

# Does Rosetta Stone Declare the Death of the Teacher?

Hamida Abdallah Saafi<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> University of Jeddah, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia

*Received: 16 December 2017 Accepted: 5 January 2018 Published: 15 January 2018*

5

---

## Abstract

Technology ushers in fundamental structural changes that can be essential to achieve significant improvements in all sectors including education. This justifies the great attention that many universities have paid to the incorporation of technology into the classroom in the recent years. The faculty of Science and Arts in Khulais, Jeddah, Saudi Arabia, and in an attempt to keep up with the technological developments, adopted a computer-mediated software called Rosetta Stone. The latter is claimed to perform the same roles as the teacher and yield effective language learning outcomes from the part of learners. Indeed, this paper addressed such claims by identifying the teachers' perceptions towards technology in general and Rosetta Stone in particular. It also aimed to explore the teachers' attitudes towards the potential adjustments they may make to their roles after the introduction of Rosetta Stone into the educational landscape and whether such programs can replace them. Data was gathered via a semi-structured interview and a questionnaire. The results showed that despite their highly favorable opinions towards technology, teachers emphasized the importance of selecting the kind of technology to be employed in the classroom according to its suitability. Findings also mirrored the teachers' views that Rosetta Stone is no substitute for the teacher. This implies that technology cannot set teachers aside or take them over, by contrast, it adds to their roles.

24

---

**Index terms**— technology; integration; learning outcomes; rosetta Stone; teacher roles.  
Does Rosetta Stone Declare the Death of the Teacher?

Introduction y definition learning is the activity or process of gaining knowledge or skill by studying, practicing, being taught, or experiencing something. More specifically, language learning has always been defined as the cognitive process by which humans acquire the capacity to perceive, produce and use words to understand, communicate and interact effectively ([www.merriam-webster.com](http://www.merriam-webster.com)). To achieve this goal, language researchers, scholars and academicians never ceased to come up with up-to -date teaching approaches, methods and tools to be implemented in the classroom. When it comes to the English language and considering the facts that "at present, the role and status of English is that it is the language of social context, political, sociocultural, business, education, industries, media, library, communication across borders, and key subject in curriculum" (Shyamlee and Phil, 2012, p.150), improving the language learning process is regarded as a highly desirable goal to be reached. In recent years, technology has been the subject of interest as it has been claimed that its introduction into the language classroom may yield positive language learning outcomes (Ismail et al (2010)).

The questions that may be posed, in this regard, are about the attitudes of the teachers, as central agents in the classroom (Wainwright (2013)), towards technology employment as well as their perceptions towards their changing role after its introduction into the educational realm.

### 3 III.

---

## 41 1 II.

## 42 2 The Rationale behind the Study

43 As a matter of fact, the worldwide recognition of the importance of technology which invaded all sectors, with  
44 education making no exception, (Shyamlee and Phil (2012)) is the first reason that urges this study to be carried  
45 out. The second reason that stands behind this research refers to the general consensus about the effectiveness  
46 of technology integration in the language classroom as reported by Ismail et al (2010) who asserted that "the  
47 potentially positive outcomes of integrating technology into education have convinced a number of countries to  
48 embark on the use of the internet and information technology in their educational systems" (p. 38). Further,  
49 this paper comes in response to Saqlain et al (2013)'s claim that no research was conducted to explore female  
50 teachers' perceptions towards technology integration in Saudi educational settings so as to confer higher credibility  
51 on previous researches about this topic. In more particular terms, the serious efforts made by the Faculty of  
52 Science and Arts in Khulais to embrace technology and encourage both teachers and students to use it, is still  
53 another reason that urges this study's conduct.

## 54 3 III.

55 Overview of Literature a) The integration of technology in the English language classroom According to Wright  
56 (2008), "technology is everywhere" (p.4). It is no longer restricted to certain universities "with prestigious  
57 departments and research centers" as it was the case in the 90s but has considerably evolved and extended rapidly  
58 since then ??Forteza and Ortiz, 2015, p. 207) to become the normal means of communication and education  
59 (Chapelle, 2003). Indeed, many scholars and educational leaders highlighted its effectiveness in language learning  
60 and considered computer and related internet technology as important educational innovations (Forteza and Ortiz  
61 2015). ??elgrum (2001) also claimed that ICT (Information and Communication Technology) is not only the  
62 "backbone" of the information age, but a "sounding tool" that helps induce educational reforms that will turn  
63 learners into "productive knowledge workers" ( cited in ??avas et al, 2009, p. 20). Almekhaili and Almeqdadi  
64 (2010) went further to assert that technology is a "cornerstone" to improve students' language performance.  
65 Wainwright (2013), on the other hand, pointed out that technology in education gets plenty of hype. Therefore,  
66 she encouraged its introduction into the classroom and considered it a "great way" to guarantee diversity in  
67 learning styles. She listed several reasons why learners need technology in the classroom. As a matter of fact, if  
68 used correctly, technology will help prepare learners for their future careers, which will definitely include the use  
69 of technology. Still, the students become more responsible as technology helps them take more command over  
70 their own learning. Within similar lines of thought, Debela (2008) cited three reasons that make technology-based  
71 learning an indisputably "well-liked mode" namely; convenience, flexibility and economic advantages (cited in  
72 Ismail et al, 2010, p. 40).

73 Additionally, Mustafa et al (2012) stressed the importance of exploiting the "plethora of resources provided  
74 by computer" (p. 426) in learning a second language. The same idea was articulated by Cavas et al (2009) who  
75 highlighted the strong effect technology has in education as "it provides enormous tools for enhancing teaching  
76 and learning" (p. 21).

