

Digital Video Creation: An Alternative Tool for Improving Oral Performance in Teaching English as a Foreign Language¹

Jasmina Đorđević² 

Faculty of Philosophy, University of Niš, Niš, Serbia

Abstract

This paper reports the findings from an action-based case study conducted with a convenience sample of 42 students encouraged by their teacher to create digital videos as an additional practice tool to improve their oral performance in English as a Foreign Language. The students recorded themselves giving a 10-minute talk following their teacher's instructions. The comparison of the students' oral performance between the oral exam at the end of the fourth semester and the oral exams at the end of the previous three semesters provided evidence of improvement in the students' oral performance in the fourth semester due to the digital videos the students created. The students also completed a questionnaire focusing on their opinions about the additional tool to practice their oral performance. The analyses of the obtained results indicate a positive effect of digital videos created by students both on their oral performance and their attitude to digital video creation. The pedagogical implications of this study suggest three main applications of digital videos: a) as a practice tool to help students improve their oral performance in English, b) as a feedback tool to help teachers provide students with feedback on areas that need improvement and c) as an assessment tool to help teachers evaluate their students' speaking skills.

Keywords: digital video creation, EFL, practice, oral performance, improvement.

Introduction

Despite a frequent focus on the use of premade educational, instructional and popular video recordings (Carey et al., 2023; Goldstein & Driver, 2015; Hervas et al., 2020; Hsieh,

1 This study was supported by the Ministry of Education, Science and Technological Development of the Republic of Serbia (Contract No. 451-03-66/2024-03).

The study was conducted at the Faculty of Philosophy, University of Niš as part of the project "Scientific Research in Foreign Language Teaching" (No. 323/1-9-01).

2 jasmina.djordjevic@filfak.ni.ac.rs

2020; Simoncini et al., 2021; Tseng & Yeh, 2019; Yeh et al., 2021) and a few attempts to explore the benefits of language learners creating their own video recordings (Alley-Young, 2017; Férez Mora & Coyle, 2023; Yang, 2021), there is a significant research gap regarding student-created videos implemented as a tool to further learners' speaking skills in English as a Foreign Language (EFL). This paper will argue that student-created videos can be a very good alternative to motivate students to practice speaking and improve their oral performance in the context of EFL, which usually relies on speaking activities suggested in textbooks (e.g. discussions, conversations, interviews, projects and collaborative work).

English language teaching theories in general suggest that the productive skill of speaking needs special attention in the classroom (Carter & Nunan, 2010; Harmer, 2015; Thurnbury, 2005). Students should be stimulated to make active use of the language they have learnt to achieve autonomy in using it (Thurnbury, 2005) in a stress-free environment (Horwitz et al., 1986; Pitura, 2022). Student-prepared talks within a communicative approach may be a helpful activity (Harmer, 2015), especially at a more advanced level as they provide students with a creative way to express themselves while using the knowledge of the language they have acquired (Carter & Nunan, 2010).

The action-based case study presented here relies on a classroom teaching experience following the instructor's decision to introduce digital video creation (DVC) to motivate EFL students to speak in English thus providing an alternative to improve their oral performance. Two analyses will testify to the successful outcome of the implementation of DVC at the end of a four-semester EFL course. Following a brief literature review of speaking skills in EFL and DVC, the paper focuses on the results of the implementation of DVC in a real EFL classroom.

Literature Review

Speaking Skills in EFL

The modern EFL classroom prioritizes language use and the communicative approach to further learners' competence for meaningful communication. Such an approach complies with more recent sociocultural theories of language learning (Lantolf, 2007) which rely on Vygotsky's notion of two planes of learning. One plane indicates that learning takes place first in contextual interactions and then on an individual level where higher-order cognitive capacities are developed, while the second refers to the developmental space between a language learner and a teacher. The teacher provides an environment in which the learning process relies on the internalization of content until the learner feels comfortable enough to use the content independently in similar contexts (Lantolf & Thorne, 2006).

Similarly, Thurnbury (2005) suggested that teachers provide extralinguistic knowledge (e.g., culture) as well as linguistic knowledge (e.g., vocabulary) so that students learn

how to make that knowledge available for use. Teachers should enable the formation and internalization of good knowledge of the target language base, help the students achieve autonomy in the use of what they have learnt and help them achieve a certain level of self-regulation while speaking (2005: 38–39). Therefore, teachers need to ensure three processes: (1) learning the characteristics of the target knowledge base; (2) integrating those characteristics into their existing knowledge base and (3) developing “the capacity to mobilize these features under real-time conditions” (2005: 37).

