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THE EFFECTS OF CALL ON THE LINGUISTIC COMPETENCE OF FIRST-YEAR SECONDARY EFL STUDENTS

Abstract

This paper presents an experimental research carried out during five weeks in the third term of the academic year 2016/2017, in April and May. The purpose of this study is to explore the effects of ICT and, more specifically of CALL, on the English linguistic competence, mainly in vocabulary, grammar, reading comprehension and writing skills, of students in their first year of compulsory secondary education at a secondary school in Algeciras (Cádiz). For this aim, this study compared two methods of language learning to explore the English achievements of two groups of students through learning tasks: the control group of students followed a traditional method to learn the language following the printed textbook and doing the activities proposed in it in their notebooks; the experimental group of students turned to a computer-based approach following an interactive textbook (‘webBook’) carrying out exactly the same units and activities but using the computer and the Internet. The student participants (N=50) were administered the same pre-test and post-tests designs. Results were later on compared. To provide additional information, the experimental group was also administered a questionnaire about the students’ perceptions on the use of computers in the English classroom concerning language learning, motivation, and class environment. Research findings revealed that both groups improved their results, but the experimental group achieved better grades than the control group in the post-test. This provides evidence for the fact that the use of CALL in the classroom can help improve the students’ linguistic competence. The results of the questionnaire also supported the idea that CALL could contribute positively to language leaning as most of the students agreed with the fact that they were more involved and motivated in the learning process and, thereby, improved their language learning. This could indicate that using ICT in the learning process, and more especially the computer and the Internet, could be a motivating and efficient way for improving the students’ English language learning. Nevertheless, as the control group also improved their results, it could be concluded that following a traditional method alongside a computer-based approach could be an effective combination to be successful in learning a foreign language. In conclusion, “blended learning” could be proposed as one of the best methodology for language learning.

Keywords: Linguistic competence; ICT; CALL; Activities done in the notebook; Interactive Activities; EFL secondary learners; blended learning.
1. CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

The spread of English around the world has made the English language an international language worthy of being learnt not only for education but also for cultural, social life, and for employment opportunities. English is considered as the language of international communication, thereby, teaching English becomes nowadays pivotal in educational contexts. Learners need to develop vocabulary, phonology, grammar, listening, speaking, reading and writing skills, and to adapt language to different real communicative situations in order to become successful communicators in the foreign language.

Different approaches to the teaching of a foreign language have been appearing through the years. Today, due to the fact that we live in a digital era, the role of Information and Communication Technology (hereafter, ICT) in the field of education has become really significant, both because it can help learners develop the skills that will prepare them for current society and because of the great benefits such technologies offer as tools for learning (Gill & Dalgarno, 2008). The advent of new technologies such as the interactive whiteboards, computers and laptops, and, above all, the Internet in language classrooms, among other tools, has brought about significant innovations in the way teaching and learning occurs. As a matter of fact, the traditional blackboard is now increasingly replaced by the interactive whiteboard which has become one of the main resources used by teachers in the language classroom. Audio-visual materials such as images, videos, animations, and charts can also be now displayed on the board in order to draw the students’ attention and to facilitate their learning process. Nevertheless, the incorporation of computers and the Internet in the language class has really modernised and enhanced teaching approaches.

According to Patel (2013), computers are instrumental in improving English language, as well as they make classroom learning interesting and lively. Bransford, Brown, and Cocking (2000) point out that the use of ICT can help students to develop the competencies required for our globalised world. Thus, ICT is considered a powerful tool for educational contexts. Integrating technology into learning settings may enhance motivation, improve language learning, and foster interest and concentration. We could therefore assume that nowadays the English language and computers are a must in our modern society, as both can open the gate for opportunities worldwide.
1.1. Statement of the problem

The main goal when learning a foreign language is to be able to communicate effectively in that language. This implies that students should know not only linguistic forms and semantic notions but also social functions, that is, to say, students should be able to use different linguistic forms and vocabulary in different real situations. For this purpose, a communicative approach to teach the language which integrates the four skills of language, namely, listening, speaking, reading and writing, and which encourages students to take an active role in the classroom, needs to be taught so that students are able to become communicative competent in the foreign language.

Nevertheless, although the communicative approach has been and is still taught in almost all English classes, the advent of ICT such as interactive whiteboards, overhead projectors, laptops and computers, and wireless internet has brought about innovations in the teaching and learning processes. Therefore, using technology and, more specifically, computers in the language classroom could be a good option in order to increase students’ interest and engage them into their learning process while increasing their communicative competence as well.

The traditional textbook has always been considered as the main source of material both for the teacher and the students. Before the incorporation of computers in education, teachers tended to follow the traditional English textbook and the students tended to do the activities provided in it (vocabulary, reading, grammar, writing activities…) in their notebooks in order to practise, revise and consolidate the target language contents. Teachers usually had to face the fact that many students did not carry out these activities in the class or as homework, maybe due to lack of interest and motivation or because they got tired of doing always the activities in their notebooks. The use of computers in the English class could imply a motivating alternative, other than the pencil and paper, to learn and practise the foreign language in an interactive way by using computers. Nowadays, their use is becoming increasingly popular in the language classrooms aimed at developing students’ autonomy, fostering language learning and helping them to adapt to the information age in which we are currently living in. With all this, we could state that incorporating computers in the English lessons could become a beneficial way of improving the teaching and learning of a foreign language. However, it should also be highlighted that excessive reliance on ICT, lack of
digital competence on the parts of teachers and students or problems in wireless connection among other factors, could lead to disadvantages as well.

This research investigates the effects of Computer-Assisted Language Learning (CALL) on the students’ English linguistic competence. For this purpose, the interactive ‘webBook’ offered by the publishing house Burlington Books has been used (see Appendix A) as an alternative to the traditional printed textbook. The ‘webBook’ contains exactly the same format, sections, contents and learning activities that the printed textbook but it is performed in an interactive way by using the computer and the Internet. In a traditional class, students carry out the activities in their notebooks and they are later on corrected for the whole class. However, unlike the printed textbook, the ‘webBook’ provides immediate feedback so that students can have the opportunity to check their answers and do and correct the activities at any time they consider appropriate; students can work at their own pace and work in a more autonomous way; and participants can get their scores at the end of each activity to so that they can be aware of their own learning and can analyse their own progress. The teacher can also check which students do each activity and can learn about the scores they obtain in each of them (see Appendix B, students’ progress).

All in all, since the main aim for the students when learning a foreign language is to become communicative competent in that language, it becomes essential to search for better and effective ways of teaching the language so that students can develop their communicative competence in an optimal way. In this respect, as Hartoyo (2008) asserts, computers can be adequate tools to facilitate and enhance language learning. Therefore, taking into consideration that the use of computers in language learning could help improve the mastery of the English language, this study investigates if using computers to carry out the different activities in the classroom instead of doing them in the students’ notebooks could be a better and effective way of helping students to improve their English language acquisition, and, consequently, enhance their communicative competence.
1.2 Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is, therefore, to explore the effects of ICT, and more specifically of CALL, on English language learning, mainly in vocabulary, grammar, reading comprehension and writing skills, in order to analyse if students improve their linguistic competence by using a computer-based approach rather than using a traditional model. For this aim, this study contrasts two methods of language learning to explore achievements of two groups of students through the proposed learning tasks. An experimental procedure was used with a focus and a control group during five weeks: the control group of students followed a traditional method to learn the language using the printed textbook and doing the activities proposed in it in their notebooks; the experimental group of students turned to a computer-based approach following an interactive textbook (‘webBook’) and carrying out exactly the same units and activities but in an interactive way by using the computer and the Internet. Both groups received instruction from the same teacher. The student participants (N=50) were administered the same pre-test and post-test before and after the experiment to determine the language gains in both groups. To provide additional information, the experimental group was also administered a qualitative questionnaire about the students’ perceptions on the use of computers in the classroom concerning language learning, motivation, and class environment. Finally, the study compared the results of students’ language achievements in terms of vocabulary, grammar, reading comprehension and writing acquisition, of both groups of students in the pre-test and post-test designs and correlated the results with the questionnaire analyses.

The present study has been, thus, an experimental research conducted in the third term of the academic year 2016/2017 in April and May. Data were collected through pre-test and post-test designs with fifty students (26 students in the control group and 24 in the experimental group) in their first year of compulsory secondary education at the IES García Lorca in Algeciras (Cádiz). It was analytic since it concentrated exclusively on linguistic learning and more specifically on their improvement in grammar, vocabulary, reading comprehension and writing skills. This was a quasi-experimental research as it was developed with pre-established groups. And finally, this has been a longitudinal investigation since it has been conducted over a period of time of five weeks.
1.3 Research questions

The following study attempts to answer the following questions:

RQ1. Is there a significant difference between the mean scores of the group using CALL-based method and the group using a traditional approach?

RQ2. Does the computer-based model increase students’ language achievements in terms of grammar, vocabulary, reading and writing acquisition?

1.4 Structure of the study

This paper is divided into six chapters. Chapter 1, presents, firstly, the research topic; then, the justification and purpose of the study and, finally, the formulation of the research questions. Chapter 2 attempts to describe the theoretical framework and literature review of the study with the purpose of contextualizing it, relating prior research to the specific purpose of the investigation, and justifying the niche of this study. Chapter 3 deals with the methodology pursued in the present study and it encompasses the research design, the type of activities of which this study is based, the sample, the variables, the instruments, the statistical procedures for data collection and data analysis. Chapter 4 provides a summary of the data analysed and the results obtained providing a clear-cut rendering of the outcomes and relating them to the initial research question. In chapter 5, conclusions and pedagogical implications, the chief points made in the study are underscored, specifically addressing to the research question posed at the beginning of this study, evaluating critically the significance of the data, and highlighting the implications which emerge from the findings. Finally, chapter 6 is devoted to the limitations of the study and the lines for future research.
2. CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW.

2.1. Evolution in Language Teaching: A Journey from Traditional to Eclectic Methods.

Foreign language teaching (FLT) has undergone dramatic shifts over the years and setting a clear sequence of its evolution is rather complex. Before the nineteenth century, language teaching had two different approaches: one focused on analysing the language (learning the grammatical rules) and another focused on using the language. The Greek and Latin languages, which were considered as the language of the learned for some 1500 years, were taught focusing on analysing the language. Later on, during the Renaissance, many people began to study Greek and Latin due to the development of the printing press and literacy. And, although both languages continued to be taught, other languages developed as people in one country began to find necessary and useful to learn the language of another country. From that moment on, the focus in language teaching shifted from analysing to using the language.

Later on, a rising interest of society in learning foreign languages led to the development of different approaches. In this way, the Grammar-Translation Method appeared in the nineteenth century focusing on teaching the grammar of classical languages and on translating sentences from the target language into the mother tongue. Consequently, with this approach, learners could only communicate in written form. Then, the Direct Method and the Reading approach appeared as a reaction to the previous approach. In the former, there was no use of the mother tongue and primary importance was given to the spoken language, whereas in the latter, reading was considered the most useful skill.

At the beginning of the twentieth century, due to linguistic and psychological theories, new approaches to teach the language were developed. The Situational and the Audio-lingual approaches appeared as a reaction to the Reading method, both taking much from the Direct approach. The Situational approach was dominant in Britain, whereas the Audio-lingual approach was dominant in the USA. Influenced by Chomsky (1959), the Cognitive approach emerged against behavioural theories which considered learning as a process of repetition, memorization and habit formation. This approach focused on the idea that language was not a product of habit formation but of rule formation. The Comprehension-Based approach was also influenced by cognitive linguistics and pointed out that foreign language learning was very similar to first language acquisition. As part of the Cognitive and Comprehension-Based
approaches the Natural Approach (Krashen and Terrell, 1983) and the Total Physical Response Method (Asher, 1988) appeared. The Natural Approach took much from the Direct method and promoted language acquisition from a naturalistic way, emphasising practise and more exposure to language input in the classroom. The Total Physical Response method combined speech and action. This method pointed out that learners comprehended better the target language in chunks rather than word by word.

Later on, the Affective-Humanistic approach appeared as a reaction against the lack of affective considerations in other approaches. This approach emphasised respect, interaction and communication on the part of the students. The Community Language Learning (Curran, 1972), The Silent Way (Gattegno, 1972) and Suggestopedia (Lozanov, 1979) are examples of Humanistic approaches which considered emotional and affective factors essential in the learning process. The Community Language Learning emphasised group-work and promoted an active role on the part of the students. The Silent Way focused on extensive use of silence as a key tool of the teacher. In this method, teaching was subordinated to learning, that is to say, the teacher was silent while the students learnt by experimenting with the language. And, Suggestopedia appeared in order to help students eliminate the feeling that they could not be successful in learning a foreign language. It used techniques such as music to facilitate relaxation and concentration in order to lower the students’ anxiety and foster their confidence.

Nevertheless, the Communicative approach emerged in the 1960s and soon gained increasingly popularity becoming officially adopted by many educational institutions during more than forty years. It is considered as eclectic, as it selects what appears to be best or most useful from previous approaches. It is based on the idea that language is for communication, thereby, it tries to make the learner communicatively competent so as to be able to use different structures (grammar) and semantic notions (vocabulary) in different real contexts. It encourages interaction, a student-centred approach, autonomy and promotes the integration of the 4 skills of language, namely, speaking, reading, listening and writing.

More recently, the advent of Information and Communication Technology (ICT) to educational contexts has really modernised and enhanced teaching approaches. Its spread in the classroom has also brought about a shift in the teaching-learning process from a traditional product-based and teacher-centered model to a process-oriented and student-centered approach (Clavel Arroitia & Zaragoza Ninet, 2010).
2.2. ICT in Foreign Language Learning and Teaching: Assets and Drawbacks

Information and Communication Technology (hereafter ICT) was incorporated into educational contexts due to its great benefits in the teaching and learning processes. Estling (2009:17) underscores that ICT helps to make more varied classes leading to increase motivation on the part of the students and, consequently, to foster better conditions to learn the target language. Grabe and Grabe (2007) state that technology plays a significant role on the students’ skills, motivation and knowledge, and can be used to help complete learning tasks. The advent of computers and, above all, the Internet has inevitably modernised teaching approaches and they are today considered invaluable resources for educators. On the one hand, the use of the Internet offers a great array of sources of information and authentic and up-to-date materials for the students to practise and learn the foreign language and provides opportunities for students to interact and communicate in the foreign language with people from other countries through emails, chats, instant messages, etc. On the other hand, the use of computers in language learning can help students to work more autonomously working at their own pace. Furthermore, the classroom environment seems to improve as students become more concentrated working with computers (Olson & Gustavsson 2011:76). All in all, the use of ICT can become an excellent tool in order to develop the students’ foreign language communicative competence.

In line with its assets, Zaragoza Ninet and Clavel Arroitia (2008; 2010) consider that the use of ICT improves the acquisition of not only specific and generic competencies, but also linguistic and technological ones. They also add that ICT favours the introduction of varied learning groupings, new types of classroom dynamics, lifelong learning and helps the learners become more active, participative and committed to the learning process. All these advantages will help to increase the students’ academic success. Moreover, by incorporating ICT in teaching methodology, students can acquire “competencies” other than purely curricular knowledge. The use of new technologies can therefore help improve the acquisition of meaningful learning and the development of competencies, and becomes “essential in every stage of the learning/acquisition process” (Maruenda & Clavel, 2014:83)

Nevertheless, disadvantages can also be found. Leuven et al. (2004) found a negative remarkable relationship between the use of ICT and some students’ performance. Estling (2009:19) remarks pitfalls such as the lack of sufficient computers at schools, that they can be old or slow and cannot work properly, the lack of technical or economic support in many
schools, or the lack of digital competence not only in students but also in teachers. In fact, one of the biggest challenges for the public educational system has been how to prepare schools technically and train teachers effectively for its use in the classroom. Undoubtedly, due to the rapid technological developments, the necessity to prepare learners and teachers with the skills to be able to use computers becomes a must since ‘digital competence’ can be considered today as paramount as reading, writing and counting (Jämterud, 2010).

In line with the importance of developing digital competence, Perez Cañado (2013) analysed how digital competencies could be incorporated in language university degrees. The findings indicated that the development of ICT competencies helped to improve the learning process by increasing student motivation and helped to develop innovative and new teaching styles. However, as Kessler and Ware (2012) pointed out, the use of technology should not be considered “as a separate competency, but rather as a vehicle for accomplishing other tasks”.

Undoubtedly, the role of ICT is becoming increasingly significant in educational systems. The technological tools that can be used to teach the EFL skills are numerous, therefore, it would be essential to identify which one are more effective for their instruction. As Pennock-Speck (2009:174) establishes “the possible benefits of ICT are obvious, but at the same time, new technologies are not by themselves a cure-all”. The effectiveness of technology relies on how it is used rather than in the technology itself (Zhao, 2003).

All in all, the spread of ICT in educational contexts has made teachers rethink language teaching practises in order to improve FL teaching. With the purpose of searching for better and effective ways of teaching the language to help students to improve their communicative competence, this study aims at investigating ICT and foreign language learning in order to analyse if students improve their linguistic competence in the foreign language by using a computer-based approach in the English classroom rather than with a traditional method.
2.3. **Computer-Assisted Language Learning (CALL)**

The spread of ICT has allowed the use of computers in the learning process, becoming known as Computer Assisted Language Learning (CALL). Computers were incorporated in schools in the 1970s (Kenning, 2007:105) and nowadays the number of English teachers using them in the language classrooms has increased considerably. Almost everybody counts on a computer or a laptop at home. Thus, introducing computers in educational contexts becomes essential today. Due to the rapid technological advances and to the growth of computers at schools, computer-based language teaching/learning has been implemented in ESL contexts.

CALL theories emerged in the 1960s in relation to the use of computers in the learning and teaching process, and soon a body of research and practice on this field began to be developed. Levy (1997:1) considers Computer-assisted language learning (CALL) as "the search for and study of applications of the computer in language teaching and learning". The earliest CALL programs provided immediate feedback (positive or negative) to learners (e.g. Tell me more, Smart Start English) and included drill-exercises. Later on, CALL programs were designed for students to construct new knowledge through exploration (webquests, treasure hunts...) and more communicative tasks were designed. Warschauer & Healey (1998) distinguish three historical stages of CALL: Behaviouristic CALL (1960s and 1970s), Communicative CALL (1980s) and Integrative CALL (embracing Multimedia and the Internet: 1990s).

Earlier approaches to CALL were influenced by behaviourists’ theories. They mostly consisted in drill-and-practice through repetition and memorization in which immediate feedback was provided. Activities such as drag and drop, clicking, gap-fillings, multiple-choice activities, which were widely used at that period in the language class, still continue to be used nowadays in our language lessons. However, rapid innovations in computers led to improvements in CALL applications.

Then, it was the communicative approach which influenced research and practise in CALL. Informed by this approach, CALL began to emphasise the use of computer-based activities to use the language rather than to analyse it (Yang, 2010:909), and to teach grammar implicitly rather than explicitly. In this way, although repetitive language drills continued to
be used, communicative activities were also introduced such as reading and listening comprehension activities, communicative games, etc.

Later on, in the 1990s, Integrative CALL emerged with the development of multimedia technology including videos, texts, animations, sounds, and graphics and integrating the four skills of language (speaking, listening, reading and writing) into the learning process. Applications such as the Internet and Computer-mediated communication (CMC), among others, soon began to offer a more real use of language skills and become really effective tools to engage students with their learning process.

Broadly speaking, CALL has evolved from using computers for teaching and learning by repetition (drill) and from considering computers as tutors, to use them for a series of communicative and effective tasks which can help improve and facilitate the teaching and learning processes.

