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Introduction
In a changing world appreciating those with specific technical skills, language is needed as means of distinction and ability to gain recent and updated knowledge. Language is composed of a set of four skills comprising minor skills, constituents, and systems. The four skills incorporating the minor components take the shape of reading, writing, listening and speaking. The ultimate goal of any language curriculum is to ensure that the four skills and relating necessary components are developed in students.

Achievement in/to language learning
Achievement informs of the effectiveness of the teaching methods used in the classroom. Besides, it tells whether learners have achieved the goals of education or not, instigating learners to identify their positive and negative areas and modify or stabilise answers later on (Nedzinskaitė et al., 2006:84). It helps in promoting self-government and self-regulation and self-learning. Spinah (2012) proposes that academic achievement denotes performance results of education either at school, college, or university, which can be embodied in the learner’s marks/points/grade gained. Besides, as to the present study, it is seen that achievement can inform whether or not changes in any of the curriculum components should be made.

It is evident in many studies carried out on student nurses that proficiency or success in using the English language is straightforwardly linked to students’ academic achievement/performance (e.g. Denham et al., 2018; Haniefi et al., 2018; Mthimunye & Daniels, 2019; Tenney et al., 2019; Asgari et al., 2019; Nasirudeen & Xiao, 2020; Sadiqa, 2020; Oducado et al., 2020; Qays et al., 2022; Çelik
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Additionally and above all, achievement is found to lead to success in gaining nursing lecture (Oducado et al., 2020).

**Background**

The Ministry of Health and Population (M.o.H.P.) has forced out an EFL course by Abdelfadeel et al. (2018) on both instructors and students at all five-year study technical tumor institutes all over Egypt since the year 2018. Technical tumour institutes have a study for five years in order to have their diploma award and they directly come from Preparatory School. The tumour institute students study the course in their final year. A conceptual content analysis of the course was conducted to detect related components, in order to have a clear picture of the course by means of a rather qualitative method. It is known that concept analysis helps in determining the existence/frequency of words, themes, and concepts within texts to be able to take decisions (Krippendorff, 2018: 87-96). In this case, the analysis was limited to finding concepts and sub-concepts. The results were analysed.

A number of course specifications were found (Adelfadeel et al., 2018: 7). For example, in terms of goals, the course stated the following goals (limited to the first term as scope of the present study) indicated under three categories:

1. **Knowledge and concepts**
   - Employ major terminologies related to students’ field of specialties.
   - Use English vocabulary in a diversity of sentence types
   - Exploit different structures appropriately
   - Distinguish main ideas from secondary ideas in reading texts in questions

2. **Intellectual skills**
   - Analyze the different types of sentences in English.
   - Express opinions and attitudes about topics in correct English
   - Compare and contrast the forms of both adjectives and adverbs in English
   - Use specialized terminologies in both communicative and functional situations
   - Pronounce major-related terms in a correct way
   - Practise reading in the field of specialties
   - Write logs and reports competently in their majors
3. General skills

• Use English in communicative situations to express oneself in diverse life situations
• Apply social English properly in different contexts

As for the teaching methods used, the course depended on interactive lectures and active learning as the sole teaching method (Ibid:7). In terms of teaching aids, none was present. As for assessment, exercises related to all components were found in each unit. Midterm and final exam were found, too.

There was also a Teacher’s Notes. It was seven pages long and they quite restated the goals above, with some explanation of steps on how to teach the components in very brief detail. As for the book content/language input, the course was divided into two halves. The first half was designated for the first term and the second half for the second. The ministry allocated two sections and eight chapters to be taught to students for the first term and only eight chapters in the second term. The two sections of the first term included one section (12 pages in length) which was concerned with writing and addressed only paragraph writing, punctuation marks, and sentence problems.

The other section (48 pages in length) which included eight chapters addressed grammar and reading texts (together with translation exercises whose content was taken out of the reading texts, and a paragraph-writing task based on the reading text, too.) The titles of reading texts in the eight chapters were as follows: Ancient Egyptian Civilization, Chin’s One-Child Policy, Strategies of Conversation, Technology and Foreign Language Learning, Life Balance, Sleeping Tricks, Overcoming Stress, and Benefitting from your Mistakes. Each reading text had the skills of skimming and scanning. Although there was no separate section within the course for technical terms, there were, rather, vocabulary relating to health issues infused in half of reading texts.

