DEPARTMENT OF GENERAL STUDIES

FINAL EXAMINATION

Student ID (in Figures)   :

Student ID (in Words)   :

Course Code & Name   :   **ENG1023 English for Foundation Studies 3**
Semester & Year   :   January – April 2020
Lecturer/Examiner   :   Nur Harizah Mohd Faiz
Duration   :   2 Hours

INSTRUCTONS TO CANDIDATES

1. **This question paper consists of 2 parts:**
    PART A (40 marks)   :   **Grammar & Vocabulary –** There are **TWO (2)** sections in this part. Answer both sections. Write your answers in the answer booklet.
    PART B (60 marks)   :   **Writing –** There are **TWO (2)** sections in this part. Read the instructions carefully and write your answers in the answer booklet.
2. **Candidates are not allowed to bring any unauthorised materials except writing equipment into the Examination Hall. Electronic dictionaries are strictly prohibited.**
3. **This question paper must be submitted along with all used and/or unused rough papers and/or graph paper (if any). Candidates are NOT allowed to take any examination materials out of the examination hall.**
4. **Only ballpoint pens are allowed to be used in answering the questions, with the exception of multiple choice questions, where 2B pencils are to be used.**

WARNING: The University Examination Board (UEB) of BERJAYA University College regards cheating as a most serious offence and will not hesitate to mete out the appropriate punitive actions according to the severity of the offence committed, and in accordance with the clauses stipulated in the Students' Handbook, up to and including expulsion from BERJAYA University College.

Total Number of pages = 10 (Including the cover page)

PART A : **GRAMMAR & VOCABULARY (40 marks)**
INSTRUCTION(S) : There are **TWO (2)** sections in this part. Answer both sections. Write your answers in the answer booklet.

_____

SECTION 1 **: 20 marks**
Instructions **:** Fill in the blanks with the most appropriate words given in the brackets. Write your answers in the answer booklet.

Running for the office of the President of the United States is exceptionally arduous and should not be undertaken by the **(1) _____ (faint / weak / mild)** hearted. The candidates must first compete in the local primary election. During the primary campaign, the candidates endeavour to **(2) _____ (drop / exist / gain)** the votes of his or her constituents. Any new candidates are the opponents **(3) _____ (by / for / of)** the incumbent, the President currently in office who is running for re-election. The candidates refrain from actions that might create animosity **(4) _____ (by / beside / between)** them and the public.

Rather, they attempt to appease their constituency by using promotional gimmicks and ambiguous equivocation, as well as **(5) _____ (observing / observant / observance)** decorous protocol. The public is indeed curious about, if not **(6) _____ (adventurous / suspicious / dangerous)** of, the candidate's professional life, in addition to his or her personal life, which will be under **(7) _____ (near / close / front)** scrutiny during the campaign. Since his or her private life becomes public domain, the candidate may **(8) _____ (look / see / be)** fit to disclose any controversial behaviour in his or her past before the press digs it up. **(9) _____ (As / Despite / Where)** history has shown us, even a prominent politician can be revealed as a phony. A politician exhibiting scandalous behaviour might even be subjected **(10) _____ (by / with / to)** censure from his political colleagues.

The voters must also **(11) _____ (include / solve / consider)** the political platform of the candidate. The platform includes the core issues **(12) _____ (which / who / whose)** the candidate promises to resolve during his or her term in office. Typical campaign promises include establishing **(13) _____ (antecedents / precedents / predators)** to reduce bureaucratic red tape. The candidate

(14) _____ (victorious / winning / championing) the primary election will be nominated by his or her political party to run **(15) _____ (to / for / under)** the final election.

After toppling the competition, the endorsed candidate is expected to **(16) _____ (begin / mention / give)** a nomination address at the National Convention. The audience is usually rapt and responds **(17) _____ (for / to / with)** a standing ovation. The final election **(18) _____ (then / that / there)** takes place. The winner will be **(19) _____ (brought / turned / sworn)** in as the president of the United States during the formal inauguration ceremony. This occurs in ornate surrounding, complete **(20) _____ (with / for / at)** red carpets and the official U. S. seal.

Adapted from: *https://www.michigan-test.com/cloze-exercises/*

SECTION 2 **: 20 marks**
Instructions **:** Write a sentence using each of the words given below. You may change the form of the verbs.