77 At the empirical level, Viswanathan (2008) conducted a research about the internet effect on education in  
78 India and came to the result that the teaching of the English language is promoted with the help of internet  
79 at all levels of education. With reference to a meta-analysis carried out in 2003 that consisted of 42 studies on  
80 7000 students, technology was found to be very effective and positively affect the learners' achievements as well  
81 as their cognitive and affective skills (cited in Saglam and Sert, 2012).

82 Things, then, have come a long way since Levy (1997) wrote "CALL remains a peripheral interest in the  
83 language teaching community as a whole, still largely the domain of the CALL enthusiast, and there is scant  
84 evidence to suggest CALL has really been absorbed into mainstream thinking, education, and practice" (cited in  
85 Stanley, 2013, p.46).

86 In another vein, Zhao (2003) raised two problematic issues related to technology. The first was about the  
87 terminology itself and described it as an illdefined term that encompasses "a wide range of tools, artifacts, and  
88 practices, from multimedia computers to the internet, from video tapes to online classrooms, from web pages to  
89 interactive audio conferencing" (p. 8). Therefore and according to this author, it is "misleading" to consider  
90 a certain tool as effective as another simply because they are all called "technology". The second issue has  
91 to do with the way how a specific technological tool is used. He argued that "assessing the effectiveness of a  
92 technology is in reality assessing the effectiveness of its uses rather than the technology itself." (p.8). He came to  
93 the conclusion that it is "inappropriate to over generalize the effectiveness (or lack thereof) of one way of using  
94 technology to the technology itself" (p. 10). He went further to stress that the use of the same technological tool  
95 under different circumstances and in different settings may result in different learning outcomes. The same idea  
96 was conveyed by Jung (2005) who claimed that despite their recognized importance as essential teaching and  
97 learning tools, technologies cannot be a panacea for all educational problems. Cavas et al (2009) recommended  
98 that, in education, ICT should not be used as a mere tool to transfer instructional materials but as a means  
99 for "learning, discovering, sharing and creating knowledge" (p.30). In this respect, Albirini (2006) argued that  
100 investments are done in the latest technologies without considering the target group needs and interests (cited  
101 in Cavas (2009), p. 10).

---

102 It becomes evident that we are now at a time in human development where digital technologies are making an  
103 increasingly significant contribution to language learning in many parts of the world (Chapelle, 2003). In many  
104 societies, educational policy makers are trying to redesign and reconstruct their educational systems based on  
105 the new educational paradigms ??Cavas et al, 2009, p.20). The Saudi Government, for example, is striving to  
106 integrate technology at all school levels (Saqlain et al, 2013). In an attempt to fit within this digital era and  
107 seize the effectiveness of educational technology, serious attempts have been made by the Faculty of Science and  
108 Arts in Khulais in terms of technology integration as it has incorporated various forms of technology to support  
109 teaching practices and engage the students in the learning process. The most noticeable of these attempts is the  
110 implementation of Rosetta Stone.

## 111 **4 b) Rosetta Stone program**

112 This program has as objective to raise the overall English language proficiency of the students. It deals with  
113 the four constructs of the language namely; speaking, writing, reading and listening. It also focuses on grammar  
114 and vocabulary. The students can control their own learning as they learn at their own pace. There are three  
115 Levels to each language taught by Rosetta Stone, and each Level contains four lessons. Within these lessons,  
116 there are several units. The layout of the course is so tightly structured to keep the learner on task trying to  
117 learn a language without a real teacher.

118 Rosetta Stone never uses L1 translations or explanations, forcing the users to rely solely on their own intuition  
119 while gradually acquiring the language content necessary for the next level. In order to do this successfully, it  
120 is expected that learners move through the program in a linear progression, expanding on the initial one or two  
121 word building blocks at the beginning of level 1 to some long, grammatically complex sentences in the higher  
122 levels.

## 123 **5 c) The effectiveness of Rosetta Stone**

124 Stanley (2013) fore grounded the importance of such programs in acquiring a language and underlined the positive  
125 attitudes of learners towards them. To put it in his words "some learners have found English learning software  
126 like Rosetta Stone ([www.rosettastone.co.uk/](http://www.rosettastone.co.uk/)) effective for swift acquisition of surface language" (p.36). Indeed  
127 and in an EFL context, learners can really benefit from self-directed vocabulary and grammar-based exercises,  
128 particularly those that monitor voice input and assess the accuracy of pronunciation which becomes possible  
129 through such programs as Rosetta Stone. Wegerif (2004) added that the endlessly patient and non-judgmental  
130 nature of computers makes them perfectly convenient to enable repetitive language learning activities that provide  
131 instantaneous feedback to the user (cited in Stanley);. Still, the effectiveness of Rosetta Stone was defended by  
132 Vesselinov (2009) who found out that after using this program for 55 hours, learners language proficiency level  
133 improved significantly (cited in Lord, 2016). Deward (2013), however, found this program lacking in a number  
134 of areas; specifically its shaky theoretical foundations, cultural in authenticity and the overall limitations of a  
135 nonhuman system, among other limitations. She came to the conclusion that this program cannot be "a viable  
136 replacement of current instruction" (p.61). In the same vein, Lord (2016) argued that such program is still lacking  
137 convincing empirical evidence to support its claimed effectiveness. Santos (2011), on the other hand, subsequently  
138 reviewed Rosetta Stone program and noted that it lacks contextualization in the materials. He added a major  
139 weakness in terms of interaction which he described as poor and limited when compared to real-life conversation  
140 managed by teachers (cited in Lord, 2016). Nielson (2014) concluded that despite the attractive options this  
141 program offers, it is "not yet able to offer an alternative to human support or interaction" (p.125).