Many students manifest physical reactions when teachers are waiting for their response (Horwitz, 2001). Students often report that they have forgotten what they have learned and that they cannot remember certain words, while some students even start shivering and have an increased heartbeat (Horwitz et al., 1986). A recent study indicated that some students seem to “have nothing to say” while others are “ridden by anxiety while speaking in English” (Pitura, 2022: 2). The reason for these problems according to Pitura may be attributed to unsuitable course organization, instruction and resources but it may also be due to large course groups, lack of time to practice speaking in class or an inappropriate atmosphere in the classroom.

A solution may be that EFL learners use various strategies to cope with speaking problems (Ahmadian & Tavakoli, 2011) while different task characteristics can help EFL learners improve speech comprehensibility (Crowther et al., 2015; García Mayo & Hidalgo, 2017). The command of a set of speech production sub-skills including vocabulary retrieval, choice of grammatical patterns and sociocultural competence could be helpful (Brown, 2001). In addition, digitally-based learning approaches may improve EFL learners’ speaking skills (Duman et al., 2014; Đorđević, 2020), which is why implementing DVC as a digitally-based and multimodal learning approach (Férez Mora & Coyle, 2023) to enhance EFL students’ speaking skills seems promising.

Digital Video Creation in English Language Learning

The immediate advantage of the implementation of DVC for spoken language production is that the teacher indirectly fosters both self-directed and student-created learning (Alley-Young, 2017). The first empowers students to be in charge of their own work pace while furthering the students’ decision-making skills. The aspect of student-created learning directly contributes to the students’ sense of independence and autonomy in the learning process. Being learner-centred, practical, hands-on and creative, video production enables teachers to empower EFL students to master foreign language content for oral communication in a realistic and authentic context (Alley-Young, 2017; Yang, 2021). Teachers thus help students create a social context for meaningful interaction as they can think critically about the topic they are about to present, express their opinions and make individual and autonomous choices about how to present their point of view (Hafner & Miller, 2011). This can have a significantly positive effect on the students’ motivation, which in turn will positively affect the overall mastery of EFL content, competences and skills (Đorđević, 2020).

Methods

Participants, Setting and Material

The present study aims to show that students can effectively improve their oral performance based on DVC as an additional practice tool (Alley-Young, 2017; Férez Mora & Coyle, 2023; Yang, 2021). Since the single-group design is best suited to determining the effect of a treatment on a given sample (Allen, 2017), the sample in this study included students attending the same four-semester English as a Foreign Language course, so all participants were exposed to the same conditions (the same treatment and assessment). The participants' oral performance was assessed in four consecutive oral exams, each at the end of one of four semesters. Since the Covid-19 pandemic imposed online classes in March 2020, the instructor had to come up with a way to help the students practise their speaking skills, which is why DVC was introduced during the fourth semester. In the previous period, speaking practice relied on discussions, conversations, interviews, group projects and presentations in class mostly following the suggested activities in the textbook (Soars & Soars, 2017a, 2017b). The idea of creating DVs never presented itself as an alternative because the students had ample opportunities to practise speaking in class both with their peers and their instructor. However, once the students could no longer attend classes in person and communicate in the way they had done before, DVs proved to be an excellent alternative.

A total of 31 Serbian Language and Literature students (SLLS) and 21 German Language and Literature students (GLLS) at the Faculty of Philosophy, University of Niš participated in the research in the school year 2019/2020. They were taking four semesters of the obligatory EFL course referred to as English Language 1 (E1), English Language 2 (E2), English Language 3 (E3) and English Language 4 (E4) (4 classes a week, anticipated B2.2. level according to the CEFR for Languages). (Note: The participants were duly informed and signed consent forms.)

A total of 10 students decided not to submit a DVC (Table 1) (these were excluded from the statistical analysis). None of the participants reported a lack of means regarding the recording of the videos and they all agreed they felt most comfortable using their smartphones so that there was no need for mitigation measures. The participants had completed at least 12 years of English language learning before their university studies, none of them had ever created a digital video (DV) for educational purposes but they had all created DVs with their smartphones for private purposes (Table 1).

