

**THE USE OF A CALL PROGRAM TO ENHANCE THE  
LANGUAGE PERFORMANCE OF LOW PROFICIENCY  
LEARNERS**

**P KANGATHEVI A/P PONNUDORAI**

**DISSERTATION SUBMITTED IN FULFILMENT OF THE  
REQUIREMENT FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF  
PHILOSOPHY IN ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE**

**FACULTY OF LANGUAGES AND LINGUISTICS  
UNIVERSITY OF MALAYA  
KUALA LUMPUR**

**2015**

UNIVERSITI MALAYA

**ORIGINAL LITERARY WORK DECLARATION**

Name of Candidate: P KANGATHEVI A/P PONNUDORAI (I.C No: 830805-05-5408)

Registration/Matric No: TGB 070043

Name of Degree: Master of English as a Second Language (MESL)

Title of Project Paper/Research Report/Dissertation/Thesis ("this Work"):

The Use of a CALL Program to Enhance the Language Performance of Low Proficiency Learners

Field of Study: Computer Assisted Language Learning

I do solemnly and sincerely declare that:

- (1) I am the sole author/writer of this Work;
- (2) This Work is original;
- (3) Any use of any work in which copyright exists was done by way of fair dealing and for permitted purposes and any excerpt or extract from, or reference to or reproduction of any copyright work has been disclosed expressly and sufficiently and the title of the Work and its authorship have been acknowledged in this Work;
- (4) I do not have any actual knowledge nor do I ought reasonably to know that the making of this work constitutes an infringement of any copyright work;
- (5) I hereby assign all and every rights in the copyright to this Work to the University of Malaya ("UM"), who henceforth shall be owner of the copyright in this Work and that any reproduction or use in any form or by any means whatsoever is prohibited without the written consent of UM having been first had and obtained;
- (6) I am fully aware that if in the course of making this Work I have infringed any copyright whether intentionally or otherwise, I may be subject to legal action or any other action as may be determined by UM.

.....  
Candidate's Signature

Date:

Subscribed and solemnly declared before,

Witness's Signature

Name: **DR. TAM SHU SIM**  
Designation: SUPERVISOR

Date:

## 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 berbantuan 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 eksperimen 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.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my great appreciation to my supervisor Dr Tam Shu Sim, who has guided me and provide constructive suggestions during the planning and development of this dissertation.

I would also like to thank the management and academic board of MUCH for enabling me to utilize their University College to study the problem. As well as, the CALL classroom instructor along with students' of the Diploma in Nursing who were very supportive to the end of the study. My appreciation is also extended to the Administration and Record department of MUCH for assisting me to group the samples for the study.

Furthermore, I am very thankful to my dearest husband Kannigeswaran Rajamanikam, my little son and daughter, Kanniesh Theeran and Kanniesh Shaindavy for their support and willingness to go on with the challenging journey along. Last but not least in the list are my Mom Anpal and Dad Ponnudorai who taught me to bear with challenges without giving up and my family members for their encouragement throughout my study.

Before I finish, I would like to dedicate this dissertation to my beloved son Kautham. Everything in life happens for a reason.

***'Always bear in mind that your resolution to succeed is more important than any other' (Abraham Lincoln).***

Thus, I hope God never gives me something that I can't handle. Thanking God to give me the strength to complete the dissertation.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

TITLE PAGE	pg. i
ORIGINAL LITERARY WORK DECLARATION	pg. ii
ABSTRACT	pg. iii
ABSTARK	pg. v
ACNOWLEDGEMENTS	pg. vii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	pg. viii
LIST OF FIGURES	pg. xiv
LIST OF TABLES	pg. xvi
LIST OF TERMS AND ABBREVIATIONS	pg. xx
LIST OF APPENDIXES	pg. xxii
CHAPTER 1 – INTRODUCTION	pg. 1
1.1 Introduction	pg. 1
1.2 Background of the study	pg. 1
1.3 Statement of the problem	pg. 4
1.4 Objective of the study	pg. 6
1.5 Conceptual framework of research	pg. 7
1.6 Significance of the study	pg. 11
1.7 Limitations of study	pg. 12
1.8 List of key terms	pg. 14
1.9 Conclusions	pg. 15