1. ambition
   ambitious

2. decide
   decision

3. economy
   economical

4. protect
   protective

5. specific
   specify

END OF PART A

PART B : **WRITING (60 marks)**

INSTRUCTION(S) : There are **TWO (2)** sections in this part. Read the instructions carefully and write your answers in the answer booklet.

_____

The following two sections are based on the accompanying **THREE (3) articles**.

SECTION 1 : **10 marks**

Instructions : Provide the full referencing following the BERJAYA University College Harvard Referencing Style for each of the following **THREE (3)** articles.

SECTION 2 : **50 marks**

This section requires you to integrate a variety of sources into a coherent, well-written essay. Refer to the sources to support your position; avoid mere paraphrase or summary. Your argument should be central; the sources should support this argument. Remember to include at least **ONE (1)** citation from **EACH** article.

'Digital natives' are generally born after the 1980s and they are comfortable in the digital age, because they grew up using technology whereas 'digital immigrants' are those who are born before 1980s and they are afraid of using technology. But several researchers have highlighted that digital natives aren't fundamentally better equipped to learn new technologies than "digital immigrants".

Instructions : Read the following articles (including any introductory information) carefully. Then, in an essay that synthesises all **THREE (3)** sources for support, take a position that defends, challenges, or qualifies the claim that **digital natives are not better learners than digital immigrants**.

ARTICLE 1:

Digital Natives, Digital Immigrants

Marc Prensky

Today's students have not just changed incrementally from those of the past, nor simply changed their slang, clothes, body adornments, or styles, as has happened between generations previously. A really big discontinuity has taken place. One might even call it a "singularity" – an event which changes things so fundamentally that there is absolutely no going back. This so-called "singularity" is the arrival and rapid dissemination of digital technology in the last decades of the 20th century.

Today's students – kindergarten through college – represent the first generations to grow up with this new technology. They have spent their entire lives surrounded by and using computers, videogames, digital music players, video cams, cell phones, and all the other toys and tools of the digital age. Today's average college grads have spent less than 5,000 hours of their lives reading, but over 10,000 hours playing video games (not to mention 20,000 hours watching TV). Computer games, email, the Internet, cell phones and instant messaging are integral parts of their lives.

It is now clear that as a result of this ubiquitous environment and the sheer volume of their interaction with it, today's students think and process information fundamentally differently from their predecessors. These differences go far further and deeper than most educators suspect or realize. "Different kinds of experiences lead to different brain structures," says Dr. Bruce D. Berry of Baylor College of Medicine. As we shall see, it is very likely that our students' brains have physically changed – and are different from ours – as a result of how they grew up. But whether or not this is literally true, we can say with certainty that their thinking patterns have changed. I will get to how they have changed in a minute.

What should we call these "new" students of today? Some refer to them as the N-[for Net]-gen or D-[for digital]-gen. But the most useful designation I have found for them is *Digital Natives*. Our students today are all "native speakers" of the digital language of computers, video games and the Internet.

So what does that make the rest of us? Those of us who were not born into the digital world but have, at some later point in our lives, become fascinated by and adopted many or most aspects of the new technology are, and always will be compared to them, *Digital Immigrants*.

The importance of the distinction is this: As Digital Immigrants learn – like all immigrants, some better than others – to adapt to their environment, they always retain, to some degree, their "accent," that is, their foot in the past. The "digital immigrant accent" can be seen in such things as turning to the Internet for information second rather than first, or in reading the manual for a program rather than assuming that the program itself will teach us to use it. Today's older folk were "socialized" differently from their kids, and are now in the process of learning a new language. And a language learned later in life, scientists tell us, goes into a different part of the brain.

There are hundreds of examples of the digital immigrant accent. They include printing out your email (or having your secretary print it out for you – an even "thicker" accent); needing to print out a document written on the computer in order to edit it (rather than just editing on the screen); and bringing people

physically into your office to see an interesting web site (rather than just sending them the URL). I'm sure you can think of one or two examples of your own without much effort. My own favourite example is the "Did you get my email?" phone call. Those of us who are Digital Immigrants can, and should, laugh at ourselves and our "accent."