Table 1
The participants in the research

Variable	Frequency	%	Total
Female	43	82.7	52
Male	9	17.3	
SLLS	31	59.6	52
GLLS	21	40.4	

Chose to create a DV	42	80.7	52
Did not know about the option to create a DV	5	9.7	
Do not remember why they did not choose DVC	5	9.7	
12 years of English language study	18	34.6	52
14 years of English language study	25	48.0	
More than 14 years of English language study	9	17.4	
DVC for educational purposes	Yes	0	52
	No	52	
DVC for private purposes	Yes	52	52
	No	0	

The EFL instructor who conducted this research relies on the textbooks *Headway Intermediate* (E1/E2) (Soars & Soars, 2017a) and *Headway Upper-Intermediate* (E3/E4) (Soars & Soars, 2017b). The focus is on grammar and vocabulary presented in non-literary texts including a wide range of topics, tasks, activities and exercises providing a sufficiently comprehensive background against which all four language skills can be taught, practised and mastered successfully in a way that suits the needs of the students at the Faculty. The instructor practices speaking skills with the students based on exercises and tasks involving responses to questions, pair work, group work and discussions. The textbooks provide additional speaking skills practice focusing on pronunciation, everyday language, intonation, etc. Frequently the instructor assigns group projects which the students present with a PPT or poster but they never prepare talks or create DVs. As stated above, the idea of creating DVs never presented itself as an opportunity given numerous available alternatives.

According to the syllabus, the assessment includes one written mid-term test (grammar and vocabulary) and a final exam at the end of each semester (an eliminatory written part and an oral part). The oral part is based on 6 texts from the textbook and the assessment is based on rubrics. The instructor initiates a conversation based on a certain excerpt from the book and frequently diverts the conversation away from the text to gain insight into how independent the student is when speaking. During the Covid 19 pandemic, the oral exam in June 2020 was organized at the Faculty adhering to all prescribed safety measures so that the conditions in all four exams were the same.

DVC Procedure

In May 2020 the instructor asked the students to prepare a talk (Harmer, 2015) and record themselves in the form of a DV delivering it. Given the limited speaking practice in online teaching during the pandemic, DVC was introduced as an additional tool for the students to practice their speaking skills and prepare for their final oral exam, and to help them alleviate stress, gain more confidence when speaking and work on their overall oral presentation skills.

The instructions for the digital videos were as follows:

8–10 minutes (the final DVs were 9.15 minutes long on average).

Title: "A problem that concerns me very much is..." The students' choices included: pollution, exam anxiety, suicide, online teaching, domestic violence, animal protection, etc.).

Structure:

Introduction of the topic (clear statement of what the concern was).

Background details (e.g., scientific facts, evidence, examples, etc.).

Detailed presentation of the personal reasons for the concern.

Reference to the consequences in the future.

Conclusion.

Additional instructions: *Headway Upper-Intermediate* (Soars & Soars, 2017b: 114–115).

Submission: via the platform Google Classroom within three days.

Assessment Procedure

The rubrics designed for this study served as an assessment tool and as a preparation tool based on which the students could organize and structure their speeches for the recordings. They included 6 categories following the CEFR recommendations (Council of Europe, 2001) (Table 2), they were descriptive and analytic with clearly defined descriptors that measured the degree of accomplishment for each category on a scale from 7 to 10 while the description of the categories included specific aspects to meet the needs for a specific evaluation (e.g. introduction of the topic, organization of thoughts, providing examples, verbal delivery, etc.) (Fulcher, 2012, 2017; Schreiber et al., 2012). To achieve objectivity, clearly distinguishable descriptions of the components at each expected level were defined (Fulcher, 2017). Following Dawson's (2017) recommendations for task-specific rubrics, the expected levels of accomplishment were based on the learning goals, tasks and outcomes predicted in the course syllabi for each semester and based on the textbooks used in the course (Soars & Soars, 2014a, 2014b). Given the communicative aspect of the task, test goals, tasks and rating criteria were contextualised in real-world language by relying on topics and problems the students were interested in (Fulcher, 2017) and predicted by the mentioned course textbooks. The focus on the overall quality of the accomplished tasks and the category of language reflected the holistic criterion of the rubrics. The main purpose of the rubrics was to translate the observed performance to a score with real-world meaning and establish and assess the alignment between scale criteria and real-world language use (Fulcher, 2012). That is why the students were told that the main assessment criterion of their language use would be their overall communicative competence (Fulcher, 2017) (language accuracy is assessed in the written test in the exam). Finally, the rubrics were teacher-created (Dawson, 2017) with expectation levels within each descriptor designed carefully to facilitate an objective assessment of all delivered talks (Table 2).

