific schools or educational institutions instead of being deployed nationwide in a consistent and streamlined manner due to challenges in terms of facilities, financial funding and teachers’ digital literacy (Dang et al., 2012; Nguyen, 2016; C. Pham, 2018; T. T. N. Pham et al., 2019). In his study framed within the context of ICT application in language teaching in Hanoi University, Dang (2011) points out a number of factors impacting on teachers’ use of technology concerning the lack of a university plan for ICT adoption, teachers’ attitudes toward extra workloads, their ICT capacity and ultimately the shortage of equipment. The same situation applies to lower levels of language education in Vietnam where teachers are not adequately trained and prepared for integrating ICT in their teaching (Le & Vo, 2014; Nguyen, 2016; T. T. N. Pham et al., 2019). However, the perceived benefits of ICT in language instruction is explicitly acknowledged by the majority of teachers and educational stakeholders for the promotion of more autonomous learning (Dang, 2011), ease of sharing language resources (Dang, 2011; Le & Vo, 2014; C. Pham, 2018), enhanced quality of language learning and teaching (Le & Vo, 2014; Nguyen, 2011; C. Pham, 2018), activation of teachers’ creativity (Nguyen, 2016), and motivational value for learners (Le & Vo, 2014; T. T. N. Pham et al., 2019).

Language Teachers’ Agency in ICT Mediated Settings

In this way, language teachers are viewed as “active agents both inside Language teachers’ approaches to efficiently and effectively utilizing the resources available in their contexts are pivotal to teaching and learning outcomes (Borg, 2006; Lee, 2010). Optimizing the quality of language education requires a strong degree of involvement among language teachers in the process of regulating their teaching practices in response to local conditions and the on-going changes in the field of language teaching, and outside the classroom” in terms of rapport, innovation in teaching, professional development, and personal adaptation to emerging obligations in their working contexts (White, 2018, p. 470). These roles contribute to shaping teachers’ ability to appraise their capabilities concerning the elements that exist in their teaching contexts, inculcating the development of teacher agency. In her
classic definition, Ahearn (2001, p. 112) refers to *agency* as “the socioculturally mediated capacity to act,” highlighting the central function of a person in making decisions as to resolve issues arising from the environment surrounding him or her. This marks out one significant feature of agency, i.e. being highly contingent on the interaction between the person and contextual elements (Kayi-Aydar, 2015; van Lier, 2008; White, 2018). In relation to language teaching, teachers are in the position to opt for best practices that meet the diverse requirements of their working contexts. Teachers’ agency is particularly found to be “imperative for pedagogical transformations” (Hamid & Nguyen, 2016, p. 33) given the changing landscape of language learning and teaching locally and globally.

The ubiquity of ICT in contemporary language education has required language teachers to exercise their agency in adapting or formulating their specific approaches to teaching. Drawing on Rogers and Wetzel’s (2013, p. 63) conceptualization of agency as “the capacity of people to act purposefully and reflectively on their world”, teachers’ *agentive adoption* of technology within this study is contingent on their ability to reflect on their specific teaching context and personal capabilities to develop their strategies for ICT use. This requires teachers to appraise the contextual and personal elements underpinning their language teaching as a way to inform their decisions on the extent to which they utilize technology and how to prepare themselves for the adoption of technological tools and the changes that may occur. In her study on two Japanese language teachers’ development of agency in the context of emergent technology and media, Kitade (2015) finds that teachers are not only accountable for enhancing their ICT literacy and integrating technological elements in their pedagogical practices but also for dissipating such knowledge across local communities. On the one hand, this points to an important task of language teachers in maximizing learning opportunities and building engaging learning experiences for learners through the mediation of technology (Bodnar et al., 2014; Hampel & Hauck, 2006; Liu & Chao, 2018). On the other hand, language teachers are expected to reflect on their ICT practices and assuming mediating roles in their immediate contexts such as school and teaching forums (Kitade, 2015). To fulfil the latter, it is crucial to gain insights into teachers’ accounts of how they use their agency in relation to the choices they make in their professional development, particularly the time of widespread ICT implementation in language education.

