

The Use of Language Laboratory in TEFL from University Students' Perspective

Nedaa Mahmoud Khalil

Researcher in TEFL

The World Islamic Sciences and Education University, Amman, Jordan

E-mail: nadooshkhalil@yahoo.com

Salem Saleh Ibnian

Associate Professor

The World Islamic Sciences and Education University

E-mail: salem_ibnian@yahoo.com

Abstract

The current study, through the descriptive approach, aimed to unveil the extent to which Jordanian universities use laboratories (labs) in teaching English, from the perspective of students. To achieve goals of the study, a relevant questionnaire with (25) items was designed.

The study sample comprised (230) male and female students selected via stratified – random sampling from the following Jordanian Universities: The World Islamic Sciences and Education University, Applied Balqa University, Amman National University, and Applied Sciences University.

The results revealed that using language lab for teaching English rated medium, from the perspective of students. They also revealed that there were differences with statistical significance at the function level ($\alpha = 0.05$) attributed to type of the university in favor of the private ones. But, there were no differences with statistical significance at the functional level ($\alpha = 0.05$) attributed to academic year or gender.

The study recommends paying more attention to using language labs in teaching English in Jordanian universities.

Keywords: English language lab; Extent of use; Jordanian university students.

1. Introduction

Teaching has drastically changed our life in several fields: industrial, economic, and medical etc. It made our life much easier, especially in the field of communication. Therefore, access to information no more needs effort and time or moving from one place to another to gain knowledge.

One of the foremost fields in which technology helps to develop is the field of teaching and learning as it assists teachers to deliver information to students in an easier and more interesting way.

Everybody likes to learn English because it is an international one used worldwide. Thus, whoever knows English will be able to delve deep in knowledge that he /she needs for his career. This is the motive behind the thrust for learning it. In addition, those who have mastery over the language can easily communicate with other people in other countries as it is used either as a foreign language or a second one (Ameja & Amandeep, 2012).

As learning English might not be easy to get through direct contacts with native speakers, using technology could be of help in this respect. Patel (2013) pointed out that technology has a unique value in teaching as it helps the teacher make the process more interesting.

With the increasing awareness of how functional technology is in teaching English, it has to be a part of the teaching learning process. Because the fundamental issue for creating a language skill is practice, the significance of language labs emerged. What is a language lab? (Bader, 2008) defined it as a room in a school, college, training institute, or university which holds special equipment that help students to learn a foreign language through listening to cassettes or compact disks, or through watching videos. What distinguishes language lab is the repetitive listening which reinforces students' structure and vocabulary (Mambo, 2004).

Najah (2013) also revealed that the lab helps students to practice good listening and double their abilities in speaking the language. In addition, it plays a significant role in improving listening and communication among students.

Due to the function labs perform in teaching English, the researchers see that Jordanian universities need to pay more attention to using labs in the process of teaching. Thus, the current study comes to investigate the extent to which language labs are used in Teaching English as a Foreign Language (TEFL), from the perspective of students.

1.1. Problem of the Study

Learning a foreign language has always been a big challenge for most of the learners in their educational background (Farrington 1999, as quoted in Bataineh and Mayyas 2017).

A large number of studies conducted in the field of TEFL indicated that the problem of English Language learning is that teaching methods still focus more on lecturing than on making use of technology, including language labs, instead. Al-Hmoud (2014), Al-Ghaith (2017) and Rummana (2019) stressed that English language instructors need to be trained on how to make use of technology, such as language labs, to achieve objectives of the educational process, mainly in the field of foreign language teaching and learning.

The researchers, being English language instructors, noticed how significant using lab is in teaching and how defective are the methods which are still used in this domain. Thus, the current study comes to investigate the extent of use of Language Laboratory in TEFL from University Students' Perspective.

1.2. Questions of the Study

The study addresses the following questions:

1. To what extent are language labs used in Jordanian universities?
2. Are there differences, with statistical significance at the function level ($\alpha = 0.05$) between arithmetic means of language lab use by students of Jordanian university attributed to type of university (state or private)?
3. Are there differences with statistical significance at the function level ($\alpha = 0.05$) between arithmetic means of using language lab by Jordanian university students attributed to academic level (freshman, sophomore, Junior, and senior)?
4. Are there differences with statistical significance at the function level ($\alpha = 0.05$) arithmetic means of using language lab by Jordanian university students attributed to gender (male, female)?