Table 2***The assessment rubrics used for the students' DVs***

	7	8	9	10
Introduction of the topic	Provides a poor statement of what the concern is in one sentence only. The choice of vocabulary suggests limited knowledge of the topic.	Provides a poor statement of what the concern is in one sentence only. The choice of vocabulary suggests some knowledge of the topic.	Provides a fairly clear statement of what the concern is in about two sentences. The coherence is acceptable. The choice of vocabulary suggests a good command of the topic.	Provides a clear statement of what the concern is in two or more sentences. The sentences are coherent. The choice of vocabulary suggests a solid command of the topic.
Background details (scientific facts, evidence, examples, etc.)	Fails to provide background details or provides only one. There is no proper link to the topic.	Provides more than one background detail but does not link them properly to the topic. The presentation of the concern is rather weak.	Provides several background details but links them only loosely to the topic. The concern stated in the introduction is presented in a more or less solid way.	Provides several background details and links them properly to the topic, thus giving a solid presentation of the concern stated in the introduction.
Presentation of the personal reasons	Fails to mention the personal reasons or provides only one.	Provides more than one personal reason for the concern but does not explain it properly.	Provides more than one personal reason for the concern, the explanation is appropriate but lacks argumentation.	Provides more than one personal reason for the concern and the explanation of the reasons is based on solid and proper argumentation.
Reference to the consequences in the future	The reference to the consequences in the future is not clearly stated.	The reference to the consequences in the future is supported by vague arguments.	The reference to the consequences in the future is explicitly stated but convincing arguments are not provided.	The reference to the consequences in the future is clearly and explicitly stated based on convincing argumentation.
Conclusion	The conclusion is expressed in a single sentence without summarizing the main points and purpose of the speech.	The conclusion is expressed in more than one sentence but fails to summarize the main points and purpose of the speech.	The conclusion is expressed in one or more than one sentence, summarizes the main points and purpose of the speech but fails to leave a lasting impression on the audience.	The conclusion is expressed in more than one sentence, summarizes the main points and purpose of the speech and leaves a lasting impression on the audience by including an effective final remark.
Language (general impression based on vocabulary, grammar, fluency and coherence)	Weak	Satisfactory	Good	Very Good

The two lowest grades 5 and 6 were deliberately excluded as all submitted DVs reached at least the score of 7 for each dimension.

Controls

Given the specific circumstances of the study and the fact that rubrics are often criticized as not being objective enough, the following controls were introduced:

- The students had to look straight into the cameras while speaking to avoid disqualification from the assessment if caught reading from notes.
- All DVs were assessed based on the same performance outcomes predicted for the study.
- Only an institutional email address enabled the submission of the DVs and access to the subsequent questionnaire through the assignment in the Google Classroom (created during the pandemic).

Further controls were not needed as all participants were students attending the same tertiary-level EFL course so that maturation was not an issue. Since the participants had not been selected based on their performance before participation in the study, a regression threat was not anticipated.

Results

Students' Performance

The students' DVs were first analysed based on the prepared rubrics (Table 3).

Table 3
The mean values of performance based on the DVs

	Student groups	DVs
SLLS	<i>Mean</i>	8.67
	<i>N</i>	26
	<i>Std. Deviation</i>	1.323
GLLS	<i>Mean</i>	8.98
	<i>N</i>	16
	<i>Std. Deviation</i>	1.102
Total	<i>Mean</i>	8.78
	<i>N</i>	42
	<i>Std. Deviation</i>	1.238

The scores in both student groups were high (8.67 and 8.98, i.e. 8.78 total) and no significant differences between the scores for the individual dimensions of the assignment could be noticed (see the discussion section for a detailed qualitative analysis).

The mean values indicate the students' spoken performance in the four oral exams in English language 1, 2, 3 and 4 (OE1, OE2, OE3 and OE4) (Table 4).

Table 4

The mean values of performance in four consecutive semesters

Student groups		OE1	OE2	OE3	OE4
SLLS	Mean	7.29	7.32	7.68	8.52
	<i>N</i>	26	26	26	26
	<i>Std. Deviation</i>	1.160	1.166	1.013	1.092
GLLS	Mean	8.95	8.86	8.90	9.52
	<i>N</i>	16	16	16	16
	<i>Std. Deviation</i>	1.284	1.236	1.091	.928
Total	Mean	7.96	7.94	8.17	8.92
	<i>N</i>	42	42	42	42
	<i>Std. Deviation</i>	1.455	1.406	1.200	1.135

The students' spoken performance in OE4 was significantly better than in OE1, OE2 and OE3 (Table 4). The mean value for both groups (8.92) indicates that the grades in OE4 were mainly 8, 9 and 10 which was not the case in the previous three semesters.

An additional paired samples t-test accompanied by Cohen's d effect size compared the mean values of the students' spoken performance in four consecutive semesters (Table 5).