But this is not just a joke. It's very serious, because the single biggest problem facing education today is that our *Digital Immigrant instructors, who speak an outdated language (that of the pre-digital age), are struggling to teach a population that speaks an entirely new language*. This is obvious to the Digital Natives – school often feels pretty much as if we've brought in a population of heavily accented, unintelligible foreigners to lecture them. They often can't understand what the Immigrants are saying. What does "dial" a number mean, anyway?

Let me highlight some of the issues. Digital Natives are used to receiving information really fast. They like to parallel process and multi-task. They prefer their graphics before their text rather than the opposite. They prefer random access (like hypertext). They function best when networked. They thrive on instant gratification and frequent rewards. They prefer games to "serious" work. (Does any of this sound familiar?) But Digital Immigrants typically have very little appreciation for these new skills that the Natives have acquired and perfected though years of interaction and practice. These skills are almost totally foreign to the Immigrants, who themselves learned – and so choose to teach – slowly, step-by-step, one thing at a time, individually, and above all, seriously.

Digital Immigrants don't believe their students can learn successfully while watching TV or listening to music, because they (the Immigrants) can't. Of course not – they didn't practice this skill constantly for all of their formative years. Digital Immigrants think learning can't (or shouldn't) be fun. Why should they – they didn't spend their formative years learning with Sesame Street.

Digital Immigrants assume that learners are the same as they have always been, and that the same methods that worked for the teachers when they were students will work for their students now. But that assumption is no longer valid. Today's learners are different. "www.hungry.com" said a kindergarten student recently at lunchtime. "Every time I go to school I have to power down," complains a high-school student. Is it that Digital Natives can't pay attention, or that they choose not to? Often from the Natives' point of view their Digital Immigrant instructors make their education not worth paying attention to compared to everything else they experience – and then they blame them for not paying attention!

So what should happen? Should the Digital Native students learn the old ways, or should their Digital Immigrant educators learn the new? Unfortunately, no matter how much the Immigrants may wish it, it is highly unlikely the Digital Natives will go backwards. In the first place, it may be impossible – their brains may already be different. It also flies in the face of everything we know about cultural migration. Kids born into any new culture learn the new language easily, and forcefully resist using the old. Smart adult immigrants accept that they don't know about their new world and take advantage of their kids to help them learn and integrate. Not-so-smart (or not-so-flexible) immigrants spend most of their time grousing about how good things were in the "old country."

So unless we want to just forget about educating Digital Natives until they grow up and do it themselves, we had better confront this issue. And in so doing we need to reconsider both our teaching methodology and our content.

The current state of digitalization: Digital Native, Digital Immigrant and Digital Settler

Adile Kurt, Selim Gunuc & Mehmet Ersoy
Ankara University Journal of Faculty of Educational Sciences
Volume 46, No. 1, Page 113 – 125
2013

Introduction: Today, in this age of intensive digital division, it is important to determine these groups well and to take necessary precautions especially in educational environments. In this way, the digital native characteristics owned by digital immigrants and digital settlers will minimize the disagreement and lack of communication between the learner and teacher in educational environments. In this respect, in the present study, the reflections of the digital native and digital immigrant characteristics into learning-teaching experiences are discussed with the concept of digital settler.

Digital Native, Digital Immigrant and Digital Settler: Marc Prensky, who first introduced the concepts of digital native and digital immigrant, emphasized the importance of reconsidering education both for future and for the past. Prensky (2001) states that learners have changed radically in recent years; that they do not share the profile of a learner involved in the education system; and that they are "native speakers" of the digital language of the Internet, computers and video games. It is pointed out that although those in the position of a teacher were not born in the digital world, they have benefitted from new technologies in their lives and thus they are "digital immigrants". In this respect, it is reported that it would be beneficial to take sharers into consideration with respect to the dimensions of system, teacher and learner.