1.3. Significance of the Study

From the theoretical perspective, the significance of the study lies in examining the extent to which language labs are used in teaching English language from the perspective of students. To the best knowledge of the researchers, studies on this issue were rare.

From the empirical perspective, the significance can be outlined in the following:

1. The study might provide people, in charge in the Ministry of Higher Education, with pioneering suggestions about using language labs both in schools and universities.
2. It might also recommend, for researchers and educators, methods of using labs in a better way.

1.4. Study Limitations

The study limits are as follows:

1. Human limitation: it is limited to students of Jordanian universities majoring in English language and literature.
2. Place limitation: The World Islamic Sciences and Education University, Applied Balqa University, Amman National University, and Applied Sciences University.
3. Time limitation: Summer semester 2018/2019
4. Objective limitation: a questionnaire designed to measure the extent to which language labs are used in teaching English from the perspective of university students.

1.5. Terminology and Procedural Definitions of the Study

The study includes the following terms and procedural definitions:

- Extent of use: It means the extent to which professors in Jordanian universities use labs in teaching English. This is measured by the questionnaire relevant to the issue.
- Language lab: Mambo (2004) defined it as an environment designed to reinforce learner's foreign language skills. It is equipped with digital sets cassettes, videos, and computers which provide a field to practice listening and speaking skills in addition to vocabulary and syntax. The researchers procedurally define it as a room with recording sets and headsets through which the student can train at listening and recording. It also has computers connected to internet.
- Students of Jordanian universities: They are B. A students majoring in English language and literature in state and private aforementioned universities during summer session of 2018/2019.

2. Literature Review

As interest is increasing in learning English, and as technology can be a good aid in this respect, the researchers reviewed some major works written on the use of language lab.

Learning a foreign language has recently switched from the method of writing to that of speaking which necessitated using labs. The new attitude toward learning language emphasizes that it can be acquired through listening to native speakers and mimicking them till it becomes a part of the learner's traditional behavior.

The influence of technology on EFL teaching and learning has brought many positive effects. Using technological tools in the learning process creates better communication for the learners. (Rodinadze & Zarbazoa, 2012).

Ibnian (2018) pointed out that the use of language labs in TEFL could provide the students with an opportunity to play an effective role in the learning process and shift instruction to a learner-centered approach, which is in line with the current trends in TEFL field. In addition, the use of language labs in the process of teaching and learning is supposed to enhance the presence of independent learners equipped with life skills that may enable them to face the difficulties of life, away from the help of teachers or parents.

In language labs, students can listen to a variety of speakers via high quality recorded CDs to which the one asked to repeat through drilling. Thus, students here can concurrently practice two activities: reading the text silently for the sake of comprehension and at the same time practice reading (Dweyer, 2010).

Alexander (2010) pointed out that language labs were rejected at the beginning of the twentieth century because they were badly designed and because of costly maintenance. Such factors dissuaded educators from using them. With the development in all fields of life, especially in the field of communication, interest in using language labs increased rapidly. Thus, such labs were instituted in universities as they help improve students' listening skill. This viewpoint was confirmed by (Richard,2001); (Wilson & Thayatan, 2007).

In the same context, Rivers (1970) indicated that for the first time in the history of teaching English language, students were given the chance to listen to a variety of native speakers' pronunciation. Therefore, the student is able to compare his recorded voice to correct himself to pronounce words in a native -like manner (Al-Sayyed, 1988). He also pointed out six aspects regarding the use of the language lab in teaching language as follows: (1) each student may have the opportunity to hear native speech clearly and distinctly for the first time in the history of foreign-language teaching; (2) the students may hear this authentic native speech as frequently as their teacher wants; (3) the taped lesson provides an unchanging model of native speech for the student to imitate; (4) in the language laboratory the student may listen to a great variety of foreign voices; (5) each student may hear and use the foreign language throughout the laboratory session, instead of wasting time waiting for his turn in a large group, as he does in the usual classroom situation; and (6) the laboratory frees teachers from certain problems of class directions and classroom management, enabling them to concentrate on the problems of individual students (Karaty,2016).