Table 5

The paired differences and Cohen's d effect size in three consecutive semesters

		<i>T</i>	<i>Cohen's d</i>
Pair 1	OE4-OE3	8.282	1.148
Pair 2	OE4-OE2	9.074	1.258
Pair 3	OE4-OE1	10.343	1.345

Table 5 shows a statistically significant difference between the students' oral performance for the three pairs ($t = 8.282$, $t = 9.074$ and $t = 10.343$ respectively) while the accompanying Cohen's d effect size indicates a large size effect ($d = 1.148$, $d = 1.258$ and $d = 1.345$ respectively). Both tests indicate a positive effect of DVC.

Students' Opinions

A questionnaire with 15 closed-ended questions was administered to the participants via Google Forms at the end of September 2020. Out of 52 students, 42 had chosen to create a DV (Table 1) and 35 responded to the questionnaire. Given the limited scope of this paper, only the most relevant results are presented here:

- 26 (74.3%) students were completely satisfied with the opportunity to prepare a DV, four (11.4%) were not satisfied at all, four (11.4%) were somewhat satisfied and one (2.9%) did not care.
- 21 (84%) students were satisfied with their grade in OE4, three (12%) were somewhat satisfied and only one (4%) was not satisfied with the final grade.

- 12 (48%) students stated they would like to have more frequent opportunities to create a DV, 10 (40%) would like it for some courses and three (12%) would not like to have this opportunity.
- 19 (76%) students stated that it was far more difficult to prepare the recording than the content and 17 (68%) admitted they had to take the recording more than three times.

To obtain more certainty regarding the students' attitudes to DVC, a correlation between those students who thought that the creation of a DV was beneficial (A), those who chose to create a DV (B) and those who were satisfied with their grades in the oral part (C) of the exam was performed (Table 6).

Table 6
Correlation between A, B and C

		A	B	C
A	<i>Pearson Correlation</i>	1	.686**	-.514**
	<i>Sig. (2-tailed)</i>		.000	.002
	<i>N</i>	35	35	35
B	<i>Pearson Correlation</i>	.686**	1	.885**
	<i>Sig. (2-tailed)</i>	.000		.000
	<i>N</i>	35	35	35
C	<i>Pearson Correlation</i>	-.514**	.885**	1
	<i>Sig. (2-tailed)</i>	.002	.000	
	<i>N</i>	35	35	35

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Note. A: students who thought that the creation of a DV was beneficial; B: students who chose to create a DV and C: students who were satisfied with their grades in the oral part of the exam.

The results in Table 6 reveal the students' positive attitude to DVC as they regarded the creation of a DV as both beneficial (A) and rewarding (C) ($p < .686$ and $p < .885$ respectively).

The most important results show that the students were quite aware of both the advantages and disadvantages of DVC:

- 13 (52%) students stated they felt uncomfortable while recording themselves, one (4%) said the preparation of the talk was demanding and 4 (16%) that the recording at home was complicated.
- 19 (76%) students chose the same three advantages of DVC: a) they could decide on their own what they would talk about, b) the task allowed them to state their own opinion and c) they could retake the video and correct it.
- 13 (52%) students stated the preparation of a DV was more creative than a regular conversation and 10 (40%) said tasks like this one provided them with the opportunity to show how well they could speak English.

The correlations between some of the most important disadvantages (Table 7) and advantages (Table 8) of DVC identified by the students were analysed as well.

Table 7*Correlations between the most important disadvantages of DVC*

		1	2	3	4
Creation of DV beneficial	<i>Pearson Correlation</i>	1	.122	.032	-.337*
	<i>Sig. (2-tailed)</i>		.485	.855	.048
	<i>N</i>	35	35	35	35
Demanding preparation	<i>Pearson Correlation</i>	.122	1	.477**	.223
	<i>Sig. (2-tailed)</i>	.485		.004	.198
	<i>N</i>	35	35	35	35
Recording is complicated at home	<i>Pearson Correlation</i>	.032	.477**	1	.096
	<i>Sig. (2-tailed)</i>	.855	.004		.585
	<i>N</i>	35	35	35	35
Uncomfortable while recording themselves	<i>Pearson Correlation</i>	-.337*	.223	.096	1
	<i>Sig. (2-tailed)</i>	.048	.198	.585	
	<i>N</i>	35	35	35	35

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 8*Correlations between the most important advantages of DVC*