**Method**

This study adopts a qualitative research design utilizing narrative frames as a means to explore language teachers’ experiences of ICT use and their reflections on how they agentively integrated technological elements in their teaching. In Barkhuizen and Wette’s (2008) words, “narrative inquiry was the most appropriate way of exploring their teaching practices and contexts” (p. 373). Narrative frames enable language teachers to provide rich accounts of what happens in their real-life teaching and how they utilize their agency in making decisions as to whether to employ or withdraw from certain classroom practices through sentence starters in skeleton structures (Shelley et al., 2013). They contribute to
capturing not only teachers’ day-to-day activities in a nutshell but also the moments that are significant to their changes in perspective which, to some extent, lead to innovation in their teaching and professional development. The narrative frames in the present study involved three primary stages: pre-adoption, actual adoption, and future projections (see Appendix). In the pre-adoption stage, the participants reflected on their language teaching without the mediation of technology and the reasons for the absence of technological elements in their contexts. The actual adoption stage focused on the critical incidents that drove the participants to incorporate ICT in their teaching, initial challenges, and adjustment of their teaching in response to technological development in language education. For their projections of ICT use, the participants depicted the shifts in their perspectives and their responses to the ongoing contextual changes.

For data collection, I first approached six language teachers who worked in different universities in Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam, and had informal conversations with them to introduce the study and find out about their ICT practices. I then invited them to complete the narrative frames through email communication. After two weeks, three of the teachers sent back their responses while the rest of them did not have time to perform this. The analytical procedures drew on a deductive approach to content analysis that involves examining the data in light of “prior formulated, theoretically derived aspects of analysis, bringing them in connection with the text” (Mayring, 2000, para. 13). Accordingly, I read the narratives thoroughly to identify excerpts that entail elements showcasing teachers’ agency in utilizing technology for their language teaching.

Findings

This section reports on the narratives of the three participants in the study at three different stages concerning their retrospective reflections on language teaching prior to ICT adoption, their initial experiences of integrating technology in their teaching, and finally their projections of ICT approaches and practices in the context of ongoing technological advances. These accounts aim to highlight how language teachers exercised their agency in response to the changes taking place in their work contexts through the mediation of technology.

Profile

The three teachers whose narratives are presented in this section include Mr. Nam, Ms. Lan, and Ms. Hoa (pseudonyms are used). They work at three different universities in Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam, and hold master’s degrees in either Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages or English Linguistics. Mr. Nam is in his mid-thirties and has been working as a language teacher for a technical university for approximately ten years. He is one of the pioneers at his university in adopting technological advances in teaching through the use of PowerPoint slideshows, LMS such as Moodle, MYELT (by Cengage), Quizlet, Quia.com, Google Docs and online discussion tools such as Padlet. Ms. Lan and Ms. Hoa have been involved in language teaching at universities specializing in the fields of
Economics, Finance, and Law for over 20 years and have adopted basic ICT tools in their practices such as social media, Microsoft PowerPoint, Wikipedia, and the Google platform. These teachers were invited to participate in this study as they showed interest in the research topic and had experienced numerous changes in their work environments and methodologies through the development of technology.

Language Teaching Prior to ICT Adoption

In their early years of teaching, the three teachers participating in this study attributed their failure to adopt ICT in teaching to the lack of access to the Internet and ICT tools dedicated to teaching. In the words of Mr. Nam, “I really want to have one but I could not afford a laptop computer to design my lessons. And it was pointless to have it as LCD projectors are not available for all classes; if there are any, they are of pretty low quality.” Indeed, within the context of language learning and teaching in Vietnam, implementation of ICT is a rather recent practice (Nguyen, 2016). The shortage of technological devices was the primary deterrent to integrating technology in language education (Dang et al., 2012; Hu & McGrath, 2011). Therefore, these teachers relied on the limited resources including the blackboard, printed materials, and handouts. Ms. Lan’s account of her teaching in those days is as follows:

*I taught my students the content of the course with specific vocabulary and grammar of each field. The students then practiced in class, sometimes they had homework. To make my students more motivated in learning and to help them broaden their knowledge I had to make some photocopies from the materials such as foreign newspapers, magazines, books ... then we could play games, tell stories, sing songs, or read articles to enhance vocabulary. (Ms. Lan)*