Wilson & Thayalan (2007) ascertained that language lab is signification because it is designed to be used for teaching any language. It helps students to be conversant with all language aspects such as: accent, pronunciation grammar, and vocabulary. Students can be also orally examined through lab connected to the internet.

Smiriti (2013) elaborated on the positive aspects of language lab as it, for the first time, provides the student with the chance to listen in a direct and clear way to a group of foreign sounds as many as he needs. In addition, language labs allow the teacher to deal with individual cases whenever needed. But the student can actively communicate with others and at the same time evaluate his performance.

Despite the privileges of using language labs, yet they have some problems summarized by Dakin (1986); Al-Arabi (1981); Najah (2013); and Mohammed (2017) as follows:

- Language labs are costly and skillful teachers are rare.
- Limitation of interaction between teacher and students who are more involved with lab tools than the teacher.
- Labs are more effective in certain skills like listening and speaking more than the other skills of reading and writing.

More studies were conducted on the benefits of using labs in teaching English of which the researchers outline the following:

Rummana (2019) in her study attempted to identify the extent to which virtual labs were used in teaching modern languages in Jordanian universities and the problems they encountered. The study adopted the descriptive survey method using a questionnaire for collecting data from 520 university participants. Results revealed that the degree of using labs was very high.

Mohammed (2017) conducted a study to determine the role of language lab in mastering English language in Abha University, Saudi Arabia. The study adopted the experimental approach. The sample of that study comprised two groups, 27 students each. The students were examined in all language skills. The results revealed that lab played an essential role in teaching English.

Karatay (2016) conducted a study to identify students' teachers' and administrators' attitude toward using language multi-media labs in (16) state Turkish universities. The study adopted the

descriptive method. Sample of the study comprised (510) English major students, (61) teachers, (5), and administrators. Tools of the study were: questionnaires and interviews. The results revealed that the reaction of all participants toward using labs in the process of teaching English was positive in addition to the positive stance regarding extant labs in Turkish state universities.

The study of Khojg (2015) aimed to identify the efficacy of electronic lab in developing the four English language skills: listening, speaking, reading, and writing for students of the secondary level in Taif, Saudi Arabia. The study adopted the experimental approach. The sample comprised (30) first secondary class female students studying the set syllabus. The results revealed that there were differences in favor of the experimental group and the efficacy of electronic lab in developing the four skills of English for Taif secondary level students.

The study of (Najah, 2013) aimed to identify the influence of language lab in teaching and learning English in Nigeria. The study adopted the experimental approach. The sample comprised (42) male and female students. To collect data, the study used a questionnaire consisting of (16) items in order to identify students' viewpoints regarding listening skill and their attitude pertaining language lab. The results revealed that there was a strong correlation between students' improvement in the skill of listening and the use of lab.

Park & Son (2009) conducted a study to investigate factors affecting English as a foreign language (EFL) teachers' use of computers in their classrooms and to find out EFL teachers' perceptions of computer-assisted language learning (CALL) and ways to improve CALL practice in school settings. Participants in the study were twelve Korean in-service teachers of EFL working at secondary schools in Korea. A questionnaire and follow-up in-depth interviews were employed to collect data. The results of the study indicated that the teachers have positive and favourable attitudes toward the use of the computers. They consider computer technology as a useful teaching tool that can enhance ways of teaching by offering students a variety of language inputs and expanding students' learning experiences in real and authentic contexts. It is also reported that external factors such as lack of time, insufficient computer facilities, rigid school curricula and textbooks and lack of administrative support negatively influence the implementation of CALL in the classroom.

Internal factors such as teachers' limited computer skills, knowledge about computers and beliefs and perceptions of CALL also seem to significantly affect teachers' decisions on the use of CALL.

2.1. Commentary on Previous Studies

The issue of using language lab and its influence on the acquisition of English language was focal for many researchers in the fields of education and linguistics as seen in the studies of Koratay (2016), and Mohammed (2006). The results of all such studies unanimously revealed that there was a positive effect of using language labs in developing language skills. More importantly, they recommended them as a dependable method for teaching English at school or university level.

