Carol Chapelle and Technology for Language Learning: Over Forty Years of Leading the Way

Françoise Blin*
Dublin City University, Ireland
Philip Hubbard
Stanford University, California, USA

Correspondence
Email: francoise.blin@dcu.ie

Abstract

Carol Chapelle has had a remarkable career, spanning four decades and influencing developments in applied linguistics across a range of its subfields, such as Second Language Acquisition (SLA), Language Testing and Assessment, and Computer-Assisted Language Learning (CALL). In this paper, we focus on her contribution to CALL by offering personal accounts of how Carol's work has influenced us individually.

How to cite this article (APA 7th Edition):
Blin, F., & Hubbard, P. (2025). Carol Chapelle and technology for language learning: Over forty years of leading the way. *Language Teaching Research Quarterly*, *50*, 7–17. https://doi.org/10.32038/ltrq.2025.50.02

[1]Introduction

As the other papers in this special issue demonstrate, Carol Chapelle has had a remarkable career, spanning four decades and influencing developments in applied linguistics across a range of its subfields, such as Second Language Acquisition (SLA), Language Testing and Assessment, and Computer-Assisted Language Learning (CALL). At the time of writing, if citation figures are anything to go by, her Google Scholar profile, at the time of writing, gives an impressive overview of her prolific authorship and of the formidable impact it has had on her chosen subfields, with approximately 22,100 citations in total and 6,500 since 2020. However, Carol's five most cited CALL-related works to date, according to Google Scholar, (Chapelle, 1997, 1998, 2001, 2003, and 2009) have attracted over 7,000 citations overall, of which approximately 1,700 citations

---

[1] This paper is part of a special issue (2025, 50-51) entitled: In honour of Carol A. Chapelle's contributions to language assessment and learning (edited by Christine Coombe, Tony Clark, and Hassan Mohebbi).

between them in the last five years alone (2020-2024 incl.). CALL research and development have always been intrinsically linked to constant technological and pedagogical innovation. Researching — and evaluating — innovation in language learning with and through technology presents significant challenges to researchers, developers and practitioners (see Chapelle, 2007, 2017). Carol's earlier CALL books and articles have been instrumental in addressing these challenges in the most rigorous academic terms, thus shaping a long-term agenda for CALL research, development, and use. This agenda places the relationship between SLA theories and CALL at its core and calls for robust methodologies that are appropriate "for investigating the critical questions about how CALL can be used to improve instructed SLA" (Chapelle, 1997, p. 24). Such an agenda continues to be most relevant today, as evident in some of Carol's latest publications (e.g., Chapelle, 2024a, 2024b). This is particularly true in relation to generative artificial intelligence (GenAI), which, "like previous generations of technology […] will require us to learn from descriptive research investigating how it can contribute to language learning goals" (Chapelle, 2024b, p. 539).

Carol is not only a prolific author and a recipient of multiple prestigious awards that recognize her stellar contribution to Applied Linguistics and its subfields. In addition to her own and collaborative work with co-authors, she has mentored a number of graduate students at Iowa State University, many of whom went on to have significant impacts on the CALL world themselves (see Xu et al., this volume). Throughout her career, she has been a committed, influential, and collegial friend to many CALL organizations and their members worldwide, such as CALICO in Northern America and EUROCALL in Europe, as well as a formidable role model for young academics in general and women academics in particular. In this paper, we focus on her contributions to CALL, but rather than provide an impersonal summary of her many achievements, we would like instead to highlight how Carol's work has influenced us individually.

Phil Hubbard

In this section, I describe areas of Carol Chapelle's work in CALL that have both directly and indirectly influenced my conceptualization of CALL. I first became aware of Carol's research decades ago, when I was just beginning my own journey in the field. She and her colleague Joan Jamieson had published work done on the PLATO system while they were both at the University of Illinois before the term CALL came into popular use (Chapelle & Jamieson, 1981, 1983). I was then in the process of moving my own career path from theoretical to applied linguistics and was drawn into the early CALL community. Carol and Joan's work stood out to me because they were going beyond simply researching whether CALL applications were as good as or better than face-to-face instruction. They took into account how specific instances of CALL related to specific characteristics of the learners, a much more nuanced and compelling view. They observed, "Clearly, CALL effectiveness cannot be looked at as though CALL represented one form of instruction and all students were in need of that kind of instruction. Instead, effectiveness must be

analyzed in terms of the effects of defined types of lessons on students with particular cognitive/affective characteristics and needs" (Chapelle & Jamieson, 1986, p. 42).