## 142 **6 d) Teacher or Rosetta stone**

143 Rosetta Stone is an example of a stand-alone self-paced language learning program. It is claimed that such  
144 programs would be more efficient, effective and enjoyable than the traditional learning forms (cited in Lord,  
145 2016).

146 This software is adopted by the Faculty of Science and Arts in Khulais, Jeddah. It is institutionally embraced  
147 as a way to improve the students' English level. Students have access to this program 6 hours per week in the  
148 language labs. Their performance is automatically assessed and their marks are included in the calculation of  
149 their overall average in the English language subject. While Rosetta Stone is being performed, the teachers are in  
150 the labs just to supervise and ensure that the learners are using the program appropriately i.e. Rosetta Stone is  
151 functioning on the computer. Students are exposed to their computers which are, in this respect, the sole source  
152 of learning. This engenders many concerns about the teachers' positions, availability, functions and roles in the  
153 educational setting.

154 Therefore, exploring teachers' perceptions towards technology in general and this program, in particular, seems  
155 to be of relevance. e) Teachers' perceptions Wainwright (2013) argued that teachers are central to what happens  
156 in the classroom. Bill (1997) confirmed that teachers are "an integral part of any educational system" and  
157 highlighted the significance "to know their concerns and issues through their perspectives" (cited in ??aqlain et  
158 al, 2013, p.148). In this regard and in terms of technology integration, Cavas et al (2009) considered teachers as  
159 the prime actors in implementing ICT in learning and teaching and should be the center of attention. The same  
160 idea was conveyed by Gilakjani (2012)

161 7 who claimed that "to successfully implement the integration  
162 of a new technological tool, consideration of what the imple-  
163 mentation will mean to teachers' personal beliefs and values  
164 is of great concern " (p. 67).

165 Mollaei and Riasati (2013) conducted a research in Iran and found that EFL teachers there perceived technology  
166 use very beneficial as it augmented language learning. Concomitantly, Park and Son (2009)'s study revealed that  
167 the Korean EFL teachers consider computer technology a useful teaching instrument that enhances learning by  
168 providing learners with a variety of language inputs and boosts their learning capabilities in real-life contexts  
169 (cited in ??erc, 2015, p.230).

170 Russell Stannard, a linguistics lecturer at Warwick and founder of a teacher training website, advocated that  
171 those who use technology argued that the advantages are obvious. Indeed, languages and digital technology are a  
172 natural fit. Language development is around four skills-reading, writing, speaking and listening -and all of those  
173 are facilitated by technology. There's a very strong link between the affordances of technology and the type of  
174 things we're trying to do as teachers (cited in Williams (2014)).

175 In an analysis of a correlation between teachers' attitudes and the effective use of technology, Cavas et al (2009)  
176 found out that these two variables are strongly linked. They added that the teachers' attitudes as well as their  
177 talents and desires are accounted for as crucial points that affect the results of technology application. Indeed,  
178 "the basic agent for establishing this system is teachers" (p.21). They reported that the success of integrating  
179 ICT into the classroom will ease the move from the teacher-centered to student-centered mode, one of the major  
180 goals of the communicative language teaching approach.

181 In the same vein, Ismail et al (2010) pointed out that "the success of integrating instructional technology in  
182 teaching and learning languages depends heavily on the attitude and support of the teachers involved" (p.37).  
183 They added that "Teachers are seen to be active agents in the process of changes and implementation of new  
184 ideas as their beliefs and attitudes may support or impede the success of any educational reform" (p.37). As a  
185 matter of fact, their positive attitudes towards computers are "widely recognized as a necessary condition" for  
186 effective technology employment in the classroom (Woodrow (1992) as cited in Ismail, 2010, p.38).

187 Aydin (2007) carried out a research whose sample was 115 Turkish EFL teachers and found that a great  
188 majority of these teachers positively perceive technology use and foregrounded its effectiveness as an educational  
189 tool to reach information (cited in Saglam and Sert, 2012).

190 However, Odabasi (2000) researched the attitudes of 144 Turkish faculty members towards ICT in terms of  
191 familiarity, use and effectiveness and the results indicated that most participants were familiar with outdated  
192 applications and used current educational technology in a rather old-fashioned way (cited in Saglam and Sert,  
193 2012). The same idea was supported by Asan (2003) who carried out a research to explore the teachers'  
194 perceptions and awareness towards three main variables namely specific technologies, the role of technology in  
195 education and the technological problems faced by schools in Turkey. Results revealed that the use of computer is  
196 not a routine part of their teaching practices. Teachers also lack computer capabilities that would allow them to  
197 professionally integrate it within their teaching paradigms. In the same respect, Hawkins (2002) confirmed that  
198 many teachers do not feel comfortable in applying ICT in their educational settings and feel more confident with  
199 their old traditional teaching styles (cited in Cavas ( ??009)). Eugene (2006), on the other hand, investigated  
200 the relationship between teachers' beliefs and technology integration and came to the conclusion that there was a  
201 discrepancy between what these teachers believe and their actual implementation of technology in their teaching  
202 (cited in Gilakjani ( ??012)).