Rummana's study revealed that there were obstacles that could prevent teachers from using labs due to absence of modern technology in teaching via labs because they are costly. The current study agrees with that of Rummana (2019) in adopting the descriptive approach. It also agrees with those of: Rummana (2019); Al-Hmoud (2014); and that of Najah, (2013) in using the questionnaire for collecting data.

3. Method and Procedures

This part of the study tackles: study methodology, population, sample, tool, validity and reliability, procedure and SPSS as follows:

3.1. Study Methodology

The researchers adopted the descriptive approach to unveil students' attitude regarding the extent to which language labs are used for teaching English in some Jordanian universities.

3.2. Population of Study

The population comprised all English language majors in (The World Islamic Sciences and Education University, Applied Balqa University, Amman National University, and Applied Sciences University) registering for summer session 2018/2019. The population covered (590) male and female B.A students according to the information gotten from registration and admission department in the aforementioned universities distributed as follows in table (1)

Table 1: Distribution of study population according to study variables

University	The World Islamic Sciences and Education University	247
	Applied Balqa University	276
	Amman National University	019
	Applied Sciences University	048
Gender	Male	102
	Female	488
Academic Level	Freshman	162
	Sophomore	212
	Junior	133
	Senior	083
Total		590

3.3. Study Sample

The sample of the study was selected via stratified-random sampling comprising (230) male and female students majoring in English language and literature from the following Jordanian Universities: (The World Islamic Sciences and Education, University, Applied Balqa University, Applied Sciences University, and Amman National University) for the academic year 2018 / 2019. The sample represents 30% of the population of the study distributed according to study variables as presented in table (2)

Table 2: Distribution of study sample in accordance with study variables

Variables	Number	
University		
	State	204
Private	26	
Gender		
	Male	40
Female	190	
Academic Level		
	Freshman	63
	Sophomore	83
	Junior	52
	Senior	32

3.4. Instrument of the Study

To achieve objectives of the study, related literature and past studies were reviewed. The following are among those studies: Shudeifat's (2013); Al-Bultan's (2010), and Al-Ghaith's (2017) which were all concerned with the extent to which labs were used in teaching English language from the perspective of students. The researchers designed a questionnaire, whose first part was based on a set of

demographic variables. The second part of the questionnaire which initially contained (26) items, focused on the extent of using language lab in teaching English in Jordanian universities initially.

3.5. Validity of the Instrument

Validity was verified via two ways:

3.5.1. First: virtual validity

The study instrument was given to a group of experienced judges specialized in English to give their opinion on items of the questionnaire to benefit from their remarks about clarity and suitability of every statement. They were also asked to verify whether the questionnaire meets the purpose for which it was designed. Amendments were done in compliance with their suggestions. Some of the judges suggested restating and amending items (1.13.14), in addition to deleting no. (15). Thus, the questionnaire in its final shape ended up with (25) items.

3.5.2. Structural Validity

Indications of structural validity were elicited in addition to measuring items of correlation coefficient with the total degree of the exploratory sample which comprised (30) male and female students from The World Islamic Sciences and Education University. The correlation coefficient here represents validity significance of each item. Correlation coefficients between items and the instrument as a whole ranged from (0.36-0.77). The following table illustrates that.

Table 3: Correlation coefficients between items and the total degree

Item No.	Correlation coefficient with the instrument	Item No.	Correlation coefficient with the instrument
1	48 (**)	14	47 (**)
2	51 (**)	15	44 (**)
3	38 (*)	16	62 (**)
4	47 (**)	17	77 (**)
5	58 (**)	18	56 (**)
6	66 (**)	19	39 (*)
7	38 (*)	20	68 (**)
8	69 (**)	21	46 (*)
9	67 (**)	22	40 (*)
10	38 (*)	23	67 (**)
11	41 (*)	24	69 (**)
12	51 (**)	25	36 (*)
13	68 (**)		

* Statistically significant at the functional level (0.05)

** Statistically significant at the functional level (0.01)

It is worth mentioning that all correlation coefficients were with acceptable degrees and statistically significant. Therefore, none of the items was deleted.