With the absence of technology, activities for language learning were only confined to practice in class and homework. T. T. N. Pham et al. (2019) presented a similar situation in which “Teachers are not satisfied with the teaching aids provided with the textbooks and they demand to have more interactive and hybridised ones … so that they could vary the quality of their teaching materials” (pp. 140-141). To motivate her students, Ms. Lan agentively took advantage of authentic texts readily available in her contexts such as newspapers, magazines, and books as additional materials for her students. The same situation applied to the language classes of Mr. Nam and Ms. Hoa. Their lessons were based on printed materials while visual illustrations in the forms of pictures or video clips were rather scarce, resulting in the fact that lessons were not engaging to students. In her reflections, Ms. Hoa found it “an arduous and time-consuming task because everything was done manually. I had to design activities, find examples from English newspapers and magazines, photocopy, and then combine them into neat handouts” to promote students’ language practice both inside and outside of the classroom. In addition, the expenses associated with lesson planning may discourage committed teachers as “there were too many materials I wanted to share with my students. However, most of them needed to be printed, which was costly” (Mr. Nam). Despite his effort, “students didn’t seem to be careful about keeping such materials; in fact, many of
them didn’t.” (Mr. Nam). One of the positive sides against such limitations was the face-to-face interaction with the students that contributed to strengthening classroom rapport. In Ms. Lan’s words, “I had a lot of fun with my students because we could communicate directly. It was easier for us to share our stories and sometimes made jokes about ourselves during lessons.” These examples show the three teachers’ agency in providing students with access to language, further learning opportunities, and, to some extent, an enjoyable classroom atmosphere while being given the constraints in their classroom contexts.

**Teachers’ Initial Experiences with ICT**

With the introduction of ICT in their universities, the three teachers started to integrate technological elements in their lessons. Unlike Mr. Nam who had measurable IT knowledge, it took Ms. Lan and Ms. Hoa plenty of time to improve their digital literacy in response to the changes in their teaching contexts. In Ms. Hoa’s words, “I remember feeling frustrated and tired when I spent a long time making listening tests or putting my files in the right format, or trying to open some files with a strange extension.” However, such challenges in adapting to new technologies did not deter the two female teachers as both of them found technology highly useful for their students. Ms. Lan pointed out that “I could make the lesson more lively and more informative. I could correct my students’ homework at home, we could share the information and contact by email or use social networks.” The rewards of enhancing the quality of lessons and ultimately classroom life as well as the convenience of establishing digital communication between the teacher and students were the main impetuses for these teachers to develop their ICT skills for language teaching (Dang, 2011; Ghasemi & Hashemi, 2011; Le & Vo, 2014).

For Mr. Nam, he wanted to maximize the application of technology in his language teaching in the hope of providing students with access to as many language resources as possible as well as to cater to the individual needs of his students. He stated:

> What I did was digitize all the materials I had so that I could curate them according to the needs of one specific group of students, and I can share with them. That way, they can have a copy, without having to worry about the materials getting lost or left at home. (Mr. Nam)

Mr. Nam’s attempt arose from his previous observations of students’ failure to retain printed materials and the cost associated with printing them. This also ensured that all materials would be available for use instantly in the classroom so that he could carry out classroom activities the way he desired and students could keep up with the progress of the lessons. However, his goodwill was confronted with difficulties in terms of time for digitalizing the class materials and classifying them systematically for quick retrieval when he needed them. He developed his strategies for sorting them out by adding tags to every file so that he could search for them at his convenience. Such processes were at times so strenuous that he repeatedly wanted to give up as it was extra work on top of his already heavy teaching load as a language teacher. Such intention was soon thwarted by the benefits that technology could offer his students, indicating Mr. Nam’s agency not only in his teaching practice but
also in his consideration of the value of ICT in language learning and teaching. In relation to this, Le and Vo (2014) point out that “their [teachers’] beliefs about the positive effects and benefits of ICT on their instruction and their students’ performance motivate them to adopt and integrate ICT in their teaching” (p. 207).