		1	2	3	4	5	6
Creation of DV beneficial	<i>Pearson Correlation</i>	1	-.616**	-.259	-.544**	-.439**	-.311
	<i>Sig. (2-tailed)</i>		.000	.133	.001	.008	.069
	<i>N</i>	35	35	35	35	35	35
Could decide on the topic on their own	<i>Pearson Correlation</i>	-.616**	1	.420*	.650**	.480**	.382*
	<i>Sig. (2-tailed)</i>	.000		.012	.000	.004	.023
	<i>N</i>	35	35	35	35	35	35
Show English language knowledge	<i>Pearson Correlation</i>	-.259	.420*	1	.292	.453**	.476**
	<i>Sig. (2-tailed)</i>	.133	.012		.089	.006	.004
	<i>N</i>	35	35	35	35	35	35
Could state their own opinion	<i>Pearson Correlation</i>	-.544**	.650**	.292	1	.596**	.261
	<i>Sig. (2-tailed)</i>	.001	.000	.089		.000	.130
	<i>N</i>	35	35	35	35	35	35
Could retake and correct the video	<i>Pearson Correlation</i>	-.439**	.480**	.453**	.596**	1	.421*
	<i>Sig. (2-tailed)</i>	.008	.004	.006	.000		.012
	<i>N</i>	35	35	35	35	35	35
More creative	<i>Pearson Correlation</i>	-.311	.382*	.476**	.261	.421*	1
	<i>Sig. (2-tailed)</i>	.069	.023	.004	.130	.012	
	<i>N</i>	35	35	35	35	35	35

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

The correlations in Table 7 and Table 8 not only confirm that the students had a positive attitude to DVC, but also indicate that the students were more than able to recognize its advantages.

Discussion and conclusion

It may be argued that the students' oral performance in OE4 would have been better than in the previous semesters even if they had not prepared DVs because after four semesters this would have been an expected outcome. However, the quantitative analysis indicates a positive impact of DVC in the fourth semester.

A total of 42 out of 52 students chose to complete an unfamiliar task. They had no experience in creating DVs for educational purposes while complying with a certain structure, limited length, specific topic, etc. Yet, their oral performance at the end of the fourth semester after DVC had been introduced was significantly better (Alley-Young, 2017). In a regular oral exam situation, the fear of not being able to put together meaningful sentences and the limited time to present their speaking skills are stress factors that almost every student reports during the exam (Horwitz et al., 1986; Pitura, 2022). With DVC the students were able to erase these factors as they could prepare the talk, practice it, record it several times and submit it when they were certain that it was of good quality. This contributed to their self-esteem and helped them focus on their speaking skills with confidence and certainty (Pappamihel, 2002) (evident in their recordings and in their final oral exam).

The speech in almost all the DVs was well-organized, argumentative and to the point while the overall oral performance was quite fluent (Thurnbury, 2005). These aspects were also evident in the final oral exam, a result most of the students had not achieved in the previous semesters. Most students showed a good command of the language, thus presenting the ability to communicate independently in a context outside the classroom (Lantolf, 2007; Thurnbury, 2005). They did show some stage fright, some of them even had trembling voices (Horwitz et al., 1986), but as they proceeded in their talks, a sense of security and self-esteem prevailed. In the final oral exam, those students who had prepared a DV showed significantly better performance in comparison to the previous semesters. Those students who had struggled in the previous oral exams with stage fright were more secure and even reported a lower level of anxiety.

The responses to the questionnaire confirm that their motivation was positive, indicating better performance and mastery when they have the alternative to make individual choices about their learning (Đorđević, 2020). Those who had chosen to create DVs were satisfied with the grade they achieved, an additional indicator that they believed that DVC was a positive and rewarding experience (Yang, 2021). None of them complained about DVC as an additional practice tool and none stated they believed it was stressful (Horwitz et al., 1986). They identified the most prominent advantages indicating that they know what is important for their oral performance and how to make active use of the language they have learnt (Carter & Nunan, 2010). The students had often been reluctant to participate in speaking activities before which is why accepting DVC seems to have been an approach they wanted to try out. This means that DVC boosted the students' autonomy

(Hafner & Miller, 2011) to develop a self-directed and self-created learning environment (Alley-Young, 2017) while stimulating the students to work independently in a state of self-regulation, focus on the appropriation of knowledge (Lantolf, 2007; Thurnbury, 2005) and work on their motivation (Đorđević, 2020).