CHAPTER 2 – LITERATURE REVIEW	pg. 16
2.1 Introduction	pg. 16
2.2 Development of Face-to-Face (F2F) Classroom Learning in Language Teaching and Learning	pg. 16
2.3 Development of CALL	pg. 23
2.3.1 The development of CALL - from the pedagogical perspective in language teaching-learning	pg. 24
2.3.1.1 Applied linguistics	pg. 26
2.4 Studies on the use of CALL	pg. 35
2.4.1 The use of CALL in developing language skills	pg. 36
2.4.1.1 Listening and speaking	pg. 36
2.4.1.2 Reading	pg. 37
2.4.1.3 Grammar and vocabulary	pg. 38
2.4.2 CALL vs. F2F	pg. 38
2.4.3 Use of CALL courseware on English language learners’	pg. 41
2.4.3.1 Use of CALL on low-proficiency learners’	pg. 45
2.5 Reviews on CALL	pg. 48
2.5.1 Support for learners	pg. 49
2.5.2 Learner Control	pg. 51
2.5.2.1 Disparity in learning	pg. 54
2.6 Conclusions	pg. 59
Chapter 3 – RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	pg. 61
3.1 Introduction	pg. 61
3.2 Research questions	pg. 62
3.3 Research variables	pg. 62

3.4	Research site	pg. 65
3.5	Research design	pg. 67
3.6	Participants	pg. 72
	3.6.1 Sampling process	pg. 73
3.7	Data collection instruments	pg. 75
	3.7.1 Pre-study questionnaire	pg. 76
	3.7.2 Achievement test (Pre-test and Post-test)	pg. 77
	3.7.3 Treatment	pg. 79
	3.7.3.1 The ELLIS courseware	pg. 80
	3.7.3.2 The F2F teaching session	pg. 87
	3.7.4 ELLIS-course experience questionnaire (E-CEQ)	pg. 89
3.8	Data collection procedure	pg. 91
	3.8.1 Achievement test	pg. 91
	3.8.2 ELLIS – Course Experience Questionnaire	pg. 93
3.9	Data analysis procedure	pg. 94
3.10	Conclusions	pg. 96
	CHAPTER 4 – RESULTS & DISCUSSION	pg. 98
4.1	Introduction	pg. 98
4.2	Research question 1: Which instruction method is more effective as measured by the learners’ pre and post-tests results on the Basic English final exam: ELLIS or F2F classroom learning?	pg. 99
	4.2.1 Is there a statistically significant difference between the learners instructed by ELLIS and the learners instructed by F2F classroom learning with regard to the scores gained on the reading comprehension, grammar and vocabulary,	

listening and speaking sections of the Basic English final exam?	pg. 99
4.2.1.1 The descriptive analysis of reading comprehension section	pg. 99
4.2.1.2 The descriptive analysis of grammar and vocabulary section	pg. 105
4.2.1.3 The descriptive analysis of listening section	pg. 110
4.2.1.4 The descriptive analysis of speaking section	pg. 115
4.2.2 Summary	pg. 121
4.3 Research Question 2: According to the learners' opinion, in what ways does ELLIS helps or does not help the learners?	pg. 122
4.3.1 The ELLIS program experience questionnaire responses	pg. 122
4.3.1.1 The frequency distribution of item 1 - 28	pg.122
4.3.1.2 The frequency distribution and thematic analysis of item 29	pg. 162
4.3.2 Summary	pg. 153
4.4 Discussion of results	pg. 155
CHAPTER 5 – CONCLUSIONS	pg. 160
5.1 Introduction	pg. 160
5.2 Summary of the findings	pg. 160
5.3 Conclusions and Implication of this study	pg. 162
5.3.1 Conclusions	pg. 162
5.3.2 Theoretical Implications	pg. 163
5.3.3 Pedagogical implications	pg. 166
5.4 Recommendations	pg. 168