3.6. Instrument Consistency

This was verified through (test-retest) which was first applied and reapplied after two weeks on a sample of (30) male and female students from The World Islamic Sciences and Education University, extraneous to study population. Pearson coefficient was calculated twice to evaluate the results which rated (0.88), statistically accepted.

Reliability coefficient was also calculated via internal uniformity using Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficient which rated (0.90), a value considered suitable for objectives of this study.

3.7. Correction Tool

Likert five -scale measurement was used to correct study tools assigning one point for each of the five scales (very high, high, medium, few, very few) in numbers (1,2,3,4,5) consecutively. The scale was calculated using the following formula: scale highest level = (5)

Scale lowest level = (1)

Number of groups needed (3)

$$\frac{1-5}{3} = 1.33$$

(1.33) was added to the outcome of each group.

The following scale was adopted for result analysis:

From: 1.00 – 2.33	few
2.34- 3.67	medium
3.68 – 5.00	high etc.

3.8. Study Variables

The study included the following variables:

First: Independent Variable Which Includes

1. Universities: (state: The World Islamic Sciences and Education University and Applied Balqa University); (private: Applied Sciences and Amman National Universities).
2. University level: (freshman, sophomore, junior, and senior).
3. Gender: (male, female).

Second: Dependent Variable: the Degree of using English Language Lab

3.9. Study Procedures

The researchers adopted the following procedures in implementing the study:

1. Reviewing the related literature and relevant studies on the use of labs in teaching English.
2. Designing the tool of the study and verifying its validity and reliability by presenting it to an experienced group of judges whose remarks were taken into consideration.
3. Assigning study sample from students majoring in English in the aforementioned universities.
4. Distributing the questionnaire to the sample of the study.
5. Collecting data from the collected sample.
6. Exporting data to the computer using SPSS program.
7. Presenting results according to the order of study questions.
8. Discussing the results.
9. Suggesting recommendations.

3.10. Statistical Treatment

- Data were processed via SPSS.
- Arithmetic means and standard deviations were calculated for the points students gained.
- Test- retest was used for the independent variable
- One – way ANOVA was also used.

4. Study Results

In answering the first question, regarding the use of language labs in teaching English from the perspective of students, arithmetic means and standard deviations were elicited and calculated as presented in the following table:

Table 4: Means and Standard Deviation for the Use of Labs in Teaching English in Jordanian Universities from the Perspective of Students (arranged in a descending order)

Item No.	Item	Arithmetic mean	Standard deviation	Rank	Level
1	University being heedful about providing a suitable lab for students	3.16	1.430	1	Medium
10	Increasing number of students reduces lab use	3.15	1.373	2	Medium
2	English study plan contains enough material to be taught via lab	3.03	1.308	3	Medium
5	The lab undergoes periodic maintenance in the university	3.01	1.354	4	Medium
11	Language lab use differs in accordance with study level	2.97	1.378	5	Medium
4	Lab contains microphones for all students	2.93	1.364	6	Medium
15	Every student is able to record his voice and get feedback	2.93	1.338	6	Medium
12	Using lab helps students to better understand the material	2.92	1.296	8	Medium
16	Lab is used in compliance with students' abilities	2.92	1.334	8	Medium
6	Lab is located in a quiet suitable place	2.91	1.371	10	Medium
3	Lab has a headphone for each student	2.88	1.432	11	Medium
23	Using language lab as a means for teaching English instead of Verbal Style	2.86	1.277	12	Medium
25	Using the lab as an effective method of teaching to identify several topics in English	2.82	1.338	14	Medium
17	Lab use motivates students to learn English	2.81	1.343	15	Medium
24	Lab is an essential means for student testing	2.80	1.315	16	Medium
22	Lab is incessantly used in teaching English	2.78	1.291	17	Medium
14	Using lab helps to develop correct pronunciation	2.73	1.347	18	Medium
8	Computers are connected to the internet	2.71	1.362	19	Medium
19	Using lab stimulates interaction between parties of education process	2.71	1.373	19	Medium
13	The student feels tensed when presenting his verbal material to his colleagues	2.70	1.361	21	Medium
21	Some teachers are not convinced with importance of using lab in teaching English	2.69	1.333	22	Medium
18	Using lab is more interesting than the traditional way	2.65	1.289	23	Medium
20	Students keep aural material for further occasional uses	2.65	1.299	23	Medium
9	Solving internet problems	2.57	1.272	25	Medium
	Total grade	2.85	.881	-	Medium