Despite the limitations of this study, such as the fact that it was based on a single group, there was no randomization nor was there a control group – which is why the study is only illustrative – the implications of the results presented in this study are manifold. DVC can be used as a practice tool to help students improve their oral performance in English (Férez Mora & Coyle, 2023). It provides students with the opportunity to make their own choices resulting in self-directed learning, more autonomy and stronger independence (Alley-Young, 2017; Đorđević, 2020) while helping them reach expected outcomes in a less stressful way (Horwitz et al., 1986; Pitura, 2022). Creating a video in their homes under their own terms reduces the pressure students normally feel when doing speaking activities in class. A further alleviating factor is that students do not have to fear speaking in front of others as DVC provides a certain anonymity that insecure students will appreciate. DVC can also be used as a feedback tool to help teachers provide students with feedback on areas that need improvement thereby boosting the students' autonomy (Hafner & Miller, 2011) and giving them a positive and rewarding experience (Yang, 2021). Finally, DVC can be used as an assessment tool to help teachers evaluate their students' speaking skills (Férez Mora & Coyle, 2023; Yang, 2021).

To conclude, though it may be argued that DVC requires additional and more elaborate training regarding proper video recording conventions and editing practices to make the whole procedure less frustrating for the students, the integration of DVC can impact EFL learners' speaking skills and improve their oral performance in a foreign language context. Based on DVC, teachers can facilitate self-paced and self-directed learning, effective time management, self-correction, collaboration and task-based learning, all of these realized creatively and entertainingly. In brief, DVC provides teachers with an additional and optional tool to empower and motivate EFL students to be more creative, independent and autonomous, thus affecting their oral performance positively.

References

- Ahmadian, M. J., & Tavakoli, M. (2011). The effect of simultaneous use of careful online planning and task repetition on accuracy, complexity and fluency in EFL learners' oral production. *Language Teaching Research*, 15(1), 35–59. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1362168810383329>
- Allen, M. (2017). *The SAGE encyclopedia of communication research methods*. SAGE. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781483381411>
- Alley-Young, G. (2017). Creating digital videos in an ESL learning community to develop communication skills and content area knowledge. In S. P. Ferris, & H. A. Wilder (Eds.), *Unplugging the classroom. Teaching with technologies to promote students' lifelong learning* (pp. 13–36). Chandos Publishing. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-08-102035-7.00002-3>
- Brown, D. H. (2001). *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy*. Longman.

- Carey, M. D., Rugins, O., & Grinder, P. R. (2023). Investigating the effects of varying Accelerative Integrated Method instruction on spoken recall accuracy: A case study with junior primary learners of French. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1515/iral-2023-0001>
- Carter, R., & Nunan, D. (2010). *Teaching English to speakers of other languages*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511667206>
- Council of Europe. (2001). *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, teaching, assessment*. Council of Europe.
- Crowther, D., Trofimovich, P., Isaacs, T., & Saito, K. (2015). Does a speaking task affect second language comprehensibility? *Modern Language Journal*, 99, 80–95. <https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12185>
- Dawson, P. (2017). Assessment rubrics: Towards clearer and more replicable design, research and practice. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 42(3), 347–360. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2015.1111294>
- Duman, G., Orhon, G., & Gedik, N. (2014). Research trends in mobile assisted language learning from 2000 to 2012. *ReCALL*, 27(2), 197–216. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0958344014000287>
- Đorđević, J. (2020). Improved understanding of meanings of modal verbs in Legal English and increased motivation through Computer Assisted Language Learning. *Ibérica* 39, 295–318. <https://doi.org/10.17398/2340-2784.39.295>
- Férez Mora, A. P., & Coyle, Y. (2023). Videoed storytelling in primary education EFL: Exploring trainees' digital shift. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1515/iral-2022-0191>
- Fulcher, G. (2012). Scoring performance tests. In G. Fulcher, & F. Davidson (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of language testing* (pp. 378–392). Routledge.
- Fulcher, G. (2017). Criteria for evaluating language quality. In E. Shohamy (Ed.), *Language testing and assessment*, (pp. 179–192). Springer.
- García Mayo, M. P., & Hidalgo, M. A. (2017). L1 use among young EFL mainstream and CLIL learners in task-supported interaction. *System*, 67, 132–145. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2017.05.004>
- Goldstein, B., & Driver, P. (2015). *Language learning with digital video*. Cambridge University Press.
- Hafner, C. A., & Miller, L. (2011). Fostering learner autonomy in English for science: A collaborative digital video project in a technological learning environment. *Language Learning & Technology*, 15(3), 68–86.
- Harmer, J. (2015). *The practice of English language teaching* (With DVD). Pearson.
- Hervas, G., Medina, J. L., & Sandin, M. P. (2020). Participants' views on the use of video in lesson study in higher education in Spain: An exploratory multiple case study. *Journal of Research on Technology in Education*, 52(4), 461–473. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/15391523.2020.1734509>
- Horwitz, E. K. (2001). Language anxiety and achievement. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 21, 112–126. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190501000071>
- Horwitz, E. K., Horwitz, M. B., & Cope, J. A. (1986). Foreign language classroom anxiety. *Modern Language Journal*, 70(2), 125–132. <https://doi.org/10.2307/327317>
- Hsieh, Y. (2020). Effects of video captioning on EFL vocabulary learning and listening comprehension. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 33(5–6), 567–589. <https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1080/09588221.2019.1577898>