CALL really influences current practices in EFL teaching with applications and activities to be used in the classroom such as interactive activities to practise grammar and vocabulary, communicative games, quizzes, puzzles, watching videos, animations, pronunciation programs, audio records, reading texts, visual aids, online dictionaries, and it also begins to innovate still more the teaching practice with the introduction of chats, e-mails, blogs, forums, the creation of blogs, webquests and treasure hunts in the language class. All these applications and activities are widely used today in the language classroom and become quite effective tools for the students to foster communication, interaction, autonomy and to engage them in real life situations. Nowadays, CALL embraces tools such as electronic portfolio assessments, the flipped classroom model, speech-recognition programs, corpus linguistics, distance learning, and most recently mobile-assisted language learning (MALL), which really has modernised the teaching and learning processes. In general, from the basic drill-and-practice to the multimedia resources, the role of CALL in language learning and teaching becomes pivotal nowadays. CALL can be considered, therefore, as an essential tool that can help to facilitate and accelerate the teaching and learning process. It can be used for students to practise, consolidate and reinforce what they have already learnt in the classroom, to help the students who need additional support, and can be used to motivate and engage the students in the learning process.
Ravichandran (2000) points out a series of assets offered by CALL in enhancing language learning: CALL fosters interest and motivation on the part of the students (CALL programs bring novelty to the students as they teach and present the language in diverse and motivating ways which can make language practise more interesting); offers an individualised learning allowing the students to work at their own pace; copes with mixed abilities as it can provide activities according to the students’ needs; offers an “optimal use of learning time”; and provides immediate feedback for the students to be aware of their own performance and learning progress.

Nevertheless, CALL application still has its pitfalls and limitations such as the increase in educational costs, lack of trained teachers, lack of digital competence on the part of some students, the time spent by teachers in managing new technologies, or the lack of wireless connection. Teachers should, therefore, know the assets and pitfalls before applying CALL in EFL classrooms.

2.4. CALL Research on Foreign Language Learning

Much research has explored the effects of CALL on foreign language teaching (Nutta, 1998; Abu-Seileek, 2007; Mohamad, 2008; Perez Cañado, 2017; Getkham, 2004; Gorjian, 2012; Salaberry, 1999; Rost, 2002), and most of them claim that CALL practices are effective ways to enhance students into the learning process. According to Beatty (2003:188) “CALL has significant positive effect on teaching and learning and creates minimal disruption”. Sehlaoui (2001), on the other hand, highlights the increase of communicative competence by using computers in EFL contexts.

2.4.1 CALL Research on Grammar

Grammar is an important part in the development of communicative competence and can be defined as “the entire system of a language, including its syntax, morphology, semantics and phonology” (Chalker & Weiner, 1994:177). Grammatical competence is, therefore, concerned with the mastery of the language code and refers to the ability to produce and understand well-formed grammatical structures of language (linguistic rules) and use them effectively in communication.
For many people, grammar is often related to rules and boredom (Larsen-Freeman, 2003). For this reason, sometimes it becomes difficult to teach grammar. Moreover, carrying out the grammar tasks in the students’ notebooks in a traditional way could be somewhat boring. The use of computers in the language class to practise the grammar in an interactive way could be an interesting way to attract the students’ attention.

There have been many studies (Nutta, 1998; Perez Cañado & Díez Bedmar, 2006; Abu-Seileek, 2007; Mohamad, 2009; Rezvani and Ketabi, 2011) focusing on the effects of CALL on grammar instruction and practise. Nutta (1998), for example, compared the students’ acquisition of some grammatical points by using two methods of grammar instruction: one group used a textbook-based grammar instruction and another group used a computer-based grammar instruction. Fifty-three university English students participated in the study. The results revealed that the students’ scores in the computer-based group were higher than the scores of the textbook-based group. Moreover, students in the computer-based group showed, through the questionnaire, great interest in using that methodology as they could review the grammar explanations as many times as they wished, they could obtain immediate feedback on the exercises, and they could work at their own pace (Nutta, 1998: 57). In general, her outcomes revealed that computer-based instruction could be a useful way of teaching foreign language grammar.

Perez Cañado & Díez Bedmar (2006) investigated whether the use of CALL and Data-Driven Learning (DDL) could help heighten the Spanish University students’ grammar weaknesses in written composition regarding verb tenses, verbal complementation, articles and prepositions (four grammatical categories considered as problematic for these students). After the intervention, students showed significant gains in articles, verbal complementation and prepositions, implying that the use of CALL and DDL could help improve these aspects. However, they remarkably worsened their performance on verbal tenses. All in all, the outcomes showed that CALL and DDL, although in some categories more than in other, can be considered as effective tools in improving grammatical aspects in written compositions with university students.

Abu-Seileek (2007) also conducted an experiment comparing textbook-based English lessons and computer-based lessons in the acquisition of verb tenses in English foreign language students. The results showed remarkable differences in favour of the computer-based grammar instructional method, showing that computer-based instruction could help
learn and teach verb tenses. However, the study also showed that both methods (computer-based and teacher-driven) were effective in teaching English verb tenses.

Mohamad (2009) also compared internet-based grammar instruction and traditional board and pen instruction to check which form of instruction was more effective in order to learn different grammatical aspects. Fifty students participated in the study. The findings showed that the students who received the internet-based grammar instruction outperformed those who received conventional lessons through the board and pen instruction. Mohamad’s study concluded that students can really improve their grammatical competence by using the Internet.

Rezvani and Ketabi (2011) investigated the effects of websites vs. textbooks on the learners’ knowledge of some grammatical points during twelve weeks. For this aim, from 120 Iranian intermediate EFL learners, finally 90 homogeneous students were chosen and they were then divided into 3 groups: a control group, a text-book group, and a website group. A pre-test was administered to all the participants in order to check their level of proficiency in those grammatical items before the experiment. After the experiment, a post-test was used to analyze the student’s gains. The research outcomes showed that students in the website group achieved better gains in grammatical learning in the post-test than the other groups, implying that websites can be new tools that can help enhance the learners’ language performance and motivation in the learning process. They, finally, suggested that language teaching websites should be used more frequently in the classroom since the alternation of web-based materials with printed materials might help improve the learners’ English grammar proficiency.

In general, most of these studies found positive effects on the use of computers in the English classroom as they were effective in improving students’ grammatical competence. However, most of them also agreed on the fact that the use of computers alongside the traditional methods could be effective ways of improving the English language.

2.4.2. CALL Research on Vocabulary

Mastering vocabulary becomes crucial for EFL learners. With the implementation of computer-assisted language learning (CALL), the attempts to find effective ways of improving vocabulary acquisition have increased.
Getkham (2004) analyzed the learning of vocabulary of students in two groups: the control group used traditional printed texts and the experimental group used multimedia materials. Results were compared in both groups according the pre-test and post-tests gains. The results showed that students in the multimedia group retained vocabulary better than students in the group which learnt vocabulary through printed texts. Therefore, multimedia materials can facilitate learners’ vocabulary acquisition.

More recently, Gorjian (2012) explored the effect of web-based and conventional paper-based approaches on the learning of English vocabulary of Iranian learners. Three hundred participants between 18 to 27 years old were randomly divided into two homogeneous groups. The experimental group turned to a web-based model whereas the control group continued with the conventional paper-based approach. Pre-test and post-designs were administered to both groups to determine whether students could better retain new vocabulary by using a Web-Based approach rather than with a Paper-based method. Findings showed that the effect of the Web-Based Language learning approach was positive on the students’ acquisition of vocabulary. The study concluded with the fact that CALL approach can facilitate the development of short term vocabulary retention.

2.4.3. CALL Research on Reading

Developing reading skills is another important aspect of language learning. The benefits of reading different types of text are enormous for students to increase their command of the foreign language. Improving reading skills by means of interactive activities through the computer could be a good option for the students to develop this skill more efficiently.

Marzban (2011) attempted to investigate the effect of CALL on the reading comprehension skill of Iranian intermediate university students. Sixty female students with the age ranged from 18 to 25 years old were selected out of 85 students. Thirty students were selected at random for the experimental group and the other thirty students constituted the control group. The experimental group was taught reading comprehension using CALL whereas the control used a traditional methodology. A pre-test and post-test experimental design was carried out. The findings indicated that the students who received CALL instruction techniques obtained better results than the students who received the teacher-
centred method. Results showed that CALL can offer diverse and motivating techniques that can help improve the students’ reading comprehension.

2.4.4. CALL Research on Listening

Barani (2011) explored the effects of CALL on listening skills with Iranian EFL learners. Sixty participants were assigned to experimental and control groups at random. The experiment lasted 20 weeks in which the control group practised the listening skill in a traditional way, whereas the control group carried out the same listening activities through CALL. The results indicated that students using computers achieved better gains than nonusers in a listening test. It could be therefore assumed that the use computer-assisted language learning has a positive effect on the students’ listening skills.

2.4.5. CALL Research on Writing

AbuSeileek (2004) studied the effect of a computer-based program on Jordanian students’ English writing skill. Participants were in their first secondary grade. For this study, a control and an experimental group was employed. The control group used a computer-based approach by using computers in the language classroom and the control group followed a traditional method. The study showed that the mean scores on the writing task of the experimental group were higher than the mean scores of students who received instruction via the traditional method.

Al-Menei (2008) investigated also the effect of computer-assisted on the English writing skill of Saudi students. The research outcomes revealed again that computer-assisted writing had a positive effect on EFL Saudi students’ writing ability mainly in paragraph writing and correcting grammar.

Perez Cañado (2017) also investigated the effects of technology to teach EFL writing within the integrative CALL phase. After providing a detailed analysis about which technological tools were available to teach the EFL writing skill, the research outcomes showed that technology enhanced teaching not only for the EFL writing process and product, but also for general skill, strategy, and competence development.
In conclusion, the aforementioned studies analysing the effects of Computer-assisted Language Learning from various perspectives (Nutta, 1998; Abu-Seileek, 2011; Mohamad, 2009; Marzban, 2011; Gorjian, 2012; Barani, 2011; Al-Menei, 2008; Perez Cañado, 2017, etc.) showed that students receiving computer-based instruction obtain positive results in practically all aspects of language such as grammar, vocabulary and reading, writing, listening, and speaking skills than those taking paper-based lessons. Hence, the incorporation of Computer-assisted language learning could be beneficial and helpful in learning a second language. As Zhao (2007) remarks, creating opportunities for language learners to use technology in their learning can be beneficial in different ways. Finally, as Abu-Seileek (2007) showed, both computer-based and traditional methods can be equally effective for language learning.