BIBLIOGRAPHY	pg. 170
APPENDIX A	pg. 189
APPENDIX B	pg. 192
APPENDIX C	pg. 201
APPENDIX D	pg. 209
APPENDIX E	pg. 211
APPENDIX F	pg. 214
APPENDIX G	pg. 215

## LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1.1: Model of the LEPO framework.	pg. 8
Figure 3.1: Pre-post test design with a control group.	pg. 68
Figure 3.2: Suggested sequence for the ELLIS program within each unit and lesson.	pg. 70
Figure 3.3: The login screen.	pg. 81
Figure 3.4: The main menu screen.	pg. 82
Figure 3.5: The skills menu screen	pg. 83
Figure 3.6: Multiple-choice questions with one answer and more than one answer.	pg. 84
Figure 3.7: Matching question.	pg. 84
Figure 3.8: Fill-in-the-blank question.	pg. 85
Figure 3.9: Sequencing question.	pg. 85
Figure 3.10: The game for one of the units.	pg. 86
Figure 4.1: Histogram of pre-test (control group)	pg. 101
Figure 4.2: Histogram of pre-test (experimental group)	pg. 101
Figure 4.3: Histogram of post-test (control group)	pg. 103
Figure 4.4: Histogram of post-test (experimental group)	pg. 103
Figure 4.5: Histogram of pre-test (control group)	pg. 106
Figure 4.6: Histogram of pre-test (experimental group)	pg. 107
Figure 4.7: Histogram of post-test (control group)	pg. 108

Figure 4.8: Histogram of post-test (experimental group)	pg. 108
Figure 4.9: Histogram of pre-test (control group)	pg. 111
Figure 4.10: Histogram of pre-test (experimental group)	pg. 112
Figure 4.11: Histogram of post-test (control group)	pg. 113
Figure 4.12: Histogram of post-test (experimental group)	pg. 113
Figure 4.13: Histogram of pre-test (control group)	pg. 117
Figure 4.14: Histogram of pre-test (experimental group)	pg. 117
Figure 4.15: Histogram of post-test (control group)	pg. 118
Figure 4.16: Histogram of post-test (experimental group)	pg. 119
Figure 4.17: ELLIS program was helpful for the low proficiency students'	pg. 137

to achieve better scores

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.1: Test Report – All Scores in the ELLIS Program	pg. 4
Table 3.1: The SPM Open Certification Grade	pg. 63
Table 3.2: Controlled learner variables	pg. 65
Table 3.3: English Language Courses offered at Masterskill University College of Health Sciences.	pg. 66
Table 3.4: Breakdown of contact hours	pg. 70
Table 3.5: Demographic characteristics of the forty respondents	pg. 72
Table 4.1: Mean, Median, Mode and Std. deviation of pre-test for control and experimental Group	pg. 100
Table 4.2: Mean, Median, Mode and Std. deviation of post-test for control and experimental group	pg. 102
Table 4.3: Statistical analysis of the t-test for pre-post tests of reading comprehension section	pg. 104
Table 4.4: Statistical analysis of the t-test for the pre-post tests of the ELLIS Group	pg. 105
Table 4.5: Statistical analysis of the t-test for the pre-post tests of the F2F group	pg. 105
Table 4.6 The Mean, Median, Mode and Std. deviation of pre-test for control and experimental group	pg. 106
Table 4.7: Mean, Median, Mode and Std. deviation of post-test for control and experimental group	pg. 107
Table 4.8: Statistical analysis of the t-test for pre-post tests of grammar & vocabulary section	pg. 109