### 203 8 f) The changing role of the English language teacher

204 From a constructivist point of view, Plomp et al ??1996) claimed that the learning process includes four  
205 components that interact: (1) the teacher, (2) the learner, (3) curriculum content and goals, (4) instructional  
206 materials and infrastructure. He argued that any change in one of these four components will definitely lead to  
207 a change in the other three. Consequently the whole teaching and learning process alters (cited in McGhee and  
208 Kozma (2005)).

209 "The computer explosion and internet have transformed the environment in which language is used and learning  
210 takes place" ??Mustafa et al, 2012, p.426). As a result and "with the improvements in technology and its use in  
211 EFL classrooms, the roles of the EFL teachers are also changing" ??Merc, 2015, p. 229).

212 In the same vein, Fernandez (2001) stressed that the teacher's role must change if computer and internet are  
213 introduced into the classroom (cited in Xiaoli ( ??009)). The same idea was conveyed more recently by Shyamlee  
214 and Phil (2012) who reported that "The new era assigns new challenges and duties on the modern teacher. The  
215 tradition of English teaching has been drastically changed with the remarkable entry of technology" (p.150).

216 However, Harris et al ??2002) insisted that teachers should be involved in all stages of technology  
217 implementation and meanwhile be assured that this approach is advantageous over the previous one and  
218 compatible with their teaching practices. Due to the ICT introduction in the classroom, a change is expected to  
219 happen in the teaching and learning styles. To put it in their words "it is not necessarily the technology that has

220 to be innovative, but the approach to teaching and learning has to be" (cited in Cava et al, 2009, p. 32). The  
221 change of teaching and learning mode has brought a great challenge to the English teachers.

222 Several studies stressed the change in the teacher's role when network and internet based technologies are  
223 introduced into the classroom ??Fernandez,2001; ??eng, 2006; ??i, 2008; as cited in Xiaoli (2009)). Xiaoli (2009)  
224 speculated that the role of the teacher is transforming from the traditional knowledge implementer to a multiple  
225 one. In this vein, he pointed out that "the teacher will be less of an information-giver and more of a learning  
226 facilitator" (p.336).

227 Computer-based activities allow the teacher to assume the role of a facilitator whilst students take on an  
228 increasing responsibility of their own learning. In fact, technology will shift the emphasis of activities away from  
229 the teacher towards the students and enhance social interaction (Xiaoli (2009)).

230 The same idea was conveyed by Ghishan and Amarin (2013) who reported that because technology becomes an  
231 integral part of the teaching/learning process, the role of the classroom teacher changes noticeably. Classroom  
232 teachers become facilitators who assist students in constructing their own understandings and capabilities in  
233 carrying out tasks on computer technologies. There is a shift from lecturing and recitation to coaching because  
234 computer encourages the teacher to play the role of a coach. In this regard, Gao (2005), added that in an internet  
235 based teaching environment, the teacher tends towards being a "researcher, director and cooperator" (cited in  
236 Xiaoli, 2009, p. 339).

237 The same author argued that among the traditional teaching drawbacks are the learners' dependence on the  
238 teacher as "the chief instructor, knowledge implementer, and the most important information sources" (p.338).  
239 He stressed that with the advent of internet based programs, these problems were addressed and the learner's  
240 autonomy, one of the major objectives of learning, has increased. He came to the conclusion that one of the key  
241 issues in making this new teaching mode successful is the shift of the teacher's role.

242 In another respect, Saglam and Sert (2012) noted that ICT integration leads to "a pause in studentteacher  
243 interaction" (p.6). In other words, this kind of interaction disappeared because learners become very busy using  
244 their computers and "responded neither to their peers nor to their teachers" (p.6). Shyamlee and Phil (2012)  
245 admitted the truth "that these technologies have proved successful in replacing the traditional teaching" (150).  
246 Selgam and Sert (2012) went further to claim that the integration and implementation of ICT in the curriculum  
247 has radically changed the educational paradigm and by consequence "face to face learning has started to give  
248 way to web-enhanced instruction via internet based resources and systems" (p.1). However, Gilakjani (2012)  
249 warned that "computer technology policy makers need to understand that teachers shouldn't be excluded from  
250 instructional planning when considering future educational computer technology use" (p.73).

251 In the same vein, Xiaoli (2009) affirmed that with the implementation of internet based technologies, a very  
252 limited number of teachers may be needed if roles changed " ??But] in no way should the teacher be denigrated.  
253 The more a teacher participates in the planning of instructional delivery, the greater the fidelity and agreed-upon  
254 implementation design" (p. 339).

255 The American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) acknowledged and highlighted the  
256 importance of technology integration into the classroom. However and due to the complexity of the learning  
257 process, it recognized the pivotal role of eachers in making the language learning experience a success. The  
258 council also stressed the availability of teachers as a crucial condition for successful technology incorporation and  
259 management.

260 In answer to the question "does teaching become obsolete?" Shyamlee and Phil (2012) wrote "all in all, the  
261 multimedia as an assisting instrument, cannot replace the dominant role of teachers and it is part of a complete  
262 teaching process. Teachers still play the leading role that their position could never be replaced by the computer"  
263 (p.154).

264 The following paper proceeds with the hypothesis that the integration of technology-based programs reduces  
265 the role of the teacher and has as objective to answer the following two questions:

266 1. What are the teachers' perceptions towards the integration of technology in the curriculum in general and  
267 that of Rosetta Stone in particular? 2. What are the teachers' perceptions towards their changing role after the  
268 introduction of Rosetta Stone?