### 2.5. Computer-based Learning Activities and Motivation

Silvester (2009) claimed that enjoyment and motivation are main factors which play an essential role for students’ effective learning. Motivating and enjoyable activities can draw the students’ attention and interest and can generate enthusiasm and desire to learn on the part of the students. The fact that a teacher always carries out the same routine of activities in the classroom can cause boredom and even rejection on the part of the students. Thus, the selection of activities becomes essential when planning a language lesson. They must be interesting, motivating and effective to attract the students’ attention and to help them to develop communicative abilities in the target language. Dörnyei (2001) underscores a strong relationship between motivation and L2 success. He establishes that teachers need to generate positive students' attitudes toward learning, break the monotony of learning, make the activities more interesting and increase the engagement of the students by means of communicative and enjoyable activities.

From this perspective, the incorporation of computer-based learning activities can be quite beneficial and effective in the EFL classroom as it can motivate students, reduce monotony and boredom, and can be time-efficient. If students use computers and the Internet every day, why not use them in educational contexts so as to complete learning tasks? Interactive activities can be used in language learning at school and out-of-school to practise, revise and consolidate the contents already learnt in the classroom. They provide immediate feedback about achievements and students can do the same activities as many times as they
consider appropriate to succeed in their learning. Students also assume responsibility for their achievements, work in a more autonomous way, and become more concentrated in their learning.

Cantos-Gomez (1997) investigated the use of computer-assisted language learning activities in English and their effect on the students’ motivations to learn. Participants were divided in control and experimental groups. After the treatment, the results indicated that the experimental group showed more interest and motivation to learn English when working with computers than those in the control group who did not use them.

3. CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY

As computers are more frequently used in the teaching and learning processes, it becomes necessary to analyse their role and effectiveness in the students’ language learning achievements. Taking into consideration that almost all the aforementioned studies have considered CALL as an effective way of improving the students’ communicative competence, this study investigates if the computer-based approach can also work with our students so as to help them develop their linguistic skills.

This section encompasses context of study, the sample, the research design, the variables, the instruments, data collection and data analysis with the aim at analysing the English language achievements of the students using an interactive textbook (‘webBook’) with the achievements of students using the traditional printed textbook acting as control group.

3.1 Context of the Study

This study took place at a public secondary school located in the southern coast of Spain, in Algeciras (Cádiz). This is its first year of the school as a Bilingual School. Due to its closeness to Morocco, the school receives a large number of Moroccan students with a low proficiency level of Spanish. This fact hinders the learning of another foreign language still more. The school is located in a disadvantaged and, somewhat, dangerous area hit by drug dealing, crime and unemployment. It is a compensatory high school of hard performance.
Parents’ socio-economic and cultural level is low and most of them do not hold any basic educational qualifications. For this reason, most of them do not support nor show interest in their children’s learning process. Broadly speaking, the students’ proficiency level in the school is low, discipline problems are often found and the lack of motivation and interests of most of the students lead, in many cases, to dropouts.

3.2. Participants

The present study involves fifty students \((N=50)\) in their first year of compulsory secondary education: twenty-six \((N=26)\) students in Group A, and twenty-four \((N=24)\) students in Group B. Most of them live in a marginal area and belong to a low social and economic class. The participants are between 12 to 13 years old, they had been learning English at the elementary school level, and students in both groups practically share the same level of English. Some of participants did not attend to school in primary education (absenteeism) and most of them show no study habits. A low proficiency level in almost all areas is common to all of them and the majority do not want to continue with tertiary education. Their exposure to English out of school is practically inexistent. The dismal familiar situations that most of them have at home (parents in prison, drugs...) do not allow them to work and study regularly and their parents do not support nor help them in their studies.

Due to these family backgrounds, a special effort should be made in favour of these students who are experiencing economic and social hardship. Thus, motivating and encouraging them to work autonomously could undoubtedly help them to succeed in their life, personally and professionally.

Most of them never do the activities that are assigned as homework, and the performance of the tasks in class is often tedious for them. Due to these students’ particular characteristics and lack of motivation and interest, it becomes necessary to find innovative and interesting ways to teach them the language which can help involve them in the learning process and become more autonomous learners. In this respect, turning to another vehicle than the pencil and the notebook to do the activities and practise what has been learnt in class could be a motivating tool that could foster their interest in the foreign language and increase their desire to learn English.
### 3.3 Research design and Procedure for data collection.

This research is a longitudinal study as it was conducted during a five-week period during the third term of the current school year 2016-2017, in April and May 2017.

From September, both groups (A and B) have been studying English in a traditional way with a teacher-directed instruction and working with the ‘Way to English’ CSE 1 textbook, by the publishing house Burlington Books (Marks and Devlin, 2016). This textbook contains nine units (see Appendix C for the sequence of contents in each unit) which help the students to develop their communicative competence and integrates the four skills of language to be later applied in different real and communicative situations.

During the first and second terms, units 1 to 6 were taught to both groups in a traditional way, in which the teacher was the instructor and students practiced and consolidated the contents of the different units by carrying out the different activities provided in the textbook using the pen and their notebooks. At the end of unit 6, all students were administered a pre-test (corresponding to the ‘second term test’ offered by Burlington books at this level) to determine their command of the English language in terms of vocabulary, grammar, reading comprehension and writing skills prior to the any exposure.

In the third term, specifically in April and May, and immediately after the pre-test, the groups were randomly divided into experimental and control groups. Both experimental and control group classes continued to be held with 4 English sessions (55 minutes) per week. From that moment on, the experimental group began to follow a computer-based approach using the interactive ‘webBook’ carrying out all the activities of units 7 and 8 using the computer; in this case, the teacher became the facilitator of the learning process. The control group continued with the traditional approach doing the same activities but in their notebooks. In general, activities consisted of gap-filling, matching, multiple choice, etc. (see Appendix A to compare the interactive webBook’s activities with the activities in the printed textbook).

The study began after obtaining permission from the school principal to use the computer room during the experimental period. Nevertheless, the computer room only had 15 working PC stations, and some students had to bring their own laptops, with a letter of consent from their parents. In this way, 10 out of 24 students in the experimental group...
brought their laptops to the English classrooms during the experimental phase. The rest of the students used the computers available in the computer room. Each student in the experimental group had to sign in previously in the ‘webBook’ application to be able to work with it. Then, students, with their username and password, could log in in the interactive book and did the activities online (see Appendix B).

The experiment lasted five weeks in which Units 7 and 8 were taught (see Appendix C to see the contents learnt during these units). After that, a post-test was administered to both groups to measure the gains. Both groups were evaluated on their acquisition of vocabulary, grammar, reading comprehension and writing skills in the pre-test and post-test designs (see Appendices D and E).

Finally, the pre-test and post-test results were compared to determine if the students in the experimental group achieved better results than the students in the control group. The experimental group was also administered a questionnaire about their opinions about the use of computers in the English class concerning language acquisition, motivation and classroom environment. Finally, after analysing data, the initial research questions were answered.

### 3.4. Identification and description of variables.

As an independent variable of study, we could find the learning method: the computer-based model followed by the experimental group compared to the traditional approach followed by the control group.

Dependent variables were the students’ language skills, mainly, grammar, vocabulary, reading comprehension and writing skills. Both experimental and control groups took a pre-test before the experimental treatments. After the five-week period, both groups received the same post-test.

As moderating variables, we could find the students’ level of proficiency in the English language, the grade level of the participants which was limited to the first year of CSE, the age, and type of school and setting.
3.5. Data collection Instruments

The instruments employed in this research were the following:

- **Pre and post Tests (see Appendices D and E):** The students’ previous knowledge was assessed by a test held as a pre-test. This pre-test was administered to both groups before the study in order to measure the students’ command of the English language. After the experiment, a post-test was administered to measure the students’ language achievements in order to assess if there was a significant difference between the final scores of the groups before and after the experiment. Participants were administered exactly the same pre and post tests, both consisting in four parts, each part for an aspect of language in terms of reading, vocabulary, grammar and writing. Each part was ranged to 10 points; therefore, the total sum of the parts was 40 points. As mentioned previously, both groups were evaluated on their acquisition of vocabulary, grammar, reading comprehension and writing skills to check if they assimilated and consolidated the contents of the different units dealt with during the study and to check if there was a significant difference between the final scores in the experimental group compared to the control group. Not only did the final score students get in the different tests but also students’ grades from the different skills already mentioned were analysed separately as well.

- **Questionnaire (see Appendix F):** A questionnaire was chosen to learn about the students’ opinions about the use of computers and the Internet in the English class, especially in terms of computer-based activities versus paper-based activities. This questionnaire contained 12 items related to language learning achievements, motivation and classroom environment. It used the Likert scale to grade the opinions of the items from 1 to 5 (being 1= strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3=uncertain, 4= agree, and 5= strongly agree).
3.6. Data Analysis

In this research, which was conducted in class during five weeks, quantitative data was gathered from two different tests: a pre-test at the beginning of the study and a post-test at the end of the experiment to attest the effects of computer-based methodology in language learning. The study measured the gains that students obtained in vocabulary, grammar, reading and writing in both pre- and post-test designs. Scores on the tests were transformed to show the results in the grades from 0 to 10 points for each aspect of language (reading, vocabulary, grammar and writing) being 40 points the maximum score in each test. In order to analyse the data and draw conclusions concerning the research questions, descriptive statistical analyses were applied. Central tendency through the Mean and variability through Standard Deviation are the descriptive statistical procedures used for data analysis.

Quantitative data was also obtained from the questionnaire used to analyse the perceptions on language learning, motivation, and classroom environment of students who used a computer-based approach doing the activities through the computer and the Internet. Quantitative data was obtained by means of percentages, means and standard deviation.

4. CHAPTER FOUR: RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1. Pre-test and Post-test analyses and results

Table 1 presents the descriptive statistics of a pre-test measuring the reading, vocabulary, grammar, and writing skills with the purpose of determining the level of proficiency in the English language of students in both groups before the experiment. The table showed that the mean scores of the experimental group (M=22.56) in the pre-test was higher than that of the control group (M=19.43). However, the difference among the mean scores of both groups in the pre-tests was not significant as we only found 3.03 points of difference among them. This could imply that both groups shared practically the same level of English proficiency at the beginning of the experiment.