With regard to students’ attitudes toward teachers’ adoption of ICT in English lessons, the teachers’ observations of their students were positive. According to Ms. Lan and Ms. Hoa, their students found lessons more engaging and interesting, contributing to their motivation to learn English. As Ms. Lan stated, “when I let students watch documentaries and then asked them questions, a lot of them volunteered to give their answers. … They didn’t mind extending the lesson for another 10 or 15 minutes to complete an online quiz.” At the same time, they became more responsible for their studies by not only completing classroom tasks but also conducting further learning outside the classroom through the online support of their classroom teachers and peers. Mr. Nam asserted that “They had to work more in class because I didn’t have to spend so much time writing tasks and questions on the board anymore. Homework was also more varied as I asked them to do it online.” This transformation in the way language is taught arises from the fact that “the modern teacher in the ICT era is no longer described as ‘a sage on the stage’ but a ‘guide by the side’” (Ghasemi & Hashemi, 2011, p. 3100). In other words, teachers take the role of facilitators supporting the learning process rather than providers of knowledge in this technologically mediated context. Another advantage of using technology in language education identified by Mr. Nam was that students could provide feedback on lessons anonymously, encouraging them to voice their ideas or complaints confidentially and without the fear of being traced by their teachers. Through the adoption of technology, these teachers could design the types of classroom tasks, the modes of interaction with students, and the methods of obtaining responses from students in their distinct ways, showing the extent to which they exercised their agency in their actual language teaching.

**Teachers’ Projections of Their ICT Practices**

Development in ICT is an ongoing process that requires language teachers to continuously keep themselves up-to-date and innovate their teaching approaches to remain adaptive to technological advances (Chao, 2015; Hockly, 2012). In Mr. Nam’s view, “ICT adoption should not be limited to material sharing and lesson presentations. I started to think about how to maximize students’ interaction in class, both with the teacher and their peers.” This excerpt suggested Mr. Nam’s review of his teaching with the integration of technological elements, his agentive appraisal of what he had achieved, and what he still needed to fulfil in relation to the emergence of new technologies by providing students with more opportunities for interaction in the target language. In addition, one critical incident that contributed to reshaping his perspective on ICT use appears in the following:

*When I started teaching [part-time] at a private university where students are quite demanding. Their tuition fees are kind of high so they don’t just want to study but to have fun in class. I also had reflections on my previous lessons and then realized that I need some changes to refresh myself. (Mr. Nam)*
Mr. Nam’s experiences in the new context helped him realize another aspect of his teaching, namely the creation of a fun classroom atmosphere. Such critical reflections are important because they “encouraged the teachers to continue reflective engagement in the ever-changing and ever-complicated digital learning, teaching, and living context” (Chao, 2015, p. 114). This resulted in his reconceptualization of the roles of language teachers in the time of ICT prevalence as active learners, innovators, and motivators. His view was shared by both Ms. Lan and Ms. Hoa who also reiterated the co-existence of teaching and professional development, especially improving their digital literacy, as well as collegial sharing of best practices in ICT adoption. For the former, Ms. Lan stated: “I think I should improve and update my knowledge not only of the language I am teaching but also the skills for delivering the lessons more effectively through technological instruments.” It means that language teachers not only needed to develop their linguistic insights but also, as (Hockly, 2012) emphasizes, sharpen digital skills for performing their work more effectively and efficiently. Similarly, Ms. Hoa strategies were to “save all the documents or ideas I find useful for my teaching whenever I come across them on the internet. I also go to a lot of conferences on using IT for language teaching”. In the case of Mr. Nam, “I kept attending webinars offered by OUP [Oxford University Press], CUP [Cambridge University Press], and TESOL International Association to keep myself updated with the latest trends.” Regarding the latter, Ms. Hoa presented herself as an inquisitive learner: “I kept asking my colleagues or friends to teach me how to use new software useful for my job” so that she could take advantage of all the benefits of ICT in language education. In the same vein, Mr. Nam suggested that “language teachers should learn from different sources, especially from each other. ... Many of my colleagues often ask me to show them how to use new programs. I am happy to do so.” This sense of collegial support is significant as “teachers themselves will not be able to make the best use of ICT without the help and support of others in the education system” (T. T. N. Pham et al., 2019, p. 151). These revealed that the three language teachers participating in this study utilized their agency in their unique ways; however, their primary aims were to develop their digital literacy and optimize the quality of language teaching through ICT application.