Additionally, it was observed that listening activities, speaking activities, language functions relating to health/medical setting were not integrated into the curriculum and were absent. It is also found that the writing was limited to only one genre – paragraph writing (eleven tasks), grammar rules mounted to eleven, idioms to eight, pronunciation to only one of modal weak forms, ESP vocabulary to 60 items. It is observed that the reading texts were quite sufficient – eight – two pages long each.
Therefore, it was contended that the course component areas consisted of writing (i.e. limited to paragraph writing), grammar, reading, and health-related vocabulary infused in a number of the reading texts, as well as translation based on those reading texts. The course has been into effect since the academic year 2018-2019, as alluded earlier. However, there was no formal reporting on the course effectiveness in improving students’ achievement of those areas forming the course until the time the study started. (That formed the rationale for carrying this research out.) Research boosting this claim is Choi (2021) which sees that few attempts of investigation have been made to test the effectiveness of courses taught to student nurses so far and investigate whether these courses result in a satisfaction of students’ needs or not, which is seen be much important to students’ engagement and achievement.

The following record investigates literature to date to examine achievements made in the five course components of writing, grammar, reading, ESP vocabulary, and translation, in research so far. Writing, especially professional writing, is important to student nurses to show in their studies, according to Swan (2021). The study clarifies that there is a problem in student nurses’ writing and even some of them might not know the technicalities of writing. The study also concludes that much exposure to professional writing definitely leads to higher levels of achievement. Su et al. (2020) find that a note-taking course was effective in improving student nurses’ achievement in writing and the student nurses were satisfied towards the course.

As for studies investigating achievement in grammar, there is evidence that online teaching of grammar to student nurses proved to be more effective than traditional teaching (Mahmoud et al., 2021). Besides, student nurses can also achieve better results in flipped type of classroom than in traditional setting classrooms, particularly in reading and writing (Öz & Abaan, 2021).

Umar and Ameen (2021) investigated the effects of formative, ongoing evaluation on student nurses' achievement in ESP and obtained positive results in student achievement as compared to traditional evaluation. There is also much evidence that technology-based teaching has much effect on ESP. Many studies prove this, e.g. Arroyyani & Nurhayati (2021). The study found that a blueprint electronic design application had positive effects on writing.
Obviously, student nurses, pushed by being in the capacity of future nurses, need to be able to comprehend a number of words and rather advanced ideas and the whole reading text (Nourinezhad and Kashefiannaeini, 2020: 3). They also need to manipulate certain reading strategies to deal with a reading text (Nghia & Yen, 2018). They need vocabulary, speaking, and grammatical structures and desire to have both English for general purposes (EGP) and English for specific (Nurakhir, 2018: 77). Furthermore, they need to be able to read physician’s instructions in English (Chetsadanuwat, 2018: 26) and want to understand medication written in English pamphlets and do better when ESP content is involved (Garzón Balcázar, 2018: 44). Additionally, the results of the study revealed that the existing materials used by the English teachers tended to be general English materials.

Besides, according to Prandana (2022: 321), the analysis results of the target situation of student nurses show that 1) most students learn English for looking for jobs; 2) the most needed language proficiency components were vocabulary mastery, speaking and listening skills; 3) the materials needed in each language skill and knowledge were the materials that were related to nursing activities and job; 4) almost all of the topics were needed by student nurses, such as giving information on treatment plans or diagnosis. Moreover, the learning activities needed by student nurses were in terms of the workgroup (small group, large group, and pairs) and discussion. Moreover, they need to provide quality nursing in English when needed in an international environment (Lu, 2018).

The aim of the present study was therefore to examine the effectiveness of the present EFL course in improving students’ achievement in its component areas of English (as delimited by this study): writing, grammar, reading, technical (i.e. health) vocabulary/ESP, and translation. Another aim was to verify whether the course meets the students’ needs based on the fact that their need satisfaction has not been assessed, and this is inevitable to be done.

1. To achieve the first study aim, a question and five sub-questions emanating from it and relating to the course components/areas needed to be addressed. The question was ‘how far is the course effective in improving students’ achievement in the areas of writing, grammar, reading, health-related/ESP vocabulary, and translation performance’?