I recall that for me, the most intriguing element of their research involved studying the differential impact of CALL on learners described as field dependent vs. field independent. Basically, field dependent learners are more holistic and attuned to social learning and more reliant on the structure provided by a teacher, while field independent learners are more analytical and independent. I was somewhat surprised to discover that their work concluded that the attitudes toward CALL exercises were more positive for field dependent learners than field independent ones, suggesting CALL may be more helpful to the former. The lesson I learned from their work was that differences in learning style could influence the effectiveness of the software I was writing at the time, leading me to offer multiple paths through some programs. Inspired by this notion and the work of Phillips (1985), I brought learning styles into the methodological framework I developed for CALL evaluation, development, and implementation (Hubbard, 1996).

Beyond this initial introduction to her work, I would like to draw attention to four of her publications that featured in a four-volume set I edited for Routledge's Great Works series: *Computer Assisted Language Learning: Critical Concepts in Linguistics* (Hubbard, 2009). The purpose of this series was to bring together in one place reprints of publications that had been particularly influential in the development of CALL from its beginnings in the 1980s through 2007. I assembled an editorial board of 19 expert colleagues (including Carol and my co-author, Françoise) to compile a list of candidate publications–eventually more than 500. Ultimately, four of the publications in the 74 reprints across four volumes were Carol's-–three as sole author. A little bit of math will show that 4/74 is more than 5% of the total that Carol was involved in. Given the thousands who had contributed to the field up to that point, that number speaks for itself. Moving through these publications chronologically, they are as follows:

- Chapelle (1997). In her lead article for the premier issue of *Language Learning and Technology,* "CALL in the Year 2000: Still in Search of Research Paradigms?", she notes concerns with the diversity of inputs from fields such as cognitive psychology and computational linguistics in CALL publications. She then builds a case for more centrally connecting SLA perspectives, such as the interaction hypothesis and discourse analysis, to the design and investigation of CALL activities.
- Chapelle (2001). Her wide-ranging book, *Computer Applications for Second Language Acquisition: Foundations for Teaching, Testing, and Research*, was drawn on for a chapter focused on CALL, with a look toward employing SLA-based constructs for evaluation.
- Chapelle (2003). Building on the previous two works, a chapter from another major book, *English Language Learning and Technology,* features an insightful discussion of the potential of technology for language learning.

● Chapelle & Douglas (2006). In an excerpt from *Assessing Language through Computer Technology*, Carol and co-author Dan Douglas address the question, What is the CALT [computer-assisted language testing] difference?

Interestingly, the first three of these ended up in Volume 1 of the four-volume series, representing 1/6 of that volume on foundations of CALL. The four publications were also among her most cited works, as noted in the introduction. Although a range of topics are covered, the common theme is the importance of drawing strongly from theory and research in instructed SLA in CALL studies. In the remainder of this section, I highlight the contributions of two of these, Chapelle (2001) and (2003), discussing their influence on my own work.

The third chapter of Chapelle (2001), "Computer-Assisted Language Learning," focuses on the connection between SLA and CALL, noting eight cognitive factors that can affect how learners allocate their attention during instructed language learning tasks. These are modified interaction, modified output, presence or absence of time pressure, modality, support, surprise, control, and stakes. She adds to these various socio-affective factors underlying willingness to communicate as well as other points to consider such as cognitive characteristics of learners, task selection, and practical factors. These form the basis of a set of six principles for CALL evaluation: language learning potential, learner fit, meaning focus, authenticity, positive impact, and practicality.