Discussion and Conclusion

Through the narratives of the three teachers working in ICT-mediated environments, this study has shown their experiences in adopting technological elements in language teaching through various stages. Teachers’ levels of willingness to integrate ICT in their classroom practices and beyond were mitigated by many factors including the available facilities, learners’ attitudes towards ICT use, teachers’ digital literacy, and confidence in incorporating technology in teaching, and curricular requirements. This confirms the fact that teacher agency is substantially mediated by the physical and social environment in which it operates (White, 2018). The narratives portray these language teachers as agentive actors in appraising the resources, opportunities, and constraints in their contexts to aptly devise their approaches to integrating ICT in their teaching practices. All the teachers agreed that ICT
implementation in language education was an inevitable trend in language education, aiming to provide learners with diverse learning modes, learning spaces, and access to authentic text for further language practice in the face of the limitations of classroom contact. However, they were subject to an on-going process of updating their ICT knowledge, ensuring that their learners were able to use such technology, and meeting curricular requirements. In this regard, Kitade (2015) points out that “Teachers need to improve the effectiveness of ICT use in their teaching by negotiating differences in the values around ICT held by themselves, their students, and the broader society” (p. 413). These factors require them to exercise their agency in designing activities or tasks and adapting materials that are compatible with not only the traditional delivery of information but also different technological platforms. In the time of ICT popularity, language teachers, therefore, perform multiple roles such as those of learners of new technologies, initiators of students’ passion for learning within ICT-mediated environments and innovators in terms of best teaching practices that promote technological elements (Hamid & Nguyen, 2016; Kitade, 2015; Liu & Chao, 2018; White, 2018).

It is evident from this study that the agency operates dynamically in the context of technological advancement through teachers’ regulation and adaptation of their teaching in response to changes in their work environment. Such contextual shifts have provided them with opportunities for enhancing the quality of their teaching and enabling them to create diverse spaces for their students to learn English; however, development in ICT has also challenged them primarily in terms of keeping themselves up-to-date with the latest technologies, making their learners aware of the value of using technology in language learning and kindling their L2 interest in digitally-mediated settings. The study also shows differing levels of ICT adoption among the three language teachers in their teaching approaches depending on various contextual elements, especially the availability of ICT facilities and the flexibility of the local curricula. It is therefore important that language program designers and course coordinators take into account the problems arising from integrating ICT in language learning and teaching in their contexts, preferably based on the reports of teachers who have hands-on experience with the adoption of technology. Further, education stakeholders need to prioritize specific areas of financial investment relevant to the local context in ways that facilitate teachers' and learners’ access to ICT for more efficient and effective language learning and teaching. For language teachers, sharing best practices emerging from their teaching and providing collegial support is crucial in the context of continuous changes in ICT, thus enabling them to overcome the obstacles relative to their digital literacy and to see the utilization of technology as a comfort zone for conducting innovative lessons rather than further burden teachers must shoulder in their work.
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Preliminary questions

1. How long have you been working as a language teacher?

2. How long have you adopted ICT in your teaching?

3. What elements of ICT have you adopted in your teaching (e.g. using chat forums, Wikipedia, social networks, PPT slides, …)? (Please list as many forms of ICT that you have adopted as you can)

4. Is the use of ICT in language teaching encouraged by your workplace?

Narrative 1: Prior to your adoption of ICT in language teaching

This narrative relates to your language teaching experience and personal reflections on teaching prior to your decision to use ICT in language classes. Please fill in the dotted line with as many details as you can.

Before adopting ICT, my language teaching

I had not adopted ICT in my teaching because

I remember thinking

Narrative 2: Initial experiences with ICT

This narrative invites you to reflect on the critical incident that encouraged you to use ICT, your initial challenges, reflections and revision in relation to your ICT adoption. Please fill in the dotted line with as many details as you can.
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Narrative 3: What happened next

This narrative focuses on how your ICT adoption changed over time, the critical events that contributed to such changes and your personal reflections.

As time went by, I came to realize that

……………………………………………………. One significant event that reshaped my perspective on ICT use in language teaching was

……………………………………………………. From that experience I thought I should ............................................. I kept

……………………………………………………………….. (This relates to how you keep your teaching practices up to date by integrating ICT in your lessons). In relation to ICT adoption in language teaching, I think language teachers should

……………………………………………………………….. In the time of technological advances, language teachers’ roles involve .........................