Moreover, in the pre-test, the control group obtained a mean of 19.43 out of 40 possible points and the experimental group achieved a mean of 22.56 out of a total of 40 points. These data revealed that both groups had a low level of proficiency in the English
language as the control group almost does not achieve the average to pass the test (20 points) and the experimental group only exceeded that average in 2.56 points.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-test</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>19.43</td>
<td>8.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22.56</td>
<td>8.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. The descriptive statistics analysis of the pre-test

Table 2 presents the mean scores of the control and experimental groups before and after the intervention in the pre- and post-tests. Both classes were given the same material and the same tests out of a total of 40 possible points. After students in the experimental group carried out computer-based activities during units 7 and 8, the mean scores of the post-test (M=26.73) were higher than the mean scores in the pre-test (M=22.56) by 4.17 points. Nevertheless, the difference between the mean scores in the pre-test and post-test in the control group was really low as only 2.2 points of difference were found (from 19.43 to 21.63).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pre-test</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>19.43</td>
<td>8.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>post-test</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21.63</td>
<td>6.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pre-test</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22.56</td>
<td>8.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>post-test</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26.73</td>
<td>6.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. The descriptive statistics analysis of language skills held as a pre-test and post-test

Graph 1 compares the results of the pre and post tests from the class which carried out the activities in their notebooks (control group) and from the other class which carried out based-computer activities (experimental group). As illustrated by the graph, the experimental group’s achievements were higher than that of those in the control group.
As it can be clearly seen, although both groups improved their results concerning the results in the pre-test, the experimental group achieved better results than the control group. Therefore, the experimental group performed higher than the control group.

For the research question number one “is there a significant difference between the mean scores of the group using a CALL-based approach and the group using the traditional method?”, it can be established that a difference was really found between the pre-test and post-test mean scores after the study in favour of the experimental group indicating that the implementation of computer assisted language learning could have helped the experimental group to improve their linguistic competence. However, the difference among the gains in the experimental group compared to the gains in the control group has not been significant (only 1.87 points of difference). With these data, we could assume that there has been a difference in favour of the experimental group as illustrated in the figures of the tests, but that difference has not been really significant.

In order to answer the research question number two, a breakdown of the grades in the control group from the four aspects of language of which the students were assessed has been carried out. As Table 3 indicates, students in the pre-test achieved better results firstly in vocabulary (M=6.34), secondly in grammar (M=5.19), then in reading (M=4.46) and finally in writing (M=3.44). In the post-test, the results improved in the four aspects of language slightly (gains: + 2.2). The increase in vocabulary, grammar and reading was practically insignificant.
CONTROL GROUP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>READING</th>
<th>VOCABULARY</th>
<th>GRAMMAR</th>
<th>WRITING</th>
<th>FINAL SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRE-TEST</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>6.34</td>
<td>5.19</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>19.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POST-TEST</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>21.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAINS</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td><strong>1.05</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.2</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Mean scores of reading, vocabulary, grammar and writing in the control group.

Graph 2. Means scores of reading, vocabulary, grammar and writing in the control group.

Similarly, a breakdown of the grades in the experimental group from the four aspects of language of which the students were assessed has been carried out. According to Table 4, students in the pre-test achieved better results firstly in vocabulary (M=6.58), secondly in grammar (M=5.92), then in writing (M=5.92) and finally in reading (M=4.58). These data showed that participants in the experimental group, after five weeks carrying out computer-based activities, also improved the results in the four aspects of language of the post-test (gains: +4.17). It was interesting to know that students improved better in the reading skill than in the other three aspects of language (gains: +1.6).
### EXPERIMENTAL GROUP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>READING</th>
<th>VOCABULARY</th>
<th>GRAMMAR</th>
<th>WRITING</th>
<th>FINAL SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRE-TEST</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>6.58</td>
<td>5.92</td>
<td>5.48</td>
<td>22.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POST-TEST</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6.18</td>
<td>7.46</td>
<td>6.91</td>
<td>6.46</td>
<td>26.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GAINS**

|      | 1.6 | 0.88  | 0.99 | 0.98 | 4.17 |

Table 4. Mean scores of reading, vocabulary, grammar and writing in the experimental group.

![Graph 3](image-url)

Graph 3. Means scores of reading, vocabulary, grammar and writing in the control group.

Detailed data in Table 5 showed that twenty-three out of the 26 participants (96%) in the control group showed improvements in language learning but the gains were relatively low (+ 2.20). In Table 6, twenty out of the 24 participants (93%) in the experimental group improved their language learning, but the gains in this group were a little higher than in the control group (+4.17). According to the results, students in both groups increased their language learning, but the experimental group’ gains were higher compared to those in the control group.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Pre-test</th>
<th>Post-test</th>
<th>Gains</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>38.8</td>
<td>38.8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEAN</td>
<td>19.43</td>
<td>21.63</td>
<td>2.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAND.DEV</td>
<td>8.09</td>
<td>6.88</td>
<td>-1.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5. Reading, vocabulary, grammar and writing achievements in the control group
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Pre-test</th>
<th>Post-test</th>
<th>Gains</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td><strong>2.5</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td><strong>4.8</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td><strong>9.9</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td><strong>4.9</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td><strong>8.8</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td><strong>-0.5</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td><strong>9.3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td><strong>-1.7</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td><strong>-5.5</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td><strong>-4.8</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MEAN</strong></td>
<td>22.56</td>
<td>26.73</td>
<td><strong>4.17</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STAND.DEV</strong></td>
<td>8.22</td>
<td>6.08</td>
<td><strong>4.17</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6. Reading, vocabulary, grammar and writing achievements in the experimental group.

In conclusion, after comparing the results in the control and experimental group to attest which group made the largest language improvement, a difference was found between the pre-test and post-test language achievement scores in favour of the experimental group after the experiment (gains: +4.17). A difference was also found between the pre-test and post-test language achievement scores of the control group (gains: +2.20). Results, then, proved that the use of computer-based activities in the classroom could improve the students’ language learning students.

As Graph 3 showed, both groups increased their language competence but the experimental group outperformed compared to the control group, supporting a conclusion that computer-based activities could have a positive effect on English language acquisition.
4.2. Questionnaire Analysis and Results

After the post-test, the experimental group received a questionnaire. The questionnaire items were divided into three categories: language development, motivation and classroom environment. The Likert scale was used to grade the opinions of the items from 1 to 5.

- Items “1” through “4” were designed to explore students’ perceptions towards their English language learning achievements by using a computer-based approach in the classroom.
- Items “5” through “9” were designed to examine students’ motivation and interest in the learning process by doing computer-based activities in the classroom.
- Items “10” through “12” were designed to check the students’ opinions about the classroom environment when using a computer-based approach to learn and practise the English language.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>St. Dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Computer-based activities for effective language learning</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Positive learning experience by using computers and the webBook</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Working more autonomously</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Computer-based approach improved my language knowledge</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Preference of doing the activities via the computer</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. More motivation working with computer-based activities</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. No Difficulties when using computers</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. More enjoyment working with the webBook</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. More engagement in the learning process by working with computers</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Class-time was more effective doing computer-based activities</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. The class atmosphere improved when following a computer-based approach</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Interest in continuing working with computers in the English class</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7. Descriptive statics of the results obtained in the experimental group students’ questionnaire
In Table 7, the students’ average perception (mean) and the variability expressed by the standard deviation were analysed. From the 12 items which formed the questionnaire, the items which obtained the highest mean scores were:

1. Item number 8 (M=4.71)
2. Item number 3 (M=4.6),
3. Item number 6 (M=4.38),
4. Items number 1 and 10 (M=4.29).
5. Item number 11 (M=4.25)

These data implied that most of students:
- enjoyed more working with the interactive ‘webBook’ rather than with the traditional printed textbook (item 8);
- worked more autonomously working with computers as they obtained immediate feedback and could do the activities any time they wanted (item 3);
- felt more motivated when doing computer-based activities rather than doing the activities in their notebooks (item 6);
- considered that computer-based activities were useful and effective tools for language learning and that class-time becomes more effective when using computers. Doing interactive activities took them less time, thus, there was more class-time to practise other skills of language such as for example the listening and speaking skills, watching videos, performing roles plays (items 1 and 10).
- considered that class atmosphere improved considerably when they worked with computers (item 11). This aspect could be related to item number 9 implying that as students were more engaged in their learning process when using a computer-based approach, the class atmosphere improved since most of them are concentrated working with the computers and did not get distracted.

On the contrary, the item which less mean results obtained was item number 4 (Mean=3.88) indicating the students’ English language improvement after the intervention but not so efficient. This information could be correlated to Table 6 related to the gains achieved in the experimental group post-test, where we notice that although most of the students (except 4) achieved better results in the post-test, these gains were not really significant.
Broadly speaking, the questionnaire results showed that participants in the experimental group preferred working with the ‘webBook’ rather than with the printed textbook.

Moreover, in the questionnaire we found a very low standard deviation in general (all the items are <1, except two of them) indicating that the data points tended to be very close to the mean, that is to say, all of them practically had practically the same opinion regarding the use of CALL in the classroom. However, in item 7, the standard deviation was higher (1.19) indicating that the data points were spread out over a large range of value, indicating that not all of the students agreed that they were good at using computers in the class.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Mean from 1 to 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10 (42%)</td>
<td>11 (46%)</td>
<td>3 (12%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>4.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9 (39%)</td>
<td>7 (29%)</td>
<td>4 (16%)</td>
<td>4 (16%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16 (67%)</td>
<td>7 (29%)</td>
<td>1 (4%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8 (33%)</td>
<td>8 (33%)</td>
<td>5 (22%)</td>
<td>3 (12%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>3.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9 (38%)</td>
<td>10 (42%)</td>
<td>1 (4%)</td>
<td>4 (16%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8 (33%)</td>
<td>13 (54%)</td>
<td>1 (4%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>4.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12 (50%)</td>
<td>7 (30%)</td>
<td>3 (12%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>4.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19 (80%)</td>
<td>3 (12%)</td>
<td>3 (12%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>4.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8 (33%)</td>
<td>11 (46%)</td>
<td>5 (21%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>4.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8 (33%)</td>
<td>15 (63%)</td>
<td>1 (4%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>4.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10 (42%)</td>
<td>10 (42%)</td>
<td>4 (18%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>4.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8. Opinions and perceptions on the use of computer-based approach in the English class by students in the experimental group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>computer-based approach</th>
<th>24</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>4.13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12. Interest in continuing working with computers in the English class</td>
<td>(34%)</td>
<td>(50%)</td>
<td>(12%)</td>
<td>(4%)</td>
<td>(0%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8 showed in percentages the opinions and perceptions of students about the use of computer-based approach in the English class. Breaking down table 8, and related to table 7, the conclusions that could be established regarding the three parts of which the questionnaire was composed were the following:

- **Language learning acquisition:** most of the students, 21 out of 24 students (88%) agreed with the fact that computer-based activities were an effective and useful for language learning which helped them to work more autonomously (96%) and which made them feel more motivated in their learning process (98%). However, 4 students (16 %) disagreed with the fact the they had a positive learning experience having using a computer-based approach, consequently, they also disagreed with the idea that CALL positively helped them to improve their English language knowledge. Table 6 also supported this fact, as these 4 students (participants 7, 14, 19 and 29 in Table 6) were the students who did not improve their language results after the treatment.