Table 4.9: Statistical analysis of the t-test for the pre-post tests of the ELLIS group	pg. 110
Table 4.10: Statistical analysis of the t-test for the pre-post tests of the F2F group	pg. 110
Table 4.11 Mean, Median, Mode and Std. deviation of pre-test for control and experimental group	pg. 111
Table 4.12: Mean, Median, Mode and Std. deviation of post-test for control and experimental group	pg. 112
Table 4.13: Statistical analysis of the t-test for pre-post tests of listening section	pg. 114
Table 4.14: Statistical analysis of the t-test for the pre-post tests of the ELLIS group	pg. 115
Table 4.15: Statistical analysis of the t-test for the pre-post tests of the F2F Group	pg. 115
Table 4.16: Mean, Median, Mode and Std. deviation of pre-test for control and experimental group	pg. 116
Table 4.17: Mean, Median, Mode and Std. deviation of post-test for control and experimental groups	pg. 118
Table 4.18: Statistical analysis of the t-test for pre- post tests of speaking section	pg. 119
Table 4.19 : Statistical analysis of the t-test for the pre-post tests of the ELLIS group	pg. 120
Table 4.20 : Statistical analysis of the t-test for the pre-post tests of the F2F group	pg. 120
Table 4.21: Result of frequency distribution on student experience Questionnaire	pg. 123



Table 4.22: Summary of Students' perception on the good quality of ELLIS program.	pg 127
Table 4.23: Summary of students' perception on the clear goals of ELLIS program.	pg 128
Table 4.24: Summary of students' perception on appropriate workload of ELLIS program.	pg 130
Table 4.25: Summary of students' perception on appropriate assessment of ELLIS program.	pg 131
Table 4.26: Summary of students' perception on generic skills of ELLIS program	pg 135
Table 4.27: Students perception on the key aspects of learning context of ELLIS program	pg 138
Table 4.28: Limited interaction reasoned the CALL (ELLIS) unhelpful for the low proficiency learners' to develop their language performance.	pg. 151

## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

The following are abbreviations used:

<b>CAL</b>	- Computer Assisted Learning
<b>CALI</b>	- Computer Assisted Language Instruction
<b>CALL</b>	- Computer Assisted Language Learning
<b>CBL</b>	- Computer Based Learning
<b>CMC</b>	- Computer-Mediated Communication
<b>E-CEQ</b>	- ELLIS-Course Experimental Questionnaire
<b>EFL</b>	- English as a Foreign Language
<b>ELD</b>	- English Language Development
<b>ELL</b>	- English Language Learning
<b>ELLIS</b>	- English Language Learning Instructional System
<b>ESL</b>	- English as a Second Language
<b>F2F</b>	- Face-to-Face
<b>ID</b>	- Identification Details
<b>IQ</b>	- Intelligence Quotient
<b>LEPO</b>	- Learning Environment, Process, Outcomes
<b>MALL</b>	- Mobile-Assisted Language Learning
<b>MS Excel</b>	- Microsoft Excel
<b>MUCH</b>	- Masterskill University College of Health Sciences
<b>PLATO</b>	- Programmed Logic for Automated Teaching Operations
<b>PRES</b>	- Panning, Research and Evaluation Services
<b>SPM</b>	- Sijil Pelajaran Malaysia
<b>SPSS</b>	- Statistical Product and Service Solutions
<b>TELL</b>	- Technology-Enhanced Language Learning

## LIST OF APPENDIXES

- APPENDIX A – Pre-study Questionnaire
- APPENDIX B – Pre-test (Basic English Final Exam Set A)
- APPENDIX C – Post-test (Basic English Final Exam Set B)
- APPENDIX D – Student ELLIS Program Experience Questionnaire
- APPENDIX E – Students' Opinion
- The Students' Response for Question Number 29 in the  
Students' ELLIS Program Experience Questionnaire
- APPENDIX F - The relevance of content to the pre-post-tests questions
- APPENDIX G - The relevance of questions to the curriculum