Her work in evaluation both contrasts with and complements my methodological framework (Hubbard 1988, 1996). The evaluation component for the methodological framework connects the language teacher's approach and the curricular elements to help teachers determine the fit of a language learning application to their teaching and learning context. It is agnostic to any specific teaching method or underlying assumptions about how languages are learned, adaptable to more or less any teaching method. Carol's framework in contrast leans heavily on SLA theory and research of the time, in particular the interactionist perspective. In comparing her framework to mine, we both use the construct of learner fit as a key element, but I found hers intriguing in three other aspects. First, there is her construct of practicality that is missing from other frameworks but seems crucial to widespread acceptance. Without a consideration of practicality for a given context, an otherwise potentially valuable CALL application will fail. Second, her focus is on CALL tasks in general, not primarily CALL courseware, giving it a broader reach. Finally, she looks at evaluation for potential, the way the methodological framework does, but then uses the same constructs for empirical evaluation.

She joined colleagues in applying this framework to the evaluation of a commercial courseware product, *Longman English Online* (later renamed *Longman English Interactive*) in a series of papers, helping to validate the framework's usefulness through case studies. One such paper showed how *Longman English Online* met the six evaluation

criteria well enough to conclude it was a good fit for a group of community college ESL students (Jamieson et al., 2005). In three iterations of a chapter I wrote on evaluation for a CALL textbook (the most recent being Hubbard (2019)), Carol's framework has featured prominently. Like most of Carol's work it remains relevant despite the evolution of technology over more than two decades. For example, Aljohani (2024) draws heavily on it for her hybrid framework for evaluating technology-mediated tasks.

The chapter from the Chapelle (2003) book on "The Potential of Technology for Language Learning" similarly builds on insights from SLA theory and research, exploring how they could be applied to CALL activities. Drawing on the cognitive interactionist perspective and other approaches to SLA, she gives examples of how CALL programs can enhance input, support interaction, and guide production. I incorporated her ideas on input enhancement in particular in an article on technology and listening for the *Encylcopedia of Applied Linguistics* (Chapelle, 2012), noting how she

> … drew on hypotheses within the interactionist perspective, sociocultural theory, and depth of processing theory to suggest how language acquisition can be promoted when the interaction is between human and computer rather than human and human. For example, she proposed that assistance provided by a computer program on request, such as translation, definitions, simplification, elaboration, repetition, and highlighting, represent modified input that can make meaning more comprehensible and forms more salient. (Hubbard, 2012, p. 4).

I returned to Chapelle (2003) in a more extensive paper on technologies for teaching and learning L2 listening (Hubbard, 2017). Once again her position on the centrality of SLA in CALL led the section on theory for integrating technology in CALL listening activities. She stated that position elegantly, "The concern for developing good CALL tasks is how to design materials that can direct learners' attention to particular linguistic forms within the input" (Chapelle, 2003, p. 41).

I conclude by noting that the concepts in these two chapters have done more than influence a number of my publications. For over twenty years, I taught a course in advanced listening and vocabulary development to international graduate students at Stanford University. A significant part of that course involved training students in how to make use of audio and video resources and media controls, what Cardenas-Claros and Gruba (2013) refer to as help options, in ways that would both fit their interests and also improve their language proficiency, for listening. These included features like linked electronic dictionaries, transcripts, captions, translations, play speed controls, and so on. The concepts from Carol's 2003 book provided a solid rationale for how to use these various help options appropriately to not only facilitate comprehension but more importantly enhance the form-meaning connection.

Françoise Blin

I started my academic career as a French for Specific Purposes lecturer in Dublin City University (DCU) in the mid-80s. With a background in applied mathematics and social sciences, but with some experience and basic training in teaching French as a Foreign Language in various language schools in Dublin, nothing prior to my appointment at DCU had prepared me for a lifelong career in CALL. However, I soon discovered that my profile was not unique amongst the nascent CALL community. By the early nineties, I had tentatively developed a CALL courseware, *Parlez-vous Banque?* (Blin & Kennedy, 1991; Blin, 1992) and presented, at various conferences and workshops in Ireland and the UK, some of my work involving technology in language teaching and learning, initially with a focus on Language for Specific Purposes. In 1993, the European Association for Computer Assisted Language Learning (EUROCALL) was officially launched in Hull, UK. I had found my 'academic home' and my professional network soon expanded to include colleagues from Europe, North America, and Australia in the first instance. In 1995, I was entrusted by the EUROCALL executive committee to organize the fifth EUROCALL Conference, *Where Research and Practice Meet,* which was to take place in Dublin in 1997.