- **Motivation:** Most of the students (96%) stated that they felt more motivated when using computers to carry out the different activities than doing them in their notebooks. Twenty-two students out of 24 (92%) agreed with the fact that they enjoyed more using the computer and the Internet and, therefore, they became more engaged in their learning process. Moreover, 19 students (80%) found no difficulties when using computers as they considered having a very good digital competence. However, two students (8%) showed that they were not good at computers, and therefore, to carry out the different activities via the Internet could be a difficult task for them. This could be precisely the reason why these students did not improve their language results in the post-test.
- Class environment: Most of the students (96%) agreed with the fact that class-time was really effective as it took them less time to finish the activities doing them in the computer rather than in their notebooks by hand, and thereby, more time could be devoted to practise other language skills such as speaking and listening. Out of 24 students, 20 participants (84%) considered that class atmosphere also improved when using the computers as most of the students were more motivated and concentrated doing the tasks and, consequently, the presence of disruptive students decreased.

Finally, concerning the last item in the questionnaire, most of the students (84%) agreed that they wanted to continue working with computers in the English classroom.

5. CHAPTER FIVE: CONCLUSION AND PEDAGOGICAL IMPLICATIONS

As we have noticed, the present study has been a quasi-experimental research with pre-test and pro-test designs to analyse the effects of CALL on students’ linguistic competence, mainly in reading, vocabulary, grammar and writing.

According to the pre-test results, which served as a starting point to learn about the level of English of the students at the beginning of the experiment, the students’ overall score ranges of the control group were 19.43 out of 40 points and in the experimental group the overall score ranges were 21.63 out of 40. These results could indicate that the two groups of participants were most probably at an equal level of proficiency with regard to their reading, vocabulary, grammar and writing skills. These data also showed that both groups had a low level of proficiency in the English language as their mean scores were close to the average of the 40 possible points that could have been achieved in the pre-test (20 points).

After the experiment, the post-test results indicated that students in both groups showed overall improvement in their linguistic competence as both groups increased the mean scores in the post-test design: the control group’s pre-test and post-test English mean scores increased by 2.2 points (pre-test: M= 19.43, post-test: M= 22.56); whereas the experimental group’s pre-test and post-test mean scores increased by 4.17 points (pre-test: M= 21.63, post-test: M= 26.73). These results, therefore, indicated that although both groups showed improvements, the experimental group’s development was higher than that of the control group.
In this respect, concerning the research question number one, ‘Is there a significant difference between the mean scores of the group using CALL-based method and the group using a traditional approach?’, it could be stated that the answer is negative because although the group following the computer-based approach (experimental group) achieved higher results than the group following the traditional method (the control group) in the post-test, the difference between their mean scores was not really significant (only 1.87 points of difference). In other words, we can find a difference, but not a “significant” difference.

In general, most students in both groups improved their results in the four aspects of language of which they were assessed, namely, reading, vocabulary, grammar and writing. In the control group the increase in vocabulary and grammar were really scarce. In the experimental group, on the contrary, the improvements in the four aspects of language were higher than in the control group after the experiment. Probably, the fact that students in the experimental group achieved better results in grammar and vocabulary might be because students in the experimental group using the interactive ‘webBook’ and doing the activities through the computer could have learnt and practised the vocabulary and grammatical contents of units 7 and 8 better than the students in the control group, that is to say, they could have worked at their own pace, obtaining immediate feedback and repeating the activities at any time so as to help them consolidate and retain better the contents.

It has been interesting to know that the experimental group improved better in the reading skill (+1.6) than in the other three aspects of language. This might imply that when students followed the traditional textbook, they probably did not read, understand and work with the texts properly or, simply, did not show interest at all in reading. Consequently, they failed the reading comprehension questions. Instead, they might have become more motivated and committed to the reading tasks when working with computers.

In this way, for the research question number two, ‘Does the computer-based model increase students’ language achievements in terms of grammar, vocabulary, reading and writing acquisition?’, the answer is affirmative since, although both groups increased their language achievements, the experimental group outperformed in grammar, vocabulary, writing, and, especially, in the reading skill than the control group whose gains in the four aspects of language already mentioned were slightly inferior (see Tables 3 and 4). We could
assume with these results that students doing interactive activities could have better vocabulary retention, could have more opportunities to understand better the grammatical contents as they can obtain immediate feedback, can do the activities once again until they consolidate the knowledge learnt, and, finally, could show more interest in reading via the computer than through printed material. These findings are thus consistent with the results obtained by Getkham (2004) and Gorjian (2012) who found that CALL approach can sometimes be more effective in helping to facilitate, above all, the retention of vocabulary and grammatical knowledge and in helping to improve the students’ reading comprehension (Marzban, 2011).

In conclusion, the post-test results proved evidence of higher learning gains in favour of the experimental group. However, the difference among the gains in the experimental group compared to the gains in the control group has not been a significant difference. Maybe, participants in the experimental group could have not improved their post-test results in a remarkable way due to the difficulty in the contents of units 7 and 8 (the past simple tense, often considered as one of the most challenging aspects of language for students) and not due to the method of instruction. Thus, solid conclusions cannot be established and further investigation about this field should be recommended.

As the results in the experimental group have not been really significant in comparison with the results in the control group as to confirm that the computer-based approach was more effective in improving language learning than the traditional approach, we could establish that both methods can be equally effective for language learning. The outcomes of this study nearly reflect the results achieved by Nutta (1998) and Abu-Seileek (2007) establishing that the use of computer-based approach in the classroom can be at least as effective as the traditional method and that combining computer-assisted materials alongside traditional printed ones could motivate the students and enhance their language achievements.

In this way, since participants in the control group following a traditional approach also improved their language results in the post-test, it could be established that traditional method can be also effective for classroom teaching and learning procedure, because in this study it has also worked. Thus, a combination of a traditional methodology with a computer-based approach could be an excellent option to be successful in the learning process. All in
all, combining activities carried out in the students’ notebooks with interactive activities by using the computer might help change the routine and dynamic of the lessons and might help facilitate the acquisition of the students’ communicative competence which is the main aim when learning a foreign language.

In this respect, the research outcomes reached at this study lead us to consider the “blended learning”, often proposed as the best methodology for learning a language (Zaragoza-Ninet & Clavel-Arroitia 2008, 2010). In fact, language lessons are increasingly turning into blended learning methodology emphasising an active learning by combining face-to-face sessions with online activities. All in all, blended learning environments could be more motivating than traditional class-based approaches to teach the language and to increase the commitment of learners. Blended learning can therefore improve students’ performance.

In addition to this, in order to provide additional evidence that the use of computers in the English classroom can contribute to language learning, the questionnaire results showed that most of students in the experimental group agreed with the fact that computer-based activities were really useful and effective for language learning as they helped them increase their autonomy in the learning process and made them feel more motivated so as to enhance their interest and engagement in the learning process.

Most of the students considered that doing the activities through the computer took less time than doing them in the notebooks, therefore, CALL approach could be more time-efficient as students can count on more time to perform other tasks in the classroom such as role-plays, watching cultural videos, series and films, playing games.... In fact, the listening and speaking skills have been often relegated to a secondary position in the English language teaching classroom as teachers have normally been concentrated on teaching vocabulary and grammar. In this respect, by carrying out the activities that appear in the textbook in an interactive way through the computer, more time could be devoted to practise the other skills already mentioned. Although in this study these two skills have been not analysed, it might be assumed that students in the experimental group could have also improved their listening and speaking skills by using a CALL approach (Barani, 2011).

Furthermore, those students who do not want to do the activities in their notebooks because of boredom or lack of interest normally tend to disrupt the classroom. In this way, the questionnaire results confirmed the findings of Beatty (2003) and Olson & Gustavsson
(2011) who established that classroom atmosphere improved when students used computers in the classroom as they were more concentrated working while disruption in the classroom decreased.

The fact that the use of interactive activities in the classroom can increase motivation and interest and enhance the students’ engagement in language learning is also compatible with the findings of Silvester (2009) and Dörnyei (2001) who found that motivating and enjoyable activities can play important roles in language learning since they can draw the students’ attention and interest and can generate enthusiasm and desire to learn on the part of the students. It can be therefore concluded that interactive activities can motivate the students at the same time they can be quite beneficial for learners for a number of reasons: to help the students to practise, consolidate and reinforce what they have already learnt in the classroom; and to help those students who need additional support.

On the other hand, it has been quite interesting to learn that from the 26 students in the control group, only one participant did not improve the results in the post-test; whereas in the experimental group four participants, out of 24, were the students who did not improve the results in the post-test. Based on the questionnaire results, these four students were precisely the participants who stated that they had no a positive experience when using computer-based activities as they recognized not being good at using computers. As they had difficulties when using computers, they did not increase their language results in the post-test. This would take us to consider that the lack of ability and confidence to use ICT in the classroom could lead to lack of motivation as well. We could establish then that computers will only favour those who are acquainted with computer technology (Roblyer 2003 in Lai 2006).