- Lantolf, J. P. (2007). Sociocultural theory: A unified approach to L2 learning and teaching. In J. Cummins & C. Davison (Eds.), *International handbook of English language teaching* (pp. 693–700). Springer US.
- Lantolf, J. P., & Thorne, S. L. (2006). *Sociocultural theory and the genesis of second language development*. Oxford University Press.
- Pappamihel, N. E. (2002). English as a Second Language students and English language anxiety: Issues in the mainstream classroom. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 36(3), 327–355.
- Pitura, J. (2022). Developing L2 speaking skills in English-medium EFL higher education, *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, 16(2), 118–143. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/17501229.2021.1884688>
- Schreiber, L. M., Paul, G. D., & Shibley, L. R. (2012). The development and test of the Public Speaking Competence Rubric. *Communication Education*, 61(3), 205–233. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03634523.2012.670709>
- Simoncini, K., Pamphilon, B., & Smith, H. (2021). Learning from teachers like us: Using video to move beyond 'secret knowledge' in Papua New Guinea elementary teacher professional development. *Teachers and Teaching*, 27(1–4), 48–63. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13540602.2021.1920908>
- Soars, L., & Soars, J. (2017a). *New Headway - intermediate*. Oxford University Press.
- Soars, L., & Soars, J. (2017b). *New Headway - upper intermediate*. Oxford University Press.
- Tseng, S.-S., & Yeh, H.-C. (2019). The impact of video and written feedback on student preferences of English speaking practice. *Language Learning & Technology*, 23(2), 145–158. <https://doi.org/10.125/44687>
- Thurnbury, S. (2005). *How to teach speaking*. Pearson Education.
- Yang, H. (2021). Epistemic agency, a double-stimulation, and video-based learning: A formative intervention study in language teacher education. *System*, 96. Article 102401. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2020.102401>
- Yeh, H.-C., Heng, L., & Tseng, S.-S. (2021). Exploring the impact of video making on students' writing skills. *Journal of Research on Technology in Education*, 53(4), 446–456. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/15391523.2020.1795955>

Primljeno: 31.01.2024.

Korigovana verzija primljena: 28.03. 2024.

Prihvaćeno za štampu: 28.03.2024.

Jasmina Đorđević

Faculty of Philosophy, University of Niš, Niš, Serbia

<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6545-5581>

Izrada digitalnog videa: alternativa za poboljšanje govora u nastavi engleskog kao stranog jezika

Jasmina Đorđević

Filozofski fakultet, Univerzitet u Nišu, Niš, Srbija

Apstrakt

Rad prikazuje rezultate akcionog istraživanja zasnovanog na studiji slučaja sprovedenoj na prigodnom uzorku od 42 studenta koji su dobili predlog da izrade digitalne video-zapise koji bi im poslužili kao dodatni alat za vežbanje i poboljšanje govora na engleskom jeziku kao stranom. Studenti su snimili sebe kako drže desetominutni govor prateći uputstva svog nastavnika. Poređenje postignuća studenata na usmenom ispitu na kraju četvrtog semestra i usmenog ispita na kraju prethodne tri semestra ukazalo je na bolji govor studenata na usmenom ispitu na kraju četvrtog semestra zahvaljujući digitalnim video-zapisima koje su studenti izradili. Studenti su takođe popunili upitnik u vezi sa svojim stavovima o dodatnom alatu za vežbanje govora. Analize dobijenih rezultata ukazuju na pozitivan efekat digitalnih video-zapisa koje studenti izrađuju sami kako na njihov govor, tako i na njihov odnos prema samostalnoj izradi digitalnog videa. Pedagoške implikacije ove studije sugerišu tri glavne primene digitalnih video-zapisa: a) alat za vežbanje koji pomaže studentima da poboljšaju svoj govor na engleskom, b) alat za povratne informacije koji omogućava nastavnicima da ukažu studentima na ono što mogu da poboljšaju i v) alat za ocenjivanje koji omogućava nastavnicima da ocene govorne veštine svojih studenata.

Ključne reči: izrada digitalnog videa, engleski jezik kao strani, vežbanje, govor, poboljšanje.