To answer this whole question, five sub-questions were formulated:
2. How far is the course effective in improving students’ paragraph writing?
3. How far is the course effective in improving students’ grammar?
4. How far is the course effective in improving students’ reading skills of skimming and scanning?
5. How far is the course effective in students’ acquiring health-related/ESP vocabulary?
6. How far is the course effective in improving students’ translation performance?

To satisfy the second study aim, the following question was considered, too:

How far are the technical tumour student nurses satisfied with the EFL course?

Method

The study approach was a quasi-experimental, for meeting the study aims. A one-group design was adopted. To meet the first aim, a pre-posttest was prepared and validated, comprising five sub-tests assessing the course five areas.

To meet the second aim, a course evaluation form was designed to assess students’ satisfaction (See Course Evaluation Form).

Sample of the study

The sample of the study was a purposeful sample of the Ismailia technical tumour institute where the researcher taught the M.o.H.P. EFL course. The reason why it was purposeful was that the same EFL course was taught to all technical tumour institutes all over the entire country. Therefore, one sample from an institute would be adequate to generalize the results as long as the sample was representative, and it was, sharing students characteristics reprehensive of types of population: urbans, villagers, bedouins, and upper-Egypt landers.

The sample comprised thirty final-year student nurses or, gender wise, girls at the five-year study technical tumour institute in Ismailia affiliated to the M.o.H.P. It is worth clarifying that M.o.H.P. required all students in this type of education to be only girls, training to be future tumour nurses. Again, the students’ study was five-years, and they had been selected to be admitted at the institute from an excellent achievement background and generally quite average economic level. They obtained 90% or higher on the Preparatory Stage Exam.
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Preparatory Stage is a middle stage between Secondary and Primary stages in Egypt.

Instruments of the study
1. An achievement test
   A pre-posttest (see Appendix 1) assessing students’ achievement was used and divided in five sub-tests, each assessing achievement of each of the course components. Each sub-test lasted half an hour. Each received 100 total score points. Related reliability was assessed through the Split-half computerized method. The coefficient was 0.88, which meant it was reliable.

2. Course Evaluation Form
   An evaluation form was designed to investigate the student nurses’ satisfaction and views about the course. It had such items asking about students’ degree of happiness with the course, enjoyability, course coverage, and teaching methods. It also directly asked about the student degree of satisfaction about the course as well as existence of missing course items and suggestions for improvement.

Setting and procedures
The teaching happened at the technical Tumour institute in Ismailia during the academic year the first term of the 2021-2022. First, a pretest was conducted. Next, the M.o.H.P. coursebook (i.e. of first term sections only) was taught to the sample for the whole term in fourteen sessions (3 months). Controlling elements were ensured. Students were taught not to be exposed to another source of English during the experiment (as much as possible) to exclude contamination from external sources. The students were obedient. Then, the posttest was conducted to obtain post-intervention and posttest data. The results were statistically analysed (for the statistical method used, see below) and later discussions, conclusions and recommendations made.

Statistical treatment
The results of the pre-posttest mean difference checking needed to be obtained and effect size needed to be calculated, too, in order to indicate effectiveness of the course components. The SPSS (the Social Package for Social Sciences), namely, t-test was used to reach a decision whether there were significant differences in the pre-posttest mean scores of the students. Cohen’s d and Hedges’ correction computerized equations were then used to check the practical significance differences
in mean scores in order to determine the extent of effectiveness in each course component.

**Hypotheses**

Due to the nature of the study, a set of appropriate hypotheses were proposed to be tested. Generally, as the course components were taught intensively during term time, it was expected to adopt a hypothesis and related five positive sub-hypotheses in connection with the five sub-questions mentioned earlier. (The five sub-hypotheses expect answers to the five sub-questions in respective order.) The hypothesis is ‘there are statistically significant differences between the mean scores of the pre and posttests at the 0.05 level in favour of those of the posttest in terms of the course components of writing, grammar, reading, ESP vocabulary, and translation at a practical significance level.’ The relating sub-hypotheses indicated as follows:

1. There are statistically significant differences at the 0.05 level between the mean scores of the pre and posttests at the 0.05 level in favour of those of the posttest in terms of the writing component at a practical significance level.
2. There are statistically significant differences between the mean scores of the pre and posttests at the 0.05 level in favour of those of the posttest in terms of the grammar component at a practical significance level.
3. There are statistically significant differences between the mean scores of the pre and posttests at the 0.05 level in favour of those of the posttest in terms of the reading component at a practical significance level.
4. There are statistically significant differences between the mean scores of the pre and posttests at the 0.05 level in favour of those of the posttest in terms of the ESP component at a practical significance level.
5. There are statistically significant differences between the mean scores of the pre and posttests at the 0.05 level in favour of those of the posttest in terms of the translation component at a practical significance level.