The group which is not digital native but has to follow the technology in order to keep up with the age could be defined as digital immigrant. Digital immigrants are individuals who were not born exactly in the technology age but who sometimes use. Digital immigrant represent parents who want to speak the same language with their children and to understand them better and sometimes refer to teachers supposed to use technology as well as to digital native learners. Digital immigrants could be said to include teachers, academicians, engineers and other individuals in business life, who are all supposed to use technology as required by their profession or by their job. Digital immigrant is neither as knowledgeable about technology and about its use as digital natives nor as away from it as digital settlers are. This new group of today's changing world comes up with different learning and also teaching characteristics due to their teacher roles. Digital settlers were defined by Odabasi (2009) and Palfrey and Gasser (2008). One can say they are slower than digital natives and digital immigrants, and accustomed to text-based learning and teaching. The other characteristics of digital settlers are being interested in a traditional and analog world, being relax in an isolated network and also information-centred working rather than taking role in action based efforts (Palfrey and Gasser, 2008; Prensky, 2005; Prensky, 2009; Shah and Jansen, 2011; Weir and Bader, 2010; Weltevrede, 2011).

Digital Native and Digital Immigrant Characteristics: Today, understanding how digital natives learn and what their preferences are will contribute significantly to the education process. Undesirable situations in which learners criticize teachers negatively and vice versa are the result of mutual disagreement. For example, it is emphasized that in traditional classroom settings, learners represent

digital natives and that teachers represent digital immigrants (Naish, 2008). One of the sources of this representative disagreement could be said to result from the fact that teachers and learners are educated in different educational systems. It could be stated that digital natives can acquire different knowledge and skills more easily by using information technologies. Therefore, it is believed that digital natives have learning preferences and styles different from those of the previous generation (Bennett, Maton and Kervin, 2008; Dede, 2005). Digital natives use technology for learning activities and especially for social-communication purposes (Lei, 2009). Digital natives adapt themselves easily to new technologies and do not avoid using them because they learn how to use these technologies in a shorter time (Bennett, Maton and Kervin, 2008). Digital immigrants and especially digital settlers are afraid of damaging new technologies, yet digital natives know that everything can be restored by restarting the technological device. Thus, digital natives use technology without any fear (Gunther, 2007; Rikhye, Cook, and Berge, 2009).

Discussion and Conclusion: Based on the results of studies conducted, it cannot be stated that the life styles of digital natives and their learning characteristics have not been understood completely. Considering the fact that most studies have been carried out by digital immigrants, it seems difficult to give meaning to digital natives' responses to events and people around them. It is thought that it is necessary to reconsider the problems likely to be experienced by teachers, parents, adolescents and adult learners in technology addiction, inappropriate use of technology and use of technology for an excessive amount of time. In a study carried out by McNeely (2005), the researcher stated that learners should consider technology as a tool. However, considering the fact that individuals of the new generation live with technology and that they usually use technological devices in their lives, it could be stated that for digital natives, technology is more than a device.

The claim that digital natives mentioned by researchers such as Gibson, Koontz, and Van Den Hende (2008) and Prensky (2001) were born in 1980s and the fact that this generation is considered as digital native are not supported by studies satisfactorily. It could be stated that individuals of this generation are digital natives but that not all of them show all the characteristics of digital natives. Therefore, it would be beneficial to redefine digital native individuals and to carry out studies on individuals born in 1990s. In addition, a long period of time has passed since Prensky (2001) explained the concept of digital natives; thus, it could be stated that it would be necessary to redefine the concepts of digital native and digital immigrant. It is necessary to conduct studies based on reconsidering not only these concepts but also learning styles and similar concepts related to digital natives (Dede, 2005).

In terms of the concept of future-cantered education, the new world order has made it necessary to train individuals who can process information effectively. Learners have certain expectations from technology as well as from universities in terms of use of current technologies in learning processes. That is, if the goal is to train a generation saying "the school did not teach me anything, I learnt everything from games" (Prensky, 2005), then it is undoubtedly necessary to avoid certain traditions.

ARTICLE 3:

Digital Natives

Sue Bennett
Encyclopaedia of cyber behaviour 2012, page 212-219
from https://www.igi-global.com/ viewed on 6 February 2020

INTRODUCTION

A 'digital native' can be defined as an individual who has grown up immersed in digital technology and is technologically adept and interested. The digital native is described in direct contrast to the 'digital immigrant', who having been exposed to digital technology later in life is fearful of it, mistrustful and lacks the skills to use technology adeptly. According to Prensky's (2001) vision, all young people who have grown up since the widespread advent of the personal computer can be considered digital natives, and, by elimination, all older people are digital immigrants.