269 IV.

## 270 9 Methodology a) Subjects

271 This study is based on data gathered from a group of participants which includes 26 non-native English language  
272 teachers currently working at the Faculty of Science and Arts in Khulais that is located in Jeddah, Saudi Arabia.  
273 These participants have a varying teaching experience ranging from 2 to 20 years. They are either holders of  
274 master or PhD degrees in applied linguistics or literature and teach different English language subjects such as  
275 poetry, grammar, reading, phonetics?etc. All of them had an experience with Rosetta Stone program given that  
276 they work as labassistants as part of their teaching duties.

277 It is worth noting that all the participants are female and this choice is made intentionally for cultural and  
278 religious considerations.

### 279 10 b) Instruments

280 The instruments used in the data collection consisted of a semi-structured interview (appendix I), and a teacher  
281 questionnaire (appendix II).

282 The semi-structured interview was conducted to obtain more comprehensive information as well as to better  
283 understand the attitudes of the teachers towards Rosetta stone implementation and their changing role. This  
284 kind of instrument as articulated by Dunn (2005) "has some degree of predetermined order but still ensures  
285 flexibility in the way issues are addressed by the informant" (p.80). Indeed, the interviewer follows the guide,  
286 but is still able to follow topical trajectories in the conversation that may differ from the guide if need be. In  
287 this research, all the interviewees have working hours at the language labs where Rosetta Stone is employed.

288 To confer a higher reliability on this research, a second instrument namely; a teacher's questionnaire was used.  
289 It was developed by the researcher herself and was administered and welcomingly completed by the teachers  
290 who appreciated the contribution to this research. This teacher's questionnaire consists of three parts each part  
291 contains 10 items. The first intends to explore the teachers' perceptions of technology integration in the curriculum  
292 as a whole. The second part investigates the teachers' attitudes towards the application of Rosetta Stone. The  
293 third part, on the other hand, elicits the teachers' views about their changing role after the implementation of  
294 Rosetta Stone. The questionnaire used a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1= strongly disagree to 5= strongly  
295 agree.

296 In an attempt to obtain more objective answers and in order not to orient the informants, the semi structured  
297 interview was conducted before administering the questionnaire.

298 V.

### 299 11 Results and Implications

300 It is worthwhile to note that the average response value for each statement was calculated by adding the response  
301 values of each teacher by statement (1, strongly disagree; 2, disagree; 3, neutral; 4, agree; 5, strongly agree) and  
302 then dividing them by the total number of respondents (26). The same approach was operated on the three  
303 variables on this paper.

304 Table1: Percentage of respondents for each category statement concerning their perceptions towards technology  
305 integration in the classroom in general Table ?? above displays the results concerning the first research question  
306 namely the teachers' perceptions of technology integration in the language classroom. The responses towards  
307 the statements did not have wide variations. As a matter of fact, the average response value is near 4 or higher.  
308 This reflects the teachers' highly positive perception of technology integration into the language classroom and  
309 its effectiveness in developing and improving the language teaching process which, in turn, helps to achieve better  
310 learning outcomes from the part of the students.

311 As mirrored in table 1, most of the respondents agree or even strongly agree that technology introduction is  
312 a must (96%) and that technology literacy has become one of the basic skills of teaching (92%).

313 Be it the case and as reflected through the table, teacher training is highly recommended (100%). The same idea  
314 was articulated by Saglam and Sert (2012) who asserted that technology is changing the educational paradigms  
315 very rapidly and warned that teachers may be caught unguarded due to the lack of professional training in  
316 this aspect. Further, findings showed the importance of technology incorporation in the classroom and thus the  
317 urgent need for teacher training in this field. Indeed, all the participants confirmed that technology integration  
318 becomes a necessity and therefore teachers as material developers should be trained for successful technology  
319 integration. This conforms to Jung ( ??005 challenges. These challenges, in turn, place new demands on teachers  
320 to incessantly retrain themselves and acquire new skills and knowledge while maintaining their jobs.

321 The same ideas were conveyed through the interviewees' answers. As a matter of fact, 23 of the teachers  
322 reported that their competency in technology is highly required and that they use different kinds of technologies  
323 in their classrooms. They argued that the application of technology becomes evident. "It goes without saying  
324 that I use my computer, internet, different types of software in my classroom", one of the teachers commented.  
325 This conforms to Chapelle (2003)'s conclusion. To put it her words "in the 21 st century, English language  
326 teachers apparently need to add another thick layer to the object of their critical thinking reflection-technology"  
327 (p.9). All the participants in this study asserted that technology helps to realize the teaching goals. This supports  
328 Saglam and Sert (2012)'s claim that technology has a great potential as a teaching tool.

329 A great majority of the participants in this study hold favorable attitudes towards the use of technology in  
330 the language classroom and attributed this to such variety of options that technology affords as making teaching  
331 interesting and more productive in terms of improvements. Shyamlee et al (2012) came to the same conclusion  
332 and proved that "technology has a positive role in promoting activities and initiatives of student and teaching  
333 effect in English class" (p.151). 12. I know why Rosetta Stone is an integral part of the curriculum and the  
334 rationale behind its diffusion in it. 13. Rosetta Stone is a reliable software that encompasses all language  
335 constructs (grammar, vocabulary, listening, reading?..etc.) 14. Rosetta Stone is a well-liked teaching mode. 15.  
336 Rosetta Stone is an effective application that results in higher learning achievements. 16. Rosetta Stone raises the  
337 students interest, engagement and motivation in learning the language as it offers visibility and liveliness where  
338 sounds and pictures are set together. 17. Using Rosetta Stone would require more effort from the learners. As  
339 indicated through the table above, most of the teachers displayed a self-evident ignorance of why Rosetta Stone  
340 was introduced to the language classroom given that the average response value for each statement was near 3

341 or lower. 71% of the respondents do not know if Rosetta Stone is reliable to achieve better learning outcomes.  
342 They either disagree or even strongly disagree that such software can nurture the learners thinking potential.