**Results and discussion**

After the statistical analysis results were obtained, data were tabulated and t-tests performed. The effectiveness of the course was reached through calculating the effectiveness of the five course components addressed in the sub-questions. To answer the sub-questions and verify related hypotheses, two tables for each question and related hypothesis were used, noting that all data in all the tables were displayed below and approximated to the nearest unit for practical purposes. To answer
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the first study sub-question dealing with the first course component (i.e. paragraph writing), ‘How far is the course effective in improving students’ paragraph writing?’, Table (1) below indicates the results of difference in means, standard deviation, t-value, and statistical significance level.

Table (1a) pre-posttest difference in means, standard deviation, t-value, and significance level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error mean</th>
<th>95% confidence interval of the difference lower</th>
<th>95% confidence interval of the difference upper</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Significance One-sided p.</th>
<th>Significance Two-sided p.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-24.2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>-27.6</td>
<td>-22.4</td>
<td>-19.7</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As indicated in Table (1a), the results show the mean, standard deviation, t-value, and significance level. The mean is -24.2. which reflects quite big difference. The standard deviation is approximately 7, which is not so big and reflects quite equal gains on the posttest. Above all, the t-value gives a value (-19.74) which suggests a significant difference between the mean scores of the pre-posttest mean scores (at 0.05 statistical significance level). Table (1b) below indicates both Standardizers of Cohen’s d and Hedges’ correlation and the confidence level reflecting the pre-posttest effect size for writing.

Table (1b) pre-posttest Effect-size for writing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standardizer</th>
<th>Point estimate</th>
<th>95% confidence interval lower</th>
<th>95% confidence interval upper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cohen’s d</td>
<td>-3.6</td>
<td>-4.6</td>
<td>-1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hedges’ correction</td>
<td>-3.6</td>
<td>-4.5</td>
<td>-2.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table (1b) above indicates that both Standardizers of Cohen’s d and Hedges correlation are both approximately 7, which reflects a big effect size at high practical significance level. The confidence levels reflect a high level of result trust. This answers the first sub question. This big achievement is comparable with Swan (2020) as he found that professional writing training had a difference in student writing achievement. Nonetheless, the present study is different in that it depended on paragraph writing not professional genres. Therefore, the first sub-hypothesis, ‘there are statistically significant differences
between the mean scores of the pre and posttests at the 0.05 level in favour of those of the posttest in terms of the writing component at a practical significance level.’, is verified.

To answer the second study sub-question dealing with the second course component, ‘How far is the course effective in improving students’ grammar?’, Table (2a) below indicates pre-posttest difference in means, standard deviation, t-value, and statistical significance level.

Table (2a) pre-posttest difference in means, standard deviation, t-value, and significance level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error mean</th>
<th>95% confidence interval of the difference lower</th>
<th>95% confidence interval of the difference upper</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Significance One-sided p</th>
<th>Significance Two-sided p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-22.2</td>
<td>9.68</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>-25.8</td>
<td>-18.59</td>
<td>-12.6</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results in Table (2a) demonstrates the mean, standard deviation, t-value, and significance level. The mean is -24.2 which reflects quite big difference. The standard deviation is 9.6, which is not so big and reflects quite equal gains on the posttest. Above all, the t-value gives a value (-12.6) which suggests a significant difference between the mean scores of the pre-posttest mean scores (at 0.05 statistical significance level).

This answer the second sub-question. therefore, the relating sub-hypothesis, see the hypothesis section, is confirmed. Table (2b) below shows both Standardizers of Cohen’s d and Hedges correlation and the confidence level reflecting the pre-posttest effect size for grammar.

Table (2b) pre-posttest Effect-size for grammar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standardizer</th>
<th>Point estimate</th>
<th>95% confidence interval lower</th>
<th>95% confidence interval upper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cohen’s d</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>-1.662</td>
<td>-2.211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hedges ‘correction’</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-1.640</td>
<td>--2.183</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table (2b) above shows that both Standardizers of Cohen’s d and Hedges correlation are both approximately 9, which reflects a very big effect size at high practical significance level. The confidence levels reflect a high level of result trust. The effect size is even bigger than that of writing. This finding is supported by (Nurakhir, 2018: 77) which sees
that students are driven by and do need grammar in their EGP as well as ESP. Generally, the result verifies the relating hypothesis: ‘there are statistically significant differences between the mean scores of the pre and posttests at the 0.05 level in favour of those of the posttest in terms of the grammar component at a practical significance level’.

To answer the third study sub-question dealing with the third course component, ‘How far is the course effective in improving students’ the reading skills of skimming and scanning?’ Table (3a) includes pre-posttest difference in means, standard deviation, t-value, and statistical significance level.

Table (3a) below pre-posttest difference in means, standard deviation, t-value, and significance level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error mean</th>
<th>95% confidence interval of the difference lower</th>
<th>95% confidence interval of the difference upper</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Significance One sided p</th>
<th>Significance Two-sided p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-14.8</td>
<td>9.799</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>-18.42355</td>
<td>-11.1</td>
<td>-8.3</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table (3a) indicates the results of mean, standard deviation, t-value, and significance level. The mean is -8.3, which reflects quite big difference. The standard deviation is approximately 8, which is not so big and reflects quite equal gains on the posttest. Above all, the t-value gives a value (-19.74) which suggests a significant difference between the mean scores of the pre-posttest mean scores (at 0.05 statistical significance level). This answers the third sub-question above. Table (3b) below includes both Standardizers of Cohen’s d and Hedges correlation and the confidence level reflecting the pre-posttest effect size for writing.

Table (3b) pre-posttest effect-size for reading

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standardizer</th>
<th>Point estimate</th>
<th>95% confidence interval lower</th>
<th>95% confidence interval upper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cohen's d</td>
<td>-1.508</td>
<td>-2.028</td>
<td>-.975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hedges’ correction</td>
<td>-1.488</td>
<td>-.962</td>
<td>-.962</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table (3b) above shows that both Standardizers of Cohen’s d and Hedges correlation are both approximately 10, which reflects a very big effect size at a very high practical significance level. The confidence
levels reflect a high level of result trust (0.05). Therefore, this confirms the third relating sub-hypothesis, ‘there are statistically significant differences between the mean scores of the pre and posttests at the 0.05 level in favour of those of the posttest in terms of the reading component at a practical significance level’.

The effect size is even bigger than those of writing and grammar, and even bigger than ESP and translation (as will follow). This finding might cope with Nirmala & Suni (2022) which found that student a majority of student nurses were driven by their difficulty linguistic areas including grammar.

To answer the fourth study sub-question dealing with the fourth course component, ‘How far is the course effective in students acquiring health related vocabulary?’, Table (4a) below indicates pre-posttest difference in means, standard deviation, t-value, and significance level

Table (4a) pre-posttest difference in means, standard deviation, t-value, and significance level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>95% confidence interval of the difference lower</th>
<th>95% confidence interval of the difference upper</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Significance One-sided p.</th>
<th>Significance Two-sided p.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Table (4a) above displays the results of mean, standard deviation, t-value, and significance level. The mean is -11.12, which reflects quite a big difference. The standard deviation is approximately 9.6, which is not so big and reflects quite equal gains on the posttest. Above all, the t-value gives a value (-11.12) which suggests a significant difference between the mean scores of the pre-posttest mean scores (at 0.05 statistical significance level). This answers the fourth sub-question mentioned above. This finding is supported by (Nourinezhad and Kashefi-Naeini, 2020: 3) which see that students are much motivated to read and understand reading texts in English as they would need it in their future career as a nurse. This probably explains their highest levels of achievement in the reading component. Table (4b) below indicates both standardizers of Cohen’s d and Hedges correlation and the confidence level reflecting the pre-posttest effect size for health-related vocabulary (ESP).
As shown in Table (4b), results show that both Standardizers of Cohen’s d and Hedges correction show are both approximately 9.4, which reflects a big effect size at a very high practical significance level quite equal to that of writing. The effect size is less than the one for grammar, and reading. The confidence levels reflect a high level of result trust.

Generally, it is contended that this confirms the fourth relating sub-hypothesis, ‘there are statistically significant differences between the mean scores of the pre and posttests in favour of those of the posttest at the 0.05 level in terms of the ESP component at a practical significance level’.

These results are comparable with Umar and Ameen (2021) which found that ongoing formative assessment had positive results on students’ achievement, as the results are not much different because the evaluation method in this study were in shape of exercises similar the quizzes used in Umar and Ameen’s (2021) study. The present study results are, however, different from those of Arroyyani & Nurhayati (2021) in that Arroyyani & Nurhayati (2021) assessed the effectiveness of technology on students’ ESP, as technology was not much utilized in teaching the present course.

To answer the fifth study sub-question dealing with the fifth course component, ‘How far is the course effective in improving students’ translation performance?’, Table (5a) below includes the pre-posttest difference in means, standard deviation, t-value, and significance level.

### Table 5a: Pre-posttest Difference in Means, Standard Deviation, t-Value, and Significance Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error of mean</th>
<th>95% confidence interval of the difference lower</th>
<th>95% confidence interval of the difference upper</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Significance One-sided p.</th>
<th>Significance Two-sided p.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-22.2</td>
<td>9.66</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>-25.8</td>
<td>-18.6</td>
<td>-12.57</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table (5a) above displays the results of mean, standard deviation, t-value, and significance level. The mean is -22.2, which reflects quite big
difference. The standard deviation is 9.6, which is not so big and reflects quite equal gains on the posttest. Above all, the t-value gives a value (approximately -12.6) which suggests a significant difference between the mean scores of the pre-posttest mean scores (at 0.05 statistical significance level). (This answers the fifth sub question mentioned above.) This is quite the same value for grammar, which reflects equal improvement gains in the two areas. Table (5b) below includes both Standardizers of Cohen’s d and Hedges correlation and the confidence level reflecting the pre-posttest effect size for grammar.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>standardizer</th>
<th>Point estimate</th>
<th>95% confidence interval lower</th>
<th>95% confidence interval upper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cohen’s d</td>
<td>9.67</td>
<td>-2.29</td>
<td>-2.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hedges’ correction</td>
<td>9.80</td>
<td>-2.26</td>
<td>-2.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table (5b) above, results indicate that both Standardizers of Cohen’s d and Hedges correlation are both approximately 9.8, which reflects a big effect size at a very high practical significance level quite equal to that of reading. The effect size is higher than those one for writing, and grammar. The confidence levels reflect a high level of result trust. This means that both translation and reading have the biggest effect sizes and this improvement. Thus, the fifth sub-hypothesis, ‘There are statistically significant differences between the mean scores of the pre and posttests at the 0.05 level in favour of those of the posttest in terms of the translation component at a practical significance level’, is verified .

This result is consistent with the conclusion of Aboshaiqah et al. (2018) that student nurse can do better if the barrier of translation is overcome. However, it has been observed that no studies in literature directly assessed student nurses’ achievement in translation, which may make this study quite unique in this respect.

Therefore, all the five course components were improved in the students, and this improvement in achievement was performed at a statistically practical significant level as reflected by pre-posttest mean score differences in means for all the five components. The first study main question, ‘How far is the course effective in improving students’ achievement in the areas of writing, grammar, reading, health-related/ESP vocabulary, and translation performance?’, was answered
This decision was reached after the answers of the five sub-questions related to the main question led to this conclusion. However, there were areas where much improvement in achievement was made than others. The areas of reading and translation, in particular, were higher than the rest. Figure (1) below displays the degree of improvement in achievement in the five course components/areas according to the effect size values obtained for Hedges’ Correction as it is bias-corrected (Lin and Aloe, 2021).

Figure (1)

This may be attributed to the supposition that students liked both areas better as it was observed that they were quite easier for them because the translations were part of the reading passages which were not themselves too complicated. Another reason was that the students were of high achieving level as their achievement at the Preparatory Stage had already been very high. When interpreting results with respect to writing, health-related/ESP vocabulary, and grammar, it appeared that because students were not familiar with much writing production, the ESP sometimes was not easy to gain as it was quite new, and the grammar rules were partly new, too. These formed reasons why the improvement was higher in reading and translation than the other three areas, bearing in mind that, particularly, the writing component came at the end of the exercises of each book chapter. Therefore, most of the time, writing was given as optional homework in a way that was not followed by instructor follow-up. This caused writing improvement not to be compared with reading and translation ones.