It is argued that the existence of the digital native makes dramatic educational reforms necessary because traditional education systems do not, and can not, cater for the needs and interests of young people. As a result, outdated schools and universities and outmoded teaching simply alienate students from learning, leaving them disengaged and disenchanted by education's alleged failure to adapt to the new digital world. By implication, education must be transformed by technology, coupled with new pedagogies. Although this argument is a familiar one to those acquainted with the broader educational technology literature, the digital native hypothesis provides a new basis for claims for revolutionary educational change through technology integration.

RESEARCHING 'DIGITAL NATIVES'

In the mid-2000s researchers began to investigate some of Prensky's key claims about digital natives. The initial area of focus was on determining whether, in fact, digital technologies were as extensively used within younger generations of the population as was supposed by the digital native thesis (eg. Kennedy, Krause, Judd, Churchward & Gray, 2006; Kvavik, Caruso & Morgan, 2004; Oliver & Goerke, 2007). These studies set about to establish the extent of access to and ownership of a wide range of technologies, and to discover the extent to which they were used for particular activities. In short, researchers wanted to know who was using what technology, how often and for what purposes. Similar research had already been conducted, for example through studies of children's use of technology in and out of school (e.g., Downes, 2002; Kent & Facer, 2004; Kerawalla & Crook, 2002), but these studies were not specifically driven by the digital native concept. Related work was also being conducted in disciplines outside of education, such as youth studies, cultural studies and media studies, but again these did not relate to the digital native idea (e.g., Livingstone & Helsper, 2007; Selwyn, 2003). These studies do, however, suggest that there was a broader appeal to research along these lines.

Early 'digital natives' studies tended to use survey methods to collect data from large populations, often of higher education students. In this exploratory work researchers attempted to gain a broad perspective by collecting data from participants who are relatively easy to access with a focus on phenomena relatively easy to measure through self-report (e.g., Kennedy et al, 2006; Kvavik, Caruso & Morgan, 2004). While questions about access to technologies and frequency of use are common features of these studies, many have gone further to gauge skills, interests and preferences, have included multiple age ranges

rather than only younger people, and in some cases incorporated qualitative methods to complement quantitative data. One of the most notable surveys has been the ECAR series in the United States, which has run since 2004 with consistently large sample sizes of college students (see Smith & Caruso, 2010 for the latest report,). Similar studies from around the world have contributed to a developing understanding of technology use, particularly among young people (e.g., Jones, Ramanaua, Cross & Healing, 2010; Kennedy et al., 2009; Oliver & Goerke, 2007; Margaryan, Littlejohn & Vojt, 2011).

In sum, the main findings of these studies have been as follows:
1. There is near universal adoption of some technologies (e.g., mobile phones).
2. Some technologies have not been widely adopted, for example, RSS feeds and some forms of social media. The reasons for this are not clear, however. Perhaps, some technologies are too specialized, overly technical, or judged to be less useful.
3. There are indicators of some differences due to age, gender, socio-economic background, and discipline of study (at university or college), although findings are not consistent across all studies or all technologies.
4. The studies trace how some technologies are abandoned, for example, because they are superseded in favour of alternatives (e.g., the demise of MySpace and the rise of Facebook, and the shift from dial-up to broadband Internet access).
5. Skills, knowledge and interests are highly varied when comparing individuals.
Findings suggest that individuals adapt their technology use to suit their needs and interests and the contexts they engage in.
6. Younger people often have lower skill and knowledge levels than what might be expected based on the digital native hypothesis.

A common conclusion from these studies is that while there appear to be some age-related factors, diversity is often higher within age groups than between them. It is also important to note that while large-scale survey studies can indicate patterns, the measures used are relatively crude and their accuracy is limited by participants' abilities to recall and estimate their usage. There is a need for qualitative studies that are capable of exploring technology use in greater depth and with sensitivity to individuals' contexts. There are also, to date, few studies from developing countries and of less affluent communities, making the global situation difficult to discern.

In short, the research conducted thus far suggests that only a small minority of the population can be considered 'digital natives', even disregarding age as a factor to include technologically adept older people. People adopt technologies for a wide range of reasons and have diverse patterns and habits, and the skills they develop are often narrow and highly contextualized (i.e., fit for a particular purpose). As a result, it would be wrong to generalize about a section of a population on the basis of how they use technology, and in particular on the basis of presumed exposure to technology.

END OF EXAM PAPER