I first met Carol at the first WorldCALL conference in Melbourne in 1998. By then, Carol's (1997) seminal article, "CALL in the Year 2000: Still in Search of Research Paradigms?", introduced by Phil above, was already the focus of much attention from a dedicated community of CALL researchers and practitioners. At the time of the WorldCALL conference, I was at the very beginning of my PhD work, still in search of a research paradigm that would allow me to investigate the relationship between CALL and the development of learner autonomy (Blin, 2005), with a view to improving the design of technology-rich language learning environments. Throughout my doctoral work, and following Benson (1997), I defined learner autonomy as a multidimensional concept that encapsulates individual (psychological), social (political), and technical constructs (Benson, 1997), which "influence each other over time, thus conferring a developmental status to autonomy" (Blin, 2004, p. 378). The 1990s saw a plethora of claims about the potential of technology to foster learner autonomy, or rather some representations or dimensions of autonomy, but few studies gave a thorough description of what learners *did* when in the process of becoming autonomous language learners and users, and fewer still gave a detailed description of the development and exercise of learner autonomy in technology supported environments (Blin, 1999). Furthermore, different representations of learner autonomy gave rise to designs presenting different levels of granularity (e.g,. macro or micro), such as a self-access center or set of resources and materials for self-directed language learning, a language programme or course, a CALL activity or task, etc.). For Benson and Voller (1997), the promotion of autonomy in language learning, at a macro level, had been "sustained and nourished by innovative work in the field of self-directed learning and self-access" (p. 5). In turn, self-directed learning and self-access were encouraged by "the growing role of technology in education" (ibid., p.6). At the level of specific CALL activities, such as tandem learning

(Little, 1996, p. 28), learner autonomy was seen as a necessary condition for the successful completion of CALL activities or tasks, and often required appropriate learner training and support. In other words, as I argued in my presentation in Melbourne, some CALL applications or activities potentially "promote[d] the development of learner autonomy, *provided* that learners [were] already significantly autonomous" (Blin, 1999, p. 136, italics in original).

Investigating such a reciprocal (even dialectical) relationship between learner autonomy and CALL presented a number of challenges that needed to be addressed from a theoretical and methodological perspective. Together with Nina Garrett's keynote at the EUROCALL 1997 conference (Garrett, 1998), Carol's call for "a perspective on CALL which provides appropriate empirical research methods for investigating the critical questions about how CALL can be used to improve instructed SLA" (Chapelle, 1997, p. 21) resonated with me. I argued, at the time, that what was also needed was a perspective on CALL that would provide "appropriate empirical research methods for investigating the critical questions about which type of CALL-supported environments [would] foster the development of learner autonomy for which type of learner" (Blin, 1999, p. 137). A few years later, I proposed that Cultural Historical Activity Theory (CHAT) offered a suitable framework for describing and analyzing the development and exercise of learner autonomy in technology-rich language learning environments in all its dimensions (individual, social, and technical), "while acknowledging the central role of CALL tools and artifacts as mediators of the language learning process" (Blin, 2004, p. 379).

It might be surprising to some that Carol's work in the late 1990s and early 2000s led me to move away from what was generally termed 'main stream SLA', such as cognitive approaches to SLA — which gave rise to a large body of works on language learning strategies and their importance for the development of learner autonomy from an individual/psychological perspective — or interactionist perspectives and their focus on "the input provided to the learner, the learner's output, and the interaction that is constructed through the turns consisting of input and output" (Chapelle, 1997, p. 25). I would argue, however, that her distinction between descriptive and evaluative research remains relevant beyond the technological landscape and beyond whatever SLA theories that are prevalent at any given time. Carol's emphasis on the importance of asking critical questions about CALL and searching for appropriate methods to investigate is also relevant today. In my experience as a research supervisor for over two decades, this is probably the most difficult stage for developing researchers preparing their first research proposal.