In addition, the teaching methods (lecture and active learning, as previously mentioned) were effective in making students gain the knowledge and skills necessary for the course. This was reflected in the significant differences in the mean scores of the pre-posttests. However, it must be mentioned that there were areas which were not addressed at all, neither in teaching nor in assessment or evaluation, such as listening, language functions and situations related to health/medical contexts, and speaking components which were not
entirely addressed in the course. Otherwise, the course significantly improved student nurses’ achievement in all the five components. This verifies the main study hypothesis: ‘There are statistically significant differences between the mean scores of the pre and posttests at the 0.05 level in favour of those of the posttest in terms of the course components of writing, grammar, reading, ESP vocabulary, and translation at a practical significance level.’.

To answer the second study question, ‘How far are the technical tumour student nurses satisfied with the EFL course?’, information from the Course Evaluation Form (see Instruments of the study) was gathered. Students (n. 30) revealed that they were slightly satisfied. Despite this, they (n. 30) did not enjoy the course much and asked for some modification for increasing ESP content and addition of a communication element (i.e. listening speaking) to the course. They said, “We want (n. 30) the language that will deal with and we want to be able to speak the language and talk to foreigners.” Also, the student nurses (n.30) were satisfied with the teaching methods. This answers the study second question. These results are supported by the results of Prandana (2022: 321) which finds that student nurses need language relating to their specialty as well as listening and speaking very much.

Conclusions

The course was effective to far extent in the achievement of student nurse writing, grammar, reading, health-related/ESP vocabulary, and translation as proven by the t-tests of the five sub-test mean difference in scores at a statistically significant level. Also, the effect size was high in all areas although it was even higher in reading and translation almost equally, which meant they had the biggest improvement. The reasons for higher improvement in reading and translation could actually be referred to the students themselves and to the course (i.e. see the above section). The student nurses were slightly happy and satisfied with the course but fully with the teaching methods. However, they declared the course needed a little modification regarding the communicative content, enjoyability, and the quantity of ESP.

The course was seen to have only paragraph writing at a time when students at the secondary stage (i.e. a lower stage) study other genres, e.g. essay (a higher level than paragraph), email, report, survey, online comments, text messages (Longman, 2021). Thus, it is a shocking finding of this study because it is not acceptable that students at the secondary stage study all the previous types of writing and when at a
higher stage, students are only asked to write only paragraph, as clarified earlier. Of course, other types than paragraph are more important to nurse in her profession, such as the genres indicated above. As clarified in Background to the study, note-taking and report writing, for example, meet students’ needs for writing (Su et al., 2020).

The course improved achievement of the students, so the components were generally suitable to the learners. However, the course did not contain listening, speaking components as well as language functions relating to the future nurse setting. Thus, these elements should be included in rich amount, as communication is important to a nurse (Albaaly, 2022). More genres needed in life, such as email, report, and note-taking writing important to their work are needed to be fitted into the curriculum. This claim cope with research. For instance, this is comparable with what Su et al. (2020) found with respect to higher achievement with note-taking student training. In addition, an increase of the portion designated for ESP into the curriculum is seen inevitable, too.

Student nurses were a little satisfied, but they asked for more ESP content, communication activities and listening and speaking. ESP cannot be abandoned for such students (Umar and Ameen, 2021). Besides, an element of enjoyability and attraction needs to be added, such as videos, stories, and humour.

The teaching methods were proven effective, but there was a need for communication in English for student nurses generally (Albaaly, 2022). Conversation classes on health issues/topics and medical topics should be arranged/added. This will boost language functions in a health/medical setting. As this element is absent in the course, too.