Table (4) shows that arithmetic means ranged between (2.57-3.16). Item (1) regarding providing a lab ranked first with an arithmetic mean (3.16); item (9) on internet problem ranked last with an arithmetic mean (2.57) ; all other items ranked medium with a total arithmetic mean (2.85).

As for the second, which reads: Are there differences, with statistical significance at the function level ($\alpha = 0.05$) between arithmetic means of language lab use by students of Jordanian university attributed to type of university (state or private)?, arithmetic means and standard deviations pertaining the use of Jordanian university students of language lab for the variable of university type were elicited as shown in table (5).

Table 5: Means, Standard Deviations and (t) Test of University Type (state/ private)

		Number	Arithmetic mean	Standard deviation	(T) value	Freedom degree	Statistical significance
Total grade	State	20	2.72	.780	6.37	228	.000
	Private	4					
		26	3.81	1.046			

Table (5) shows that there are differences with statistical function ($\alpha = 0.05$) attributed to type of university in favor of private ones.

To answer the third question on differences between arithmetic means attributed to year level: freshman, sophomore, junior and senior, arithmetic means and standard deviations for students' use of lab with reference to the variable of university level were elicited as shown in table (6).

Table 6: Means and Standard Deviations for the Influence of Year Level on the Degree of Using Language Lab

	Category	No.	Arithmetic mean	Standard deviation
Academic level	Freshman	63	2.81	.928
	Sophomore	83	2.94	.922
	Junior	52	2.74	.558
	Senior and higher	32	2.84	1.099
	Total	230	0.85	.881

Table (6) shows a difference in the arithmetic means and standard deviations regarding Jordanian university students' use relevant to the variable of academic level. To explain statistical functional differences between arithmetic means, ANOVA was used as presented in the following table:

Table 7: ANOVA Analysis for the Influence on the Degree of Jordanian University Students' Use of Language Lab

Source	Square Total	Degree of freedom	Square mean	F value	Statistical function
Between categories	1.469	3	.490	.627	.598
Within categories	176.418	226	.781		
Total	177.886	229			

Table (7) shows that there were no differences with statistical significance at the functional level ($\alpha = 0.05$) attributed to academic level.

To answer the fourth question, which reads: Are there differences with statistical significance at the function level ($\alpha = 0.05$) arithmetic means of using language lab by Jordanian university students attributed to gender (male, female)? ,arithmetic means and standard deviations of using lab by Jordanian students' relevant to gender variable were elicited. To show the differences, (t) test was used as in the table (8):

Table 8: Means, Standard Deviations, and (t) Test on the Influence of Gender on the Degree of Using Language Lab

		Number	Arithmetic mean	Standard deviation	(T) value	Freedom degree	Statistical significance
Total grade	Male	40	2.76	.784	-690	228	.491
	Female	190	2.86	.901			

Table (8) shows that there were no differences with statistical significance at the statistical function level (0.05) attributed to gender.

5. Discussion and Recommendations

In this part of the study, the researchers will discuss answers to the four questions posed at the onset in the following manner. Answers to question one regarding the degree of using language lab in teaching English indicated that the total degree was medium. In addition, items results rated medium, their arithmetic means ranged between 2.57-3.16.

The results also showed that the total arithmetic mean of the items was (2.85) and standard deviation (.881). The item on university providing suitable language lab ranked first with an arithmetic means (3.16) and standard deviation (1.430), medium. This result reflects that Jordanian universities were short of reaching the aspired level. Such a thing might be the result of universities inability to accommodate the huge number of students joining college.

According to the statistics conducted by the Ministry of Higher Education, the number of students joining colleges in 2018/2019 increased 22 % compared to 2016/2017. The second reason behind this result might be attributed to the high costs of language lab, and because Jordan universities might have priorities other than purchasing language labs.