Following on Phil's account above, I too would like to briefly return to the third chapter of Carol's 2001 book, *Computer Applications in Second Language Acquisition* (Chapelle, 2001, pp. 44-94), and more particularly to her principled approach to evaluation that entails both judgmental and empirical analyses and to the set of criteria recalled by Phil

(language learning potential, learner fit, meaning focus, authenticity, positive impact and practicality). Twenty years ago, I noted that if learner autonomy did not explicitly figure in Carol's model, it appeared to be subsumed across several criteria, such as *positive impact*, which refers to the effects of a CALL task "beyond its language potential" (Chapelle, 2001, p. 57) and emphasizes "the importance of metacognition in the language learning process" (Blin, 2024, p. 379). However, the proposed criteria did not seem to address the tension between the individual and the social that characterized the debates that figured prominently in both the SLA and learner autonomy literature. Yet, in my view, Carol's distinction between the two types of analyses constituted "a useful starting point for examining the relationship between CALL and learner autonomy beyond evaluative purposes" (Blin, 2004, p. 380) and from an activity theoretical perspective (Blin, 2005). More specifically,

> Judgmental analyses would aim at assessing the potential of CALL tools and artefacts for the development and exercise of learner autonomy, while empirical analyses would focus on the process and the outcomes associated with the development of learner autonomy in context. (Blin, 2004, p.380).

Twenty years later, I would argue that judgmental analyses can help design educational, social, and technological affordances for second language learning and language use (Blin, 2016), while empirical analyses should seek to identify those affordances that have been realized as well as the contradictions that underlie the CALL activity system (Blin et al., 2024).

Conclusion

In this paper, we have provided our personal accounts of some of the ways Carol Chapelle's work has influenced our own conceptualizations of CALL. We should add that Carol is not just someone whose work we studied, but a longtime colleague we look forward to seeing at conferences. Many of us, from all continents, have had firsthand experience of Carol's generosity, kindness, and support. At the Computer Assisted Language Learning Research Conference in Antwerp in August 2002, Phil joined Carol as two of the three keynote speakers. When Phil and Mike Levy were completing the manuscript for the first edited volume on teacher education in CALL (Hubbard & Levy, 2006), they asked Carol if she would write the foreword, and she graciously agreed. After describing the challenges she and colleagues faced teaching CALL courses in the past, she concludes, "The papers open a much-needed discussion on the issues associated with courses and programs on CALL. [...] This volume will contribute greatly toward addressing today's problem of deciding how, when, what and why to teach about CALL in pre-service and in-service teacher education. It is a welcome addition to the professional literature in CALL" (Chapelle, 2006, p. viii).

Throughout this paper, we focused on the influence that Carol had on our early trajectories, which coincided with the early years of a new discipline in the making. We could have highlighted other impactful papers that have further unpacked the relationship between SLA theory and CALL (e.g., Chapelle, 2009, 2024a). Carol indeed continues to make outstanding contributions to CALL, which cannot be ignored. At the EUROCALL 2014 Conference in Groningen, *"CALL Design: Principles and Practice"*, Carol delivered an inspiring Graham Davies Keynote, *Arguments for Technology and Language Learning*, where she outlined and critically appraised five types of arguments that have been used to support claims for evaluating the use of technology in language learning and teaching. A much expanded version (Chapelle, 2017) appeared in the *Handbook of Technology and Second Language Teaching and Learning,* which she co-edited with Shannon Sauro (Chapelle & Sauro, 2017). In addition to her two 2024 papers mentioned earlier, Carol is a co-editor of and contributor to a book published in July 2024, *Exploring AI in Applied Linguistics* (Chapelle et al., 2024). So, in her fifth decade of working with technology for language learning, she continues to lead the way, and we should all keep paying attention to what she is up to. What's next, Carol?