One very important point to consider is a need to modify the course content in order to cope with the course goals. The following course goals were not achieved because they had no component in the course content. Specifically, the following goals were not attained:

• Using specialized terminologies in communicative and functional situations
• Writing logs and reports skillfully in their majors
• Using English in communicative situations to express oneself in diverse life situations
• Applying social English properly in different contexts

Therefore, intervention is urgently needed to modify the content in order to suit those inspiring goals. A course has to follow its goals (Itmeizeh & Hassan, 2020; Sasaki, 2018).
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Abstract
Assessing the effectiveness of EFL courses for student nurses is necessary to inform student achievement and provide feedback to the educational process in order to take relating proper decisions. However, the EFL course for the student nurses at the Ministry of Health and Population has not been assessed in terms of students’ achievement in EFL as represented in the five course components of writing, grammar, reading, health-related/ESP vocabulary, and translation. The aim of the study was to cover this shortage by assessing the effectiveness of the course in students’ achievement in the above components and students’ attitudes towards the course. The study adopted a quasi-experimental approach and had one group pre-posttest design. The sample comprised 30 final year student nurses enrolled at the five-year study Technical Tumour Institute in Ismailia. The instruments included a pre-posttest and a course evaluation form. Results indicated that the students’ achievement in the five course areas/components above was proven high by students’ statistically significant difference in pre-posttest mean scores at the 0.05 statistically practical significance level. Two components have improved better than the others, i.e. reading and translation. The student nurses’ views showed that they were slightly satisfied about the course, but desired that the ESP component should be increased and a communicative component to be added. Recommendations included incorporating listening and speaking activities, language functions related to the students’ future work setting, and more genres needed in life, such as email, note-taking, and report writing. Additionally, increasing the portion of ESP content into the course was suggested.
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فعالية مقرر اللغة الإنجليزية في تحسين تحسين تحميل طلاب التمريض في اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية

د/ عماد أحمد محمد البعلي

أستاذ مناهج وطرق تدريس اللغة الإنجليزية
كلية التربية - جامعة قناة السويس

الملخص

يعتبر قياس فعالية مقرر اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية لطلاب التمريض أمرًا مهمًا لمعرفة
تحصولهم وتقديم التغذية الراجعة للعملية التعليمية التي تم اتخاذ القرارات المناسبة، ومع ذلك،
فإن مقرر اللغة الإنجليزية لوزاء الصحة والسكان لم يتم ذلك فيهما بخصوص تحسين الطلاب في
مقرر اللغة الإنجليزية وحسب محتويات المقرر، فهيئة هذه الدراسة لغزوبة هذا الفصل وقياس
فعالية مقرر اللغة الإنجليزية لطلاب التمريض في تحسينهم لمكونات المنهج، وبصورة تحليلية.
فإن محتوي المقرر قد تكون من: كتابة قطعة، وفهم قاعدي، ومفردات ترتبط باللغة الإنجليزية
لأغراض خاصة، وترجمة، وقد تثبت الدراسة المنهج شبه التجريبي، وكان لها تصميم
المجموعة الواحدة ذو القياس القبلي البديهي، وشملت العينه عدد ثلاثين طالبة من المعهد
الفنى للأورام بالإسماعيلية، ولقد شملت ادوات الدراسة اختيار تحسينًا قبليًا عقبًا واستمرار تقييم
المقرر، ولقد أوضحت النتائج أن تحسين الطلاب في مكونات المقرر الخمسة قد كان عاليا
عند مستوى دلاة خمسة في المئة في الاختبار القبلي البديهي، وكان تحسين الطلاب في
مكونات المقرر أعلى من بقية المكونات، تحديداً في القواعد والترجمة، ولقد اظهرت أراء
 الطلاب أنهم كن راضيين بصورة بسيطة عن المقرر، ولكنهم طالب أن يزيد محتوي اللغة
الإنجليزية لأغراض خاصة وأن يتم إدراج مكون تواصل في المقرر، ولقد شملت توصيات
الدراسة تضمن أنشطة الاستماع والتحدث بالإضافة إلى الوظائف اللغوية المتخصصة بما في
الطيات المستقبلية وكذلك أنواع الكتابة المطلوبة في الحياة مثل رسائل البريد الإلكتروني، واحذ
الملاحظات وكتابة التقارير، كما شملت أيضاً زيادة حصة اللغة الإنجليزية لأغراض خاصة في
المقرر.

الكلمات المفتاحية: طلاب التمريض، فعالية، مقرر، اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية، تحميل،
وزاء الصحة والسكان
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