343 One of the interviewees argued that "teachers can guarantee the students effective learning outcomes in many  
344 ways, while Rosetta Stone cannot," she argued that "Rosetta Stone cannot provide feedback".

345 This would be similar to that of De Waard (2013)'s findings as she claimed that language classrooms are  
346 structured by putting students in the kinds of situations they would encounter in real life. They are also given  
347 an abundance of grammar support. She added that Rosetta Stone software is simply not flexible enough to allow  
348 for deep learning of a foreign language. Without a focus on structure or grammar, she suggested, students are  
349 merely memorizing words, not learning to speak a language.

350 One important implication that we came to in this paper is that the teachers do not oppose technology  
351 integration in the classroom. "We are protechnology," stated one of the respondents, "when it is properly  
352 selected". What matters, here, is the kind of technology being applied. As such, after being selected, technology  
353 effectiveness in terms of learning outcomes should be assessed. Indeed, technology should not be blindly embraced.

## 354 12 Year 2018

355 Volume XVIII Issue XIII Version I ( G ) As seen in Table 3, the average response for the first six statements is  
356 almost 4 which indicated that most of the respondents agreed that after the introduction of Rosetta Stone, their  
357 roles changed. This supports Proctor (2002)'s claim that the implementation of Rosetta Stone poses challenges  
358 and urges the teachers to make adjustments to their traditional activities. Practically speaking, most of the  
359 teachers strongly agreed that the teacher's voice is replaced by the computer sound and that his/ her analysis  
360 was substituted by visual images which justifies the respondents consensus that Rosetta Stone relatively limits  
361 the teacher's roles in the leaning process and therefore hampers their productivity in the classroom. One of the  
362 informants protested "with Rosetta Stone, the students do not need the teacher, they need a technician may be".  
363 Another complained "my students are exposed to the computer and barely notice me in the classroom".

364 It is worth noting, however, that all the respondents displayed a strong opposition towards the last four items  
365 on the questionnaire. This implies that despite their admission of their changing role, teachers still perceive  
366 themselves as the only agents who are able to pass on certain crucial skills to their students. The same idea  
367 was conveyed by Wright (2015) who stated that a teacher does not only transmit knowledge; s/he guides her/his  
368 students. Teachers are mentors who encourage students to develop critical thinking skills and apply them to real  
369 life. Indeed, 23 of the respondents do not perceive that students can reach a proficiency level by relying solely  
370 on Rosetta Stone software by contrast they fore grounded the importance of input and guidance from a qualified  
371 teacher. All of the teachers either disagree or even strongly disagree that teaching can in anyhow be archaic.  
372 Through the semi-structured interview, the teachers stressed that "Rosetta Stone cannot in anyway replace the  
373 teacher??it's just a program and is no way a substitute of the teacher", "teaching can never be obsolete, be  
374 it Rosetta Stone or whatever program applied". The same idea was conveyed by Shyamlee et al (2012) who  
375 highlighted the paramount importance of technology but "teachers still play the leading role that their position  
376 could never be replaced by the computer." (p. 154).

377 "While technology will certainly help to promote the learning process, it is useful -sometimes essentialto have  
378 a real live human who gives valuable help. Will these technologies mean ???fewer teachers? Let's hope there will  
379 always be a friendly human face to brighten up your learning experience" expressed one of the informants. As  
380 a matter of fact, this lends strong support to Wright (2013)'s claim which described the teachers as role models  
381 that create trust and inspire students in an environment where learning occurs. She added that technology alone  
382 cannot offer these skills.

383 Hence, an important issue appears in this respect that is the necessity to consider teachers attitudes before  
384 employing Rosetta stone or any other kind of technology into the English language classroom. Indeed, Shyamlee  
385 et al (2012) insisted that the teachers are to determine whether or not to adopt multimedia technology. They  
386 suggested that when it comes to language curriculum, teachers play a pivotal role in the decision making process.  
387 Therefore, the success of any implementation rests on the teacher engagement and a deep understanding of the  
388 technology to be incorporated.

## 389 13 VI.

## 390 14 Study Limitations

391 Before moving on to concluding remarks, it seems of relevance to point out that the current study results may  
392 be confounded by a number of issues, namely; the focus on a single application in a relatively short time. Hence  
393 the need for studies that evaluate the effectiveness of more comprehensive uses of technology over a longer period  
394 of time is very much higher recommended for the sake of reliability as suggested by Zhao (2003).

395 Additionally, the conclusions drawn through this research are very much the opinions of a relatively restricted  
396 number of female teachers. Despite their recognized importance, attitudes and perceptions alone cannot be  
397 reliable to measure technology successful incorporation. This may lay the ground for more researches to be  
398 conducted and proficiency level tests to be taken in order to come up with more definite results about the  
399 potential effectiveness of Rosetta Stone program and its impact on the learners language achievements. As a  
400 matter of fact, A clear cut answer to the question whether technology could substitute the teacher cannot be

## 16 CONCLUSION

---

401 obtained through a mere elicitation of the teachers perceptions as many other variables may interact, therefore  
402 more investigation should be sought. Additionally and according to ??elgrum and Plomp (1996), students are an  
403 important element in the teaching/ learning process, thus, their views about what helps to improve their learning  
404 is substantial. However, this paper did not cover such views. In this respect, students' perceptions seem to be  
405 significant if technology is to be successfully incorporated within the curriculum.