ORCID

https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3504-8165

https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4083-4395

Publisher's Note

Acknowledgements

Funding

CRediT Authorship Contribution Statement

Françoise Blin: Conceptualization, Writing – Original Draft, Writing – Review and Editing
Philip Hubbard: Conceptualization, Writing – Original Draft, Writing – Review and Editing

Generative AI Use Disclosure Statement

The authors did not use any AI tool in this manuscript.

Françoise Blin and Philip Hubbard

Ethics Declarations

World Medical Association (WMA) Declaration of Helsinki–Ethical Principles for Medical Research Involving Human Participants

Not Applicable

Competing Interests

The authors have no competing interests.

Data Availability

Not applicable

References

Aljohani, N. J. (2024). Technology-mediated task-based language teaching: a CALL evaluation framework and its pedagogical implications. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 1-30. https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2024.2317840

Benson, P. (1997). The philosophy and politics of learner autonomy. In P. Benson and P. Voller, (Eds.), *Autonomy and independence in language learning* (pp. 18–34). Longman.

Benson, P., & Voller, P. (1997). *Autonomy and independence in language learning*. Longman.

Blin, F., & Kennedy, S. (1991). Parlez-vous Banque. In D. Little and B. O'Meadhra (Eds.), *Media technologies and language learning* (pp. 95-97). IRAAL.

Blin, F. (1992). Parlez-vous Banque 2: An approach to LSP Course Design and CALL. In C. Davis and M. Deegan (Eds.), *Computers and language* (pp. 43-55). Papers from the Computers and Language II Conference (1991), Sheffield City Polytechnic, Oxford: Office for Humanities Communication Publications, Number 2.

Blin, F. (1999). CALL and the development of learner autonomy. In M. Levy & R. Debski (Eds.), *WorldCALL: Global perspectives on computer assisted language learning* (pp. 133–147). Swets & Zeitlinger.

Blin, F. (2004). CALL and the development of learner autonomy: Towards an activity-theoretical perspective. *ReCALL*, *16*(2), 377–395. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0958344004000928

Blin, F. (2005). *CALL and the development of learner autonomy—An activity theoretical study* [Unpublished doctoral thesis]. The Open University, UK.

Blin, F. (2016). The theory of affordances. In C. Caws & M.-J. Hamel (Eds.). *Language-learner computer interactions: Theory, methodology and CALL applications* (pp. 41-64). John Benjamins Publishing.

Blin, F., Dey-Plissonneau, A., & Shrestha, S. (2024). Activity theory and CALL. In R. Hampel & U. Stickler (Eds.), *The Bloomsbury handbook of language learning and technology* (pp. 337–351). Bloomsbury Publishing.

Cardenas-Claros, M. S., & Gruba, P. A. (2013). Decoding the "CoDe": A framework for conceptualizing and designing help options in computer-based second language listening. *ReCALL*, *25*(2), 250-271.

Chapelle, C. A. (1997). CALL in the year 2000: Still in search of research paradigms? *Language Learning & Technology 1* (1), 19-43. http://dx.doi.org/10125/25002

Chapelle, C. A. (1998). Multimedia CALL: Lessons to be learned from research on instructed SLA. *Language Learning & Technology, 2(1)*, 21-39. http://dx.doi.org/10125/25030

Chapelle, C. A. (2001). Computer assisted language learning (excerpt)' in *Computer applications for second language acquisition: Foundations for teaching, testing, and research*. Cambridge University Press.

Chapelle, C. A. (2003). *English language learning and technology*. John Benjamins.

Chapelle, C. A. (2006). Foreword. In P. Hubbard & M. Levy (Eds.), *Teacher education in CALL* (pp. vii-viii). John Benjamins.