With all these data, we could assume that this study is in line with the findings of different studies about CALL and EFLT (Perez-Cañado, 2013; Ravichandran, 2000; Beaty, 2003; Sehlaoui, 2001; Zhao, 2007; Cantos-Gomez, 1997; Zaragoza Ninet and Clavel Arroitia, 2008, 2010), which support the fact that using ICT, and, especially, computers in the learning process heightens students’ motivation, fosters an active learning on the part of the students, copes with the students’ needs, offers an optimal use of the learning time, favours new types of classroom dynamics, promotes lifelong learning and helps the learners to be more committed to their learning process.
It would not be necessary to replace traditional tools by new technologies because sometimes technical conditions may be unfavourable, and there may exist students and teachers who are not digitally competent. Using ICT alongside with traditional techniques could become an optimal combination in language learning. As Ravichandran (2000) underscores, CALL becomes not an alternative but a complementary tool in reinforcing classroom activities. CALL could be considered not as a replacement for teachers’ work and materials but as a supplement to them. In this case, “the computer is merely a part of the entire learning process” (Hartoyo, 2008:11). The findings of this study might therefore help teachers to reconsider new language teaching practices such as using the printed textbook alongside the interactive ‘webBook’ for the students to develop their communicative competence in an optimal way.

Last but not least, whether a CALL approach can help improve students’ linguistic competence might not be clear in this study as results are only from two classes and variables such as the students’ age and level, their personal family background, the school context, or the difficulty of contents in the different units are insufficient for drawing generalisations about the effect of CALL in the students’ linguistic competence. Besides, the data have been analysed by using only the Mean and Standard Deviation. Other data analysis instruments such as the t-test, which could have analysed the data in a more accurate way, have not been applied. This is only an initial investigation project about the effects of CALL on the students’ linguistic competence, thereby, results in this study are preliminary and encourage us to continue to explore the use of ICT in the language classroom.
6. CHAPTER SIX: LIMITATIONS AND LINES FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

A number of limitations could be found in the present study:

1. This study has been carried out with a limited scope of the sample in a specific school context, thus, more results could be achieved with a wider sample and in different school contexts to provide more reliable conclusions.

2. Participants in both groups were restricted to students in their first year of compulsory secondary education, thus, it would be recommended to extend this study to other levels.

3. The length of the study was only five weeks. Students might have improved their command in the English language by having more time to practise with computer-based activities.

4. This study only investigated the effects of CALL on English reading, vocabulary, grammar and writing. Other skills of language such as the listening and speaking skills have been not investigated.

5. The data in this study has been analysed by means of descriptive statistics (the mean and standard deviation). Other data analysis instruments such as Anova or t-test could have provided more reliable results.

6. The lack of technical support such as the necessary hardware, software, and wireless connectivity could have also limited the study.

It would be, therefore, recommended to replicate this study in different contexts, levels, with larger size of participants and with a longer period of time in order to analyse if the same findings can be obtained. However, it is expected that the conclusions drawn in this study can be interesting to continue exploring the use of ICT in language learning and teaching for the benefits of all EFL learners and teachers. I will therefore conclude with suggestions for further pedagogically-oriented research on this field.
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APPENDICES

APPENDIX A.

Interactive ‘WebBook’ compared to the printed Textbook by Burlinghon Books.

UNIT 7 WEBBOOK (some pages, sections and activities)

Figure 1. Page 90. Vocabulary Section 1.

Figure 2. Page 90. Vocabulary Section 1. Activity 2.
Figure 3. Page 93. Grammar Section 2. Was/were

Copy and complete the sentences with was, wasn’t, were, or weren’t to learn some facts about food.
1. Popcorn is thousands of years old. It was… an ancient Mexican food.
2. Noodles are from China. Pasta was…a common food in Italy until the 17th century.
3. Omelettes have got a long history in France. They were… one of Napoleon’s favourite dishes.
4. We can thank the Germans for the first hamburgers. They were… popular in the US until the 19th century.
5. Today, cola is a popular fizzy drink. Originally, it was… a medicine.

Listen and check your answers to Exercise 5.

In your notebook, write questions with the words was, wasn’t, were, or weren’t.

Figure 4. Page 93. Grammar Section 1. Activity 5.

1. Complete the text with the correct form of was or were.

Today, people all over the world eat ice cream, but it was… always popular for everyone? No, it wasn’t… (next). In the past, ice cream was… a food for rich people and kings and queens. In fact, it was… one of the Roman emperor Nero’s favourite foods. Of course, there weren’t any fridges in ancient Rome, so it was… hard to find ice to make the ice cream. Luckily, for Nero, the mountains were… not far from his house in Rome. The mountains were… very high, but Nero had many slaves and they were… quick runners. It was… easy to send them up the mountains to get snow. After adding some honey, fruit or wine to the snow, the ice cream was… ready. It was… (next) like modern ice cream, but it was… a true emperor’s food!
An article

1. Look quickly at the article and find the following information.
   1. a date
   2. a city in Italy
   3. a country in South America
   4. a country in Oceania

2. Read the article. Choose TWO correct answers for each question. Write the answers in your notebook.
   1. Insects and other bugs are... 
      a. the only food in 80% of the world
      b. good for you
      c. an ancient food
   2. In Thailand and Colombia, ants are... 
      a. big
      b. in hamburgers
      c. a popular food between meals
   3. Tarantulas are... 
      a. always hungry
      b. common in Cambodia

Did you know that 14th October is National Chocolate-Covered Insect Day in the USA?

On that day, instead of their usual meal of chicken, steak or ham – some adventurous people eat insects with chocolate on them! Why insects? Well, they are very good for you and they are usually free. In ancient Greece and Rome, insects were a common food for this reason. Today, people still eat insects and other bugs in 80% of the countries in the world.

Figure 5. Page 92. Reading Section.

Figure 6. Page 92. Reading Section. Activity 1.
Figure 7. Page 92. Reading Section. Activity 2.
Figure 8. Page 96. Writing Section.

Figure 9. Page 96. Writing Section. Activity 1.
Figure 10. Page 96. Writing Section. Task. Write a description of an event.
Figure 11. Page 90. Vocabulary Section 1. ‘Food’

Figure 12. Page 93. Grammar Section 2. ‘Was/Were’
**Figure 12. Page 92. Reading Section.**

**Figure 13. Page 96. Writing Section.**
Appendix B.

Teacher’s WebBook and Student progress

Figure 1. Teacher’s WebBook log in.

Figure 2. Student Progress: Pag 102, activities 1,2 and 3 in the interactive WebBook.
Figure 3. Student Progress: Scores in the activities 1, 2 and 3 page 102 of the WebBook.
**APPENDIX C.**
**Sequence of Contents of Each Unit.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNIT</th>
<th>VOCABULARY</th>
<th>READING</th>
<th>GRAMMAR</th>
<th>WRITING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>They’re famous</td>
<td>Adjectives of description Adjectives of personality</td>
<td>Voice Actors A web page</td>
<td>To be Have got</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>At Home</td>
<td>The house Household items</td>
<td>The Sixty-Eight Rooms A book review</td>
<td>There is/There are Articles and quantifiers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Teens Today</td>
<td>Activities Routines</td>
<td>The Results are in! A magazine survey</td>
<td>Present Simple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Great Holidays</td>
<td>Clothing</td>
<td>A travel brochure</td>
<td>Present Simple/Present Continuous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>All About Sport</td>
<td>Sports Sports venues and equipment</td>
<td>The History of Basketball A school project</td>
<td>Can, Adverbs of manner Must, can, should</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Amazing Animals</td>
<td>Adjectives and animals Animal groups</td>
<td>Robotic Animals A magazine article</td>
<td>Comparative adjectives, (not) as...as Superlative adjectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>It’s a Celebration!</td>
<td>Food Adjectives of opinión</td>
<td>Bugs for Dinner An article</td>
<td>There was/There were Was/were</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Changing the World</td>
<td>Achievements Jobs</td>
<td>Real Life Heroes A newspaper article</td>
<td>Past Simple</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D. Pre-test

IES GARCÍA LORCA  CSE 1°  UNITS 1-6 TEST

NAME: .............................................. DATE: ..............................................

READING 20 points

1. Read the text. Then find the following information in the text. (10 points)

Imagine it’s morning and you’re getting dressed. You’ve got socks on your feet and you’re putting on your shoes, but there’s something big and brown in your shoe and it’s moving... it’s a spider!

Spiders are amazing creatures. They live everywhere. You can find them in the desert, in caves, near rivers or on high mountains. Some spiders live in trees in forests and jungles. There are over 40,000 types of spiders and they can be tiny or huge. For example, some tarantulas are as large as your hand but the Puma de la Victoria is smaller than an ant!

Spiders are carnivores. They usually eat flies, mosquitoes and other insects, but some large spiders can catch and eat birds, frogs, fish and lizards. Female spiders are usually bigger and stronger than males. Male spiders must be careful because females sometimes eat them!

Spiders are usually brown, grey or black, but some spiders are as colourful as butterflies. Spiders can move quickly and some can jump far. Water spiders can live under the water for months at a time. Many types of spiders live for one or two years, but the oldest tarantulas can live for 25 years.

So, the next time you see a spider in your shoe, remember - it’s amazing!

1. The description of the spider in the shoe...

2. Complete the sentences. (10 points)

1. Spiders can ........................................ in the desert.
2. An ant is bigger than a ......................... spider.
3. Big spiders can sometimes eat ......................... and ......
4. Male spiders are usually ......................... than female spiders.
5. Some spiders can live under ......................... for over a month.

3. VOCABULARY 20 points

1. Circle the word that doesn’t belong. (5 points)
   1. skateboard ♦ mucket ♦ rollerblades ♦ bicycle
   2. swimming pool ♦ lake ♦ valley ♦ mountains
   3. mosquito ♦ horse ♦ net ♦ fly
   4. trainers ♦ trousers ♦ T-shirt ♦ tennis
   5. heavy ♦ huge ♦ wild ♦ tiny

2. Complete the sentences with the correct words. (10 points)

1. A ........................................ is an insect with beautiful colours.
2. I always wear a coat or a ........................................ when it’s cold.
3. There are five players in a ........................................ team.
4. Cows and dogs are ........................................ animals.
5. We go surfing in the ........................................ every Saturday.
6. In golf, you hit a ball with a ...........................................
7. Baby animals are usually very ........................................
8. A ........................................ looks like a big fish, but it’s a mammal.
9. Many people wear b ........................................ on their feet in the winter.
10. It rarely rains in a ........................................