## 406 15 VII.

## 407 16 Conclusion

408 It goes without saying that the internet and computer explosion have transformed the environment in which  
409 language is used and learning takes place. In this vein, the present paper addressed the growing faculty concern  
410 that software could replace classroom teaching with a particular focus on the role of the teacher. Among the  
411 conclusions drawn from this research is that in this digital era and within the English language classroom  
412 boundaries, to apply technology or not seems to be an irrelevant question. The real issue is which technology  
413 to introduce and how and in what ways the uses of this technology are effective in improving language learning.  
414 Given that they positively perceive technology integration, teachers should foster their technology competencies  
415 in order to successfully integrate it in their classrooms. Therefore, more skills are needed from the part of the  
416 teachers. Indeed, modern developments of innovative technologies cannot replace the teacher; by contrast, they  
417 have provided new possibilities to teaching professions.

418 Ideally speaking, the purpose of both traditional and computer-mediated software language learning processes  
419 is to provide a space in which the facilitation of language learning itself can take place and thus better language  
420 learning outcomes may be achieved. A partnership of such processes and more would make language learning  
421 a better journey. Further researches to deeply investigate the relationship between teachers' pedagogical beliefs  
422 and technology use in education, which becomes essential, are still needed to enrich the educational landscape.

423 Instructions: Please read each statement and then tick the number which best shows how you feel.  
424 1= strongly disagree 2= disagree 3= neutral 4= agree 5= strongly agree Questions 1 2 3 4 5 Your perception of  
425 technology 1-Nowadays technology introduction into the language classroom is a must. 2-Technology introduction  
426 into the classroom is effective in education.

427 3-The teacher's competency in technology helps to successfully integrate it into the curriculum. 4-The use  
428 of technology helps improve the English language learning. 5-The use of different kinds of technologies in the  
429 classroom is highly recommended. 6-Technology integration helps me to achieve my teaching objectives. 12-I  
430 know why Rosetta Stone is an integral part of the curriculum and the rationale behind its diffusion in it. 13-Rosetta  
431 Stone is a reliable software that encompasses all aspects of the language (grammar, vocabulary, listening,  
432 speaking?.etc.) 14-Rosetta Stone is a well-liked teaching mode. 15-Rosetta Stone is an effective application that  
433 results in higher learning achievements. 16-Rosetta Stone raises the students interest, engagement and motivation  
434 in learning the language as it offers visibility and liveliness where sounds and pictures are set together. 17-Using  
435 Rosetta stone would require more effort from the learners. Year 2018

436 Volume XVIII Issue XIII Version I ( G )

437 28-Rosetta Stone can provide that high quality language instruction as done by a qualified English teacher.  
438 29-Even with the provision of such programs as Rosetta Stone, students still need input and guidance from  
439 a qualified teacher to learn the language effectively. 30-After the introduction of Rosetta Stone, teaching has  
become obsolete. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11

## 2

Statement	1 (%)	2 (%)	3 (%)	4 (%)	5 (%)
11. I have a full understanding of what Rosetta Stone is, its vision and how it works.					

Figure 1: Table 2 :

---

**3**

Statement	1 (%)	2 (%)	3 (%)	4 (%)	5 (%)
21.					

Figure 2: Table 3 :

---

<sup>1</sup>© 2018 Global Journals Does Rosetta Stone Declare the Death of the Teacher?

<sup>2</sup>© 2018 Global Journals Does Rosetta Stone Declare the Death of the Teacher?

<sup>3</sup>© 2018 Global Journals Does Rosetta Stone Declare the Death of the Teacher?

<sup>4</sup>© 2018 Global Journals Does Rosetta Stone Declare the Death of the Teacher?

<sup>5</sup>© 2018 Global Journals Does Rosetta Stone Declare the Death of the Teacher?

<sup>6</sup>© 2018 Global Journals Does Rosetta Stone Declare the Death of the Teacher?

<sup>7</sup>© 2018 Global Journals Does Rosetta Stone Declare the Death of the Teacher?

<sup>8</sup>© 2018 Global Journals Does Rosetta Stone Declare the Death of the Teacher?

<sup>9</sup>© 2018 Global Journals Does Rosetta Stone Declare the Death of the Teacher?

<sup>10</sup>© 2018 Global Journals Does Rosetta Stone Declare the Death of the Teacher?

<sup>11</sup>© 2018 Global Journals Does Rosetta Stone Declare the Death of the Teacher?



### 440 .1 Appendix i

441 A semi-structured interview

442 [ International Journal of Business, Humanities and Technology] , *International Journal of Business, Humanities and Technology* 3 (1) p. .

444 [Networks] , Securedge Networks . <http://www.securedgenetworks.com/blog/10> -Reasons-Todays-  
445 Students-NEED-Technology-in-the-Classroom

446 [Almekhali and Almeqdadi ()] , A G Almekhali , F A Almeqdadi . 2010.

447 [Wainwright ()] *10 Reasons Today's Students Need Technology in the Classroom*, A Wainwright . 2013.

448 [Cavas et al. ()] 'A Study on Science Teachers' Attitudes toward Information and communication Technologies in Education'. B Cavas , P Cavas , B Karaoglan , T Kisla . *The Turkish online Journal of Educational Technology* 2009. 8 (2) p. .