Chapelle, C. A. (2007). Challenges in evaluation of innovation: Observations from technology research. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, *1*(1), 30–45. https://doi.org/10.2167/illt041.0

Chapelle, C. A. (2009). The relationship between second language acquisition theory and computer-assisted language learning. *The Modern Language Journal*, *93*, 741–753. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2009.00970.x

Chapelle, C. A. (Ed.) (2012). *Encyclopedia of applied linguistics*. Wiley Blackwell.

Chapelle, C. A. (2017). Evaluation of technology and language learning. In C. A. Chapelle & S. Sauro (Eds.), *The handbook of technology and second language teaching and learning* (pp. 378–392). Wiley. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118914069.ch25

Chapelle, C. A. (2024a). Second language acquisition theories and TELL. In R. Hampel & U. Stickler (Eds.), *The Bloomsbury handbook of language learning and technology* (pp. 71–84). Bloomsbury Publishing.

Chapelle, C. A. (2024b). Open generative AI changes a lot, but not everything. *The Modern Language Journal*, *108*(2), 534–540. https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12927

Chapelle, C. A., Beckett, G. H., & Ranalli, J. (2024). Paths for exploring AI in applied linguistics. In C. A. Chapelle, G. H. Beckett, & J. Ranalli (Eds.), *Exploring AI in applied linguistics* (pp. 1–8). Iowa State University Digital Press. https://doi.org/10.31274/isudp.2024.154.01

Chapelle, C.A., & Douglas, D. (2006). *Assessing language through computer technology*. Cambridge University Press.

Chapelle, C., & Jamieson, J. (1981). ESL spelling errors. *TESOL Studies 4,* 29-36.

Chapelle, C., & Jamieson, J. (1983). Language lessons on the PLATO IV system. *System*, *11*(1), 13-20.

Chapelle, C., & Jamieson, J. (1986). Computer-assisted language learning as a predictor of success in acquiring English as a second language. *TESOL Quarterly*, *20*(1), 27-46.

Chapelle, C. A., & Sauro, S. (2017). *The handbook of technology and second language teaching and learning*. John Wiley & Sons.

Garrett, N. (1998). Where do research and practice meet? Developing a discipline. *ReCALL*, *10*(1), 7–12. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0958344000004195

Hubbard, P. (1988). An integrated framework for CALL courseware evaluation. *CALICO Journal 6*(2), 51-72.

Hubbard, P. (1996). Elements of CALL methodology: Development, evaluation and implementation. In M. C. Pennington (Ed.) *The Power of CALL* (pp. 15-32). Athelstan.

Hubbard, P. (Ed.) (2009). *Computer assisted language learning: Critical concepts in linguistics, Vols I-IV*. Routledge.

Hubbard, P. (2012). Technology and listening. In C. Chapelle (Ed.). *Encyclopedia of applied linguistics*. Wiley Blackwell.

Hubbard, P. (2017). Technologies for teaching and learning L2 listening. In C. A. Chapelle & S. Sauro (Eds.), *The handbook of technology and second language treaching and learning.* Wiley Blackwell.

Hubbard, P. (2019). Evaluation of courseware/tutorial apps and online resource websites. In N. Arnold & L. Ducate (Eds.) *Engaging language learners through CALL* Equinox.

Hubbard, P., & Levy, M. (Eds.) (2006) *Teacher education in CALL.* John Benjamins.

Little, D. (1996). Learner autonomy and learner counselling. In D. Little & H. Brammerts (Eds.), *A guide to language learning in tandem via the Internet.* CLCS Occasional Paper No 46, Trinity College Dublin, pp. 23-34.

Jamieson, J., Chapelle, C. A., & Preiss, S. (2005). CALL evaluation by developers, a teacher, and students. *CALICO Journal*, 93-138.

Phillips, M. (1985). Logical possibilities and classroom scenarios for the development of CALL. In C. Brumfit, M. Phillips, and P. Skehan (Eds.), *Computers in English language teaching (*pp. 25-46). Pergamon.

Xu, J., Lee H-w., Karatay, Y., & Karatay, L. (2025). Reflections on Carol Chapelle's contributions to applied linguistics: Perspectives from her students. *Language Teaching Research Quarterly* (this volume).