3. Match A to B to make sentences. (5 points)

A
1. In volleyball, you hit the ball over a ...........................................
2. A crocodile is a type of ........................................
3. In cycling, you must wear a ........................................
4. A chicken is a type of ........................................
5. In the summer, people rarely wear a ........................................

B
a. bird
b. helmet
c. net
d. coat
e. reptile
GRAMMAR 30 points

1. Complete the text with the verbs in brackets. Use the correct form of the Present Simple or Present Continuous. (10 points)

Kenny is on a safari in Africa. Early every morning, his guide \( ^1 \).................... (take) him in a jeep to see wild animals. Right now, he \( ^2 \).................... (watch) hippopotamuses – or hippos – in a river. What \( ^3 \).................... they \( ^4 \).................... (do)? They \( ^4 \).................... (move) slowly in the water. According to the guide, hippos \( ^5 \).................... (stay) in the water all day, but at night, they must find food. Hippos aren’t carnivores – they \( ^6 \)....................

(not eat) meat, but they \( ^7 \).................... (love) fruit. Hippos \( ^8 \).................... (not like) people in their territory. They can become angry easily and an angry hippo is very dangerous. Kenny \( ^9 \).................... (not want) to be near an angry hippo, so he \( ^10 \).................... (not leave) the jeep now.

2. Write sentences with the words below. Use the correct adverb form of the adjectives. (5 points)

1. can / read / Susie / good

2. so / shouldn’t / quick / eat / you

3. kick / Scott / hit / a ball / can’t

4. talk / you / loud / mustn’t / here

5. Ron / easy / learn / can’t / new languages

3. Complete the sentences with the correct form of can or must. (5 points)

RULES AT THE BIRD PARK

1. No dogs! You \( ^1 \).................... bring animals into the bird park.

2. Don’t frighten the birds. You \( ^2 \).................... talk quietly in the park.

3. The young birds \( ^3 \).................... fly well. Please don’t go near them.

4. You \( ^4 \).................... give any food to the birds.

5. You \( ^5 \).................... take photos of the birds but don’t touch them.

4. Write sentences with the words below. Use the comparative or superlative form of the adjective or (not) as ... as. (10 points)

1. a dolphin / fast / than / a goldfish

2. skiing / dangerous / than / running

3. Angelina Jolie / famous / as / Brad Pitt

4. deserts / the / dry / places on Earth

5. a horse / not heavy / as / an elephant

WRITING 10 points

Imagine you are at a sports event. Write a description of the event. Include information about the people doing the sport, the place and the people with you.
Appendix E. Post-test

IES GARCÍA LORCA  CSE 1*  UNITS 7 and 8 TEST

NAME: ...........................................  DATE: .........................

Reading  20 points
1  Read the text and tick (✓) the sentences T (true), F (false) or DS (the text doesn’t say). (10 points)

The first World Exposition was in London in 1851. Six million visitors took a trip to Hyde Park to see new
wonders of machines and technology. In 1855, the World Exposition was in Paris. It was very crowded, with
about 32 million visitors. There were many exciting things for the visitors to see and do.

At the Gallery of Machines, there were 16,000 machines. They were the best of modern technology. There
were musicians and dancers from Java, Vietnam, Africa, the Middle East, the USA and more. The food wasn’t
like the fast food of today. There weren’t any hot dogs, chips or fizzy drinks. People ate tasty, authentic meals
from around the world.

But, of course, the favourite attraction was the 300-metre-tall Eiffel Tower. It stood at the entrance to the
Exposition and people walked under it to go in. Gustave Eiffel designed the tower for the Exposition and until
1981, it was the tallest structure in the world. At night, the Eiffel Tower had red, white and blue lights.

Electric lights were new in 1889, so it was amazing to see them.

World Expositions, or Expos, are popular today, too. In 2015, there was a World Expo in Milan with eight
million visitors. Where is the next World Expo going to be? Do you think you will go?

    T  F  DS

1. The first World Exposition was in London.
3. There was music from Egypt at the Paris Exposition.
4. In 1900, the Eiffel Tower was taller than other structures in the world.
5. There were many World Expositions between 1889 and 2013.

2  Complete the sentences according to the text. (10 points)

1. People went to the World Exposition in London to see .............................................
2. The Gallery of Machines in Paris had .................................................................
3. There were ............................................. to eat at the Exposition.
4. People walked under ...................................................... to go into the Exposition.
5. In 1889, the ............................................. on the Eiffel Tower were amazing because they were new

Vocabulary 20 points
1  Write the words below in the correct categories. (12 points)

noisy • arcade • artist • grapes • TV host • rice • chemist’s • clean • strange • cheese
hairdresser • bakery

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Places</th>
<th>Jobs</th>
<th>Food</th>
<th>Adjectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2  Complete the sentences with the words below. There are more words than you need. (8 points)

competed • cake • relaxed • sweet shop • looked after • boring
post office • clean • visited relatives • tomatoes • donated

1. Jake stayed at a cottage in the mountains and ......................... by the lake.
2. Many people .................................. money to build schools in Africa.
3. We ...................... in York last Christmas. We’ve got a great family!
4. The film was ...................... Don’t go and see it.
5. We haven’t got any ...................... for the salad.
6. James ...................... in the race, but he didn’t win.
7. When my friend was on holiday, I ...................... her pets.
8. They’ve got delicious chocolates at this ......................
Grammar 30 points
1. Choose the correct answer. (6 points)
   1. There were / Were there / Were hot dogs and pizza at the party last night.
   2. Were there / Were / There were your parents at the bank yesterday?
   3. The book was / wasn’t / there was interesting, so I didn’t finish it.
   4. There were / Were there / There weren’t any pins, so Lewis bought a cake.
   5. Was there / There was / There wasn’t an amusement park in the city in the 1900s?
   6. Mum made a great dinner. The food there was / were / was very tasty.

2. Complete the sentences with the verbs below. Use the Past Simple. (5 points)
   - eat out ● carry ● not wear ● receive ● stop
   1. Dad .......... at the bakery to buy rolls.
   2. .......... the scientist .......... the Nobel Prize?
   3. There wasn’t much food at home, so we .......... at a restaurant.
   4. I .......... my golf clubs for two hours!
   5. She .......... trainers at the beach.

3. Complete the sentences with the verbs in brackets. Use the Past Simple affirmative or negative. (5 points)
   2. Pau and Marc Gasol ................. (not play) on Team USA at the 2012 Olympics.
   3. Agatha Christie ................. (not write) in Italian.
   5. In 1979, Margaret Thatcher ................. (become) Prime Minister of the UK.
   6. According to Sir Isaac Newton, an apple ................. (not hit) his head.
   7. The Wright brothers ................. (fly) an aeroplane for the first time in 1903.
   8. Albert Einstein ................. (win) a Nobel Prize for physics.

2. Write questions with the words below. Use the Past Simple. Then match the questions to the answers. (10 points)
   1. the dog / save / the boy
   2. Ann / see / any celebrities / at the party
   3. what / the scientist / discover
   4. the students / receive / new books
   5. when / you / donate / to this organization
   6. a. No, they didn’t.
   7. b. Yes, she did.
   8. c. Last week.
   10. e. Yes, it did.

3. Complete the text with the correct form of the verbs in brackets. Use the Past Simple. (11 points)
   1. .......... you .......... (help) to change the world last year? Many people
   2. .......... (not do) anything to help because they don’t know what to do. But teenagers can learn
   3. about activities to do at a special event called “WE Day.” The 2010-2011 WE Day events in North America
   4. were very successful. During WE Day, the students .......... (learn) about some world problems
   5. and .......... (watch) videos about important work by teenagers. Of course, the teenagers
   6. .......... (not study) all day. There were also some fun events. Famous musicians
   7. .......... (sing) songs and the students .......... (enjoy) the music. Then, the teenagers
   8. .......... (go) home and organised events at their schools. How .......... these events
   9. .......... (change) the world? Students .......... (give) 1.7 million hours of their time,
   10. collected $5.4 million and .......... (take) 235 tonnes of food to collection centres!

Writing 10 points
Write a short text about someone from your family. Include the following:
- where and when he / she was born
- what he / she studied at school, at university or in a different place
- his / her job / she had in the past
- two interesting things he / she did in the past
Appendix F.
Questionnaire and Questionnaire Analysis.

QUESTIONNAIRE: STUDENTS' OPINIONS AND PERCEPTIONS ABOUT THE USE OF COMPUTER-BASED ACTIVITIES IN THE CLASSROOM

Student nº: ...................................... Date:.........................

Are you agree with the following statements for L2 learning?
Grade these items by using the following scale:
5 = strongly agree
4 = agree
3 = don’t know
2 = disagree
1 = strongly disagree

(.....) 1. Computer-based activities are a useful and effective tool for language learning.
(.....) 2. I had a positive learning experience using computers and the ‘webBook’ in the classroom.
(.....) 3. When I work with the computer I work more autonomously.
(.....) 4. Computer-based approach has contributed positively to improve my language knowledge.
(.....) 5. I prefer doing the activities through the computer.
(.....) 6. I feel more motivated when I use the computer in the learning process.
(.....) 7. I did not found difficulties carrying out the activities as I am not good at using computers.
(.....) 8. I enjoyed more working with the interactive ‘webBook’ than with the traditional printed textbook.
(.....) 9. I am more engaged in the learning process when I use the computer than when I follow the traditional printed textbook.
(.....) 10. Class-time is more effective when we work with computer-based activities.
(.....) 11. The class atmosphere improves when we follow a computer-based approach.
(.....) 12. I would like to continue working with computers in the English sessions.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>Q2</th>
<th>Q3</th>
<th>Q4</th>
<th>Q5</th>
<th>Q6</th>
<th>Q7</th>
<th>Q8</th>
<th>Q9</th>
<th>Q10</th>
<th>Q11</th>
<th>Q12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mean**: 4.29 3.96 **3.83** 4.04 **4.38** 4.13 **4.71** 4.13 4.29 4.25 4.13

**Standard Deviation**: 0.69 1.09 0.91 0.58 1.19 0.62 0.74 0.55 0.74 0.80

**Figure 1. Questionnaire Analysis.**