The researchers' finding in this respect disagrees with the result of the study Rummana conducted in (2019) in which she claimed that Jordanian universities use language labs with a higher percentage. The findings of the current research revealed that item (9), regarding internet problems, rated lowest with an arithmetic mean (2.57). Such a result agrees with that of Rummana's study (2019) in which she revealed that absence of clear vision regarding significance of using language labs besides the absence of skillful technicians and academicians led to such a result. The result also agrees with that of Mohammed (2017) in which he pointed out that using language labs in teaching English in Jordanian universities wasn't to the aspired level.

Results of analyzing answers to the second question, regarding differences, with statistical functions between arithmetic means of using language lab and the possibility of attributing it to university type, revealed that there were differences with statistical difference at the function level ($\alpha=0.05$) in favor of private universities. This might be due to high budgets private universities have, compared to their state counterparts. In addition, the number of students in private universities is fewer than that in state ones. This result agrees with that of Karatay's study (2016), which revealed that there were differences between students' view regarding type of university, while the results disagree with that of Rummana (2019) who claimed the opposite. The discrepancy between the researchers' view and that of Rummana might be the result of difference of the sample opted for by her.

Results of analyzing answers to the third question, regarding differences with statistical function at the level ($\alpha=0.05$) between arithmetic means of language use attributed to academic level, revealed that arithmetic means were close ranging between (2.81-2.94).

The findings also revealed that there were no differences with statistical significance at the function level ($\alpha=0.05$) in the degree of using labs attributed to academic level variable. The researchers attribute that to the similarity of conditions students undergo in addition to the variety of students with different specializations attending the same course, thus language lab use was ineffective. Such results agree with those of Al-Hmoud's (2014) and Abu Marriam's (2003). They also agree with the results of Rummana's (2019) study pertaining academic level.

Results of analyzing the fourth question, regarding differences with statistical significance at the function level ($\alpha=0.05$) lab use attributed to gender, revealed that there were no differences between arithmetic means from the perspective of students attributed to gender (male, female). This reveals that the two genders study under the same conditions as using language lab is not confined to either females or males for they both grew up in the world of technology. Such results agree with those of Abu Marriam (2003); Rummana (2019); and Al-Hmoud (2014).

In light of findings of the study, the researchers recommend universities to activate using labs in language teaching due to their effective role in exposing EFL learners to native speakers, a fact that is expected to positively affect their listening and speaking skills and create a motivating atmosphere in the class. The implementation of technological advancements, including language labs, is believed to provide a platform through which students can grab knowledge in a more independent and

decentralized fashion while maintaining the required interest in the curricula. However, not only can technology integration save precious class time, but it can also help instructors create interactive and collaborative opportunities to engage learners and improve learning (Ibnian, 2018).

The researchers also call for securing necessary funding for more rooms and labs in the universities and reviewing courses' study plans in order to increase the number of courses that require further use of language labs. The researchers also recommend compelling all state universities to establish language labs and equipping universities with competent and qualified academic cadres with technological experience in order to deal with language labs actively. On the other hand, the researchers call for conducting further studies on other universities to unveil the status of using language labs there and to investigate the effect of language labs on improving EFL learners' language skills (listening, speaking, reading and writing) and suggest solutions to difficulties in this field.