451 [Saqlain et al. ()] 'Are English language teachers in Saudi Arabia ready to integrate technology?'. N Saqlain , F Al-Qarni , N Ghadi . *Procedia-Social and Behavioural Sciences*, (edia-Social and Behavioural Sciences) 2013. 103 p. .

454 [Wright ()] *Can Technology Replace Teachers*, L Wright . <http://www.ipadin-schools.com/310/can-technology-replace-teachers/> 2015.

456 [Asan ()] 'Computer Technology Awareness by Elementary School Teachers: A Case Study from Turkey'. A Asan . *Journal of Information Technology Education* 2003. 2 p. .

458 [Gilakjani ()] 'EFL Teachers' Beliefs toward Using Computer Technology in English Language Teaching'. A B Gilakjani . *Journal of Studies in Education* 2012. 2 (2) p. .

460 [Chapelle ()] *English language learning and technology*, C Chapelle . 2003. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

462 [Wright ()] *Glut Mastering information through the ages*, A Wright . 2008. Washington. D.C: Joseph Henry Press.

463 [Proctor ()] *Handbook for Teachers. USA: Fairfield Language Technologies*, B L Proctor . 2002.

464 [Jung ()] 'ICT-Pedagogy Integration in Teacher Training: Application Cases Worldwide'. I Jung . *Educational Technology & Society* 2005. 8 (2) p. .

466 [Stanley (ed.) ()] *Integrating Technology into Secondary English Language Teaching*, G Stanley . G. Motterram (ed.) 2013. London: British Council. p. . (Innovations in learning technologies for English language teaching.)

468 [Dunn ()] 'Interviewing'. K Dunn . *Qualitative Research Methods in Human Geography*. 2 nd ed. ed. Iain Hay, (Oxford) 2005. Oxford University Press.

470 [Dewaard ()] 'Is Rosetta Stone a Viable Option for L2 Learning?'. L Dewaard . *ADFL Bulletin* 2013. 42 (2) p. .

471 [Williams ()] *Is technology a silver bullet for language teaching and learning?* The Guardian, M Williams . <http://www.theguardian.com/tea-cher-network/teacherblog/2014/may/12/technology-language-teaching-learning-pedagogy> 2014.

474 [Ghishan ()] *Learning With Technology from a Constructivist Point of View*, Amarin Ghishan . 2013.

475 [Mcghee and Khozma ()] *New Teacher and Student Roles in the Technology-Supported language Classroom. The Friday Report*, R McGhee , R Khozma . <http://christycain.typepad.com/fridayreport/200> 2005.

477 [Saglam and Sert ()] 'Perceptions of In-Service Teachers Regarding Technology Integrated English Language Teaching'. A G Saglam , S Sert . *Turkish Online Journal of Qualitative Inquiry* 2012. 3 (3) p. .

479 [Perceptions of Technology Integration in the United Arab Emirates School Classrooms. Educational Technology and society] *Perceptions of Technology Integration in the United Arab Emirates School Classrooms. Educational Technology and society*, 13 p. .

482 [Forteza and Ortiz ()] 'Quality standards for the self-learning of languages through the internet'. F R Forteza , R S Ortiz . *Procedia-Social and Behavioural Sciences* 2015. 187 p. .

484 [Zhao ()] *Recent Development in Technology and Language Learning: A Literature Review and Meta-analysis*. The Computer Assisted Language Instruction Consortium, Y Zhao . 2003. 21 p. .

486 [Lord ()] 'Rosetta Stone For Language Learning: An Exploratory Study'. G Lord . *The IALLT Journal of Language Learning Technologies* 2016. 46 (1) p. .

488 [Nielson (2011)] 'Self-Study with Language Learning Software in the Workplace: What Happens'. Katharine B Nielson . *Language Learning and Technology* 2011. July 2014. 15 p. .

490 [Shyamlee and Phil ()] D S Shyamlee , M Phil . *Use of Technology in English Language Teaching and Learning": An Analysis*. International Conference on Language, Media and Culture, 2012. 33 p. .

492 [Ismail et al. ()] 'Teachers' Perceptions of the Use of technology in Teaching Languages in United Arab Emirates Schools'. A S Ismail , A G Almekhali , M H Al-Mekhaly . *International Journal for research in Education* 2010. 27 p. .

## 16 CONCLUSION

---

495 [Xiaoali ()] 'The Roles of Teachers in a Network-based Teaching Mode of Listening and Speaking in College  
496 English'. Z Xiaoali . <http://www.seiofbluemountain.com/en/search/index> *Science Innovation Aca-*  
497 *demic Frontier* 2009.

498 [Pelgrum and Plomp ()] *The use of computers in education worldwide: Results from a comparative study in 18*  
499 *countries*, W Pelgrum , T Plomp . 1991. Chicago, IL: American Educational Research Association.

500 [Mustafa et al. ()] 'Using Internet for Learning Vocabulary among Second Language Learners in a Suburban  
501 School'. H R Mustafa , N Sain , N Z Razak . *Procedia-Social and Behavioural Sciences* 2012. 66 p. .

502 [Merc ()] 'Using Technology in the Classroom: A Study with Turkish Pre-Service EFL Teachers'. A Merc . *The*  
503 *Turkish online Journal of Educational Technology* 2015. 14 (2) p. .

504 [Volume XVIII Issue XIII Version I ( G )] *Volume XVIII Issue XIII Version I ( G ),*