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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to investigate the use of a computer assisted language learning (ELLIS) program to enhance the language performance of low proficiency learners. Additionally, this study aimed to identify the causes for the disparity if there was any between the scores obtained for the ELLIS program and the final assessment.

The sample population consisted of forty diploma nursing students who had to follow the Basic English subject at Masterskill University College of Health Sciences (MUCH). The participants selected their own mode of delivery i.e. CALL (ELLIS) or face-to-face (F2F). Pre-test, post-test, a pre-study questionnaire and an ELLIS course experience questionnaire (E-CEQ) were the instruments for the study. The data were subjected to analysis through descriptive statistics, t-test, and thematic analysis.

The results for the reading comprehension, grammar, vocabulary, speaking and listening components indicated that the differences between the two groups in their post-test scores were statistically significant favouring the F2F classroom learning mode. This means that the F2F control group outperformed the CALL (ELLIS) group rendering the CALL (ELLIS) remains as a tool to learn, F2F proved to be more effective in enhancing the performance of low proficiency learners’.

For the potential causes for the less effectiveness of the CALL (ELLIS) program, the study found that, the lack of interaction faced by learners between various aspects such as an instructor as well as non-human aspects was identified. Apart from that, there is also a lack of interaction in the CALL learning environment. In addition, the study also found that students’ computer competency level and their preference were not factors
that influenced the language performance results. Thus, the findings of this study prompted the University College academic board to revise the Basic English course. Instead of CALL (ELLIS) only, the University College look up the suggestion given that is a blend of CALL (ELLIS) program and F2F classroom learning instructed by a teacher to enhance the low proficiency students’ language performance.
ABSTRAK

Tujuan kajian ini adalah untuk mengkaji penggunaan program pembelajaran bahasa berbantukan komputer (ELLIS) di Kolej Universiti dalam meningkatkan prestasi bahasa pelajar yang memiliki tahap penguasaan bahasa yang rendah. Selain itu, kajian ini bertujuan untuk mengenal pasti punca kelainan antara skor yang diperolehi bagi program ELLIS dan penilaian akhir.

Populasi sampel terdiri daripada empat puluh pelajar diploma kejururawatan yang mengikuti subjek Bahasa Inggeris Asas di Kolej Universiti Sains Kesihatan Masterskill (MUCH). Para peserta diberi peluang untuk memilih kaedah pembelajaran iaitu PBBK (ELLIS) atau pembelajaran bersemuka (F2F). Instrumen bagi kajian ini adalah pra-ujian, pasca-ujian, soal selidik sebelum kajian dan soal-selidik experimen program ELLIS. Data dianalisis melalui teknik statistik deskriptif, ujian-t dan juga analisis tematik bagi soal selidik.

Hasil kajian untuk bahagian pemahaman, tatabahasa, perbendaharaan kata, lisan dan pendengaran menunjukkan perbezaan yang signifikan di antara dua kumpulan dalam pasca-ujian dan memihak kepada kumpulan pembelajaran bersemuka. Kumpulan kawalan iaitu kumpulan pembelajaran bersemuka mengatasi prestasi kumpulan PBBK (ELLIS) dalam pembelajaran menunjukkan PBBK (ELLIS) kurang berkesan dalam meningkatkan prestasi bahasa pelajar yang memiliki tahap penguasaan bahasa yang rendah berbanding dengan pendekatan pembelajaran bersemuka.

Kajian ini mendapati bahawa kekurangan bimbingan pengajar dalam PBBK (ELLIS) berbanding pendekatan bersemuka serta beberapa aspek bukan manusia adalah antara...
punca untuk menjadikan program PBBK (ELLIS) tidak begitu berkesan. Pendekatan PBBK yang menerima pakai fasilitasi bukannya pengajaran nyata tidak diterima dengan baik. Di samping itu, kajian juga mendapati bahawa tahap kompetensi komputer pelajar dan keutamaan pemilihan mod pengajaran mereka tidak mempengaruhi keputusan prestasi pelajar. Dengan itu hasil kajian ini mencadangkan lembaga akademik Kolej Universiti untuk menyemak semula subjek Bahasa Inggeris Asas. Sebalik PBBK (ELLIS) sahaja, kajian ini mencadangkan agar program ELLIS digabungkan dengan pembelajaran bersemuka dengan bantuan seorang guru untuk meningkatkan prestasi bahasa pelajar yang memiliki tahap penguasaan bahasa yang rendah.
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