References

- [1] Abu Mariam, (2003). The effect of using language laboratory on the achievement of the governmental community college's students of English in West Bank, Palestine. (unpublished master's thesis). Najah National University, Palestine.
- [2] Al-Baltan, A. (2010). The use of virtual labs in teaching science at the secondary level in Saudi Arabia. (unpublished dissertation). Faculty of education, Umm Al-Qura University, Mecca, Saudi Arabia.
- [3] Alexander, A. (2010). Language labs: an overview of the trends. Intercollege: The International University of Cyprus. (Available online). Retrieved May 20.2010 from <http://www.intercollege.ac.cy>.
- [4] Al-Hmoud, S. (2014). The effectiveness of using English lab on English language student's pronunciation at Muatah university from the students' perspective. *International Interdisciplinary Journal of Scientific Research*, 1 (1).
- [5] Al-Arabi, S.A. (1981). *Learning living languages between theory and practice*. Beirut: Leban library.
- [6] Al-Ghaith, M. (2017). The use of virtual labs by teachers of science and their attitudes on the issue. *Specialized Journal of Education*, 6 (5), 39-53.
- [7] Al-Sayyed, M.A. (1988). *Linguistics and language teaching*. Susa: Dar Al-Maaref for printing and publishing.
- [8] Ameja, R. & Amandeep, A. (2012). Significance of language laboratory and its implication in Indian classroom language in India, (11), 591-59.
- [9] Bader, M. (2008). language laboratory of learning spoken and written language. Retire from: <http://bederebhashe.blogspot.com>.
- [10] Bataineh, R. & Mayyas, M. (2017), The utility of blended learning in EFL reading and grammar: a case for Moodle, *Teaching English with Technology*, 17(3), 35-49.
- [11] Dakin, J. (1986). *The language laboratory and the language learning*. London: Longman Group, England.
- [12] Dwyer, T.P. (2010). *Designing a language laboratory for communicative language learning*. Teaching and learning. Singapore: Institute of Education.
- [13] Farrington, G.C. (1999). The New Technologies and the Future of Residential Undergraduate Education. In N. R. Katz (ed.), *Dancing with the Devil Information Technology and the New Competition in Higher Education* (pp. 73-94). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- [14] Ibnian, S.(2018). The Effect of Using Computer Games on EFL 7th Graders' Achievement in Grammar and Vocabulary, *Al Mishkat Journal for Humanities and Social Sciences Studies "forthcoming"*, WISE University.
- [15] Karatay, Y. (2016). An investigation on multimedia language laboratory in Turkish State University. (unpublished master's dissertation), Ihsan Dogramaci Bilkent University. Turkey.

- [16] Khoja, R. (2015). Efficacy of electronic lab on developing English language skills for secondary students at Taif City. (unpublished master thesis). Umm- Al-Qura University, Mecca, Saudi Arabia
- [17] Mambo, B. (2004). Evolving view, evolving practices: language laboratory and cha supporting the communitive approaches to language instruction. *Journal of Edi Computing, Design and online learning* (vol.5).
- [18] Mohammad, A. (2017). The role of language laboratory in English language learning settings. *English Language Teaching*, 10 (2), 16-47.
- [19] Mohammad, Z. (2006). The Effect of Using Language Laboratory on Students' Fluency . Unpublished Master Dissertation, Omdurman Islamic University.
- [20] Najah, B. (2013). Improving students listening skill through the language laboratory. (unpublished master Dissertation). Mohammed Kheider University. Algeria.
- [21] Park, Chan Nim and Son, Jeong-Bae (2009). Implementing computer-assisted language learning in the EFL classroom: teachers' perceptions and perspectives. *International Journal of Pedagogies and Learning*, 5 (2). pp. 80-101.
- [22] Patel, C.M. (2013). Enhancing communication skills through ELCS labs of guts affiliated engineering college in Gujara: an analysis. *Indian Streams Research Journal*, 3(7), 1-3.
- [23] Richard, J. (2001). *Approaches and methods in language teaching*. Cambridge: CUP.
- [24] Rivers, W. M. (1970). *Teaching foreign language skills*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- [25] Rodinadze, S. & Zarbazoia, K. (2012). The Advantages of Information Technology in Teaching English Language, *Frontiers of Language and Teaching*, 3. 271-275
- [26] Rummana, D. (2019). The degree of using virtual language labs by Jordanian university students and obstacles they encounter. (unpublished masters' thesis). Middle East University, Amman, Jordan.
- [27] Smiriti, S. (2013). Language laboratory: purpose and shortcomings. *Journal of Teaching for ELT*,3(1),2231-4431
- [28] Shudeifat, S. H. (2013). The degree of using education technology in Zarqa schools by teachers of Islamic and social education. (unpublished master's thesis). Muata University, Karak, Jordan.
- [29] Wilson, D. Thayalan, V. (2007). The Significance of the language laboratory in communication. Available online at Karen's linguistics issues. Free resources for teachers and students of English www.3telus.net/linguisticsissues/lab.