

**UNIVERSITY OF TARTU
COLLEGE OF FOREIGN LANGUAGES AND CULTURES
DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH STUDIES**

**THE EFFECT OF LEARNER-GENERATED REVISION VIDEOS
WITH REVISION QUESTIONS ON VOCABULARY ACQUISITION
AND SPEAKING FLUENCY IN AN EFL ORAL COMMUNICATION CLASS**

MA thesis

**SANDRA LEEBEN
SUPERVISOR: Asst. Lect. NATALJA ZAGURA, MA**

**TARTU
2021**

ABSTRACT

The aim of this study is to research the effects of learner-generated revision videos with revision questions on vocabulary acquisition and speaking fluency in the 9th grade EFL oral communication class. Many students are reluctant to speak in foreign language lessons even when they may participate in activities focusing on other skills, so it is important to find effective techniques to reduce the learners' speaking anxiety while advancing their vocabulary and fluency skills. Furthermore, while many studies examine the creation of audio-visual materials by adult learners, little is known about the way this technique affects teenagers. The author of the thesis, therefore, aims to find out whether learner-generated revision videos with revision questions positively affect the 9th graders' perceived vocabulary and fluency skills, and whether they find this technique useful.

The introduction of the thesis discusses the shift from a grammar-focused approach to a more communicative one in language learning, highlights the problems in oral communication lessons, and discusses the main aims of oral communication teaching. The literature review examines the effect of the student-centred approach and collaborative learning on academic performance, and the role of fluency and vocabulary in oral communication. Then, the results of previous research on learner-generated audio and audio-visual materials, questions and tests are examined. The empirical part of the thesis describes the background of the participants, the procedure and methodology, and the results of the study. Both quantitative and qualitative data was collected, although the quantitative data from the questionnaires was mainly used to devise the questions for the semi-structured interviews.

Table of Contents

ABSTRACT.....	1
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS.....	3
1. INTRODUCTION	4
2. The effect of student-constructed materials on academic achievement	11
2.1 Student-centred approach.....	11
2.2 The role of fluency and vocabulary in oral communication	16
2.3 Learner-generated audio and audio-visual materials	20
2.4 Student-generated questions.....	23
3. The study of the perceived effect of the process of creating learner-generated revision videos with revision questions	27
3.1 Background	27
3.2 Methodology and procedure.....	28
3.3 Results and discussion.....	33
3.3.1 Vocabulary.....	35
3.3.2 Fluency	39
3.3.3 Usefulness.....	45
4. Conclusion	55
References	58
Appendix 1. Pre-task questionnaire	68
Appendix 2. Post-task questionnaire.....	69
Appendix 3. Semi-structured interview questions	70
Appendix 4. Quotes from the interviews	71
RESÜMEE	80

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

CEFR - Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, teaching, assessment

EFL - English as a foreign language

L2 - second language

LGAM/AVM - learner-generated audio and audio-visual material

LGRVs - learner-generated revision videos

N – number of respondents

Q – statement in the questionnaire

SCA – student-centred approach

SD – standard deviation

SGQ – student-generated questions

SGT – student-generated tests

1. INTRODUCTION

The Estonian national curriculum for basic schools places a strong emphasis on creativity and entrepreneurship competence. Schools are expected to equip students with the ability to organise their learning environment individually and in group, create and implement ideas, organise and take part in joint activities, and to participate in creating digital content. According to the communication competences, learners also need to develop the ability to “clearly, relevantly and politely” express themselves in various situations in both their first and second languages (National curriculum for basic schools 2014).

While teachers of all subjects are responsible for promoting the core values and competences among their students, the responsibility for teaching students to express themselves in a foreign language weighs mainly on foreign language teachers alone. Even in foreign language lessons, however, language is no longer seen from only the linguistic viewpoint. Saks, Leijen and Täht (2016: 280) note that a shift has been underway from the emphasis on grammar as the most important element of language learning to a more communicative approach. As a result, speaking fluency, here defined as the rapid, smooth and accurate translation of thought into spoken language, is becoming more important than grammatical accuracy. This demands sufficient vocabulary knowledge from the students, and a different approach to methods and techniques from the teachers. Similarly, the *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, teaching, assessment* (CEFR) marks communicative language competences as an integral part of language learning. CEFR (Council of Europe n.d.: 9) defines competences as “the sum of knowledge, skills and characteristics that allow a person to perform actions”, while communicative language competences are those, which “empower a person to act using specifically linguistic means”, such as processing receptively and/or productively texts in order to carry out a task. It

(Council of Europe n.d.: 9) also views language learners as members of society who use acts of speech in a wider social context, which gives the acts of speech their full meaning. Therefore, while grammatical accuracy is important in language use, truly effective communication requires many additional skills highlighted in the Estonian national curriculum for basic schools. Nonetheless, many of these are still not promoted in English as a foreign language (EFL) lessons, leaving the learners with poor oral communication skills.

Savaşçı (2014: 2682) has highlighted that one of the complaints by the teachers of EFL communication classes is that students are reluctant to speak, even when they may participate in activities focusing on other skills such as reading, writing and listening. The author (*ibid.*) adds that “the problem exists among EFL learners from beginning to more advanced levels”. In fact, Zhao’s (2014: 145) findings reveal that students regarded the use of communicative strategies, range of vocabulary and fluency as “the most difficult things in their oral English learning”. Although Zhao does not define the term “communicative strategies”, CEFR (n.a.: 57) explains that the term “strategies” is “the adoption of a particular line of action in order to maximise effectiveness”, and that communication strategies can be seen as the application of pre-planning, execution, monitoring and repair action to the different kinds of communicative activities including reception, interaction, production and mediation. The reasons why oral communication is viewed as one of the most difficult aspects of foreign language lessons are widely discussed in literature. These include the lack of practice or knowledge how to learn oral foreign language effectively, assessment and feedback, emotional issues, and culture. Vaca Torres and Gómez Rodríguez (2017: 57) consider the lack of practice opportunities as the most hindering aspect for students being unable to achieve the desired oral communicative goals. They (*ibid.*) explain that if students live in countries where the first language is not the target language, their “opportunities

to improve their oral skills are reduced”. Zhao (2014: 148) agrees, but lists the lack of practice opportunities as only one of the leading problems. The author (*ibid.*) also reports that more than half of the student respondents claimed they did not know how to learn oral English efficiently. Furthermore, the findings of the study (*ibid.*: 149) show that only 5.6% thought their English teachers paid sufficient attention to oral English, despite that 63.3% of the students reported having speaking classes every week, and that while over 95% of the subjects thought feedback about their oral English proficiency would be useful, less than 6% claimed to have received it. This may not necessarily mean the students did not receive it. It could also mean that they have not recognised it as feedback. Teacher strategies are also noted by Savaşçı (2014: 2682) who further lists anxiety, fear of being despised, and culture as contributors to the reluctance to speak in EFL classes. The author of the thesis confirms that similar trends occur in the school where the present study was conducted. Students often reach the 9th grade with poor vocabulary knowledge and a reluctance to speak and communicate in English.

It has to be highlighted that many of the studies examining the reluctance to speak in foreign language lessons have been conducted on Asian students. Li and Liu (2011: 962) propose that various cultures, including many Asian ones, “forbid or strongly discourage individuals from speaking up in classroom settings”. This is confirmed by Savaşçı (2014) whose subjects were Turkish, and Zhao (2014) who studied Chinese students. Natividad and Batang (2018: 104) proved that learning styles indeed vary across ethnic groups, although their results did not cover fear of speaking in a foreign language. As a result, these studies may not be entirely reflective of the situation in Estonia. However, the study by Liu and Littlewood (1997: 371) challenges the belief that Asian students are reluctant to adopt active speech roles in English classes. Their (*ibid.*) two large-scale surveys at the University of Hong Kong demonstrated that students gave no evidence

of reluctance, and instead, they expressed “liking for communicative work at school” and “a preference for university classes in which students do most of the talking”. It is also important to emphasise that reluctance to speak in foreign language classes not only stems from culture, but also from self-efficacy, personal emotional aspects, teacher strategies, lack of practice, and learning strategies. Therefore, Estonian students are just as susceptible to reluctance to participate in EFL oral communication classes. Students require more communication practice opportunities through pair and group work, to overcome the fear of speaking, and a greater emphasis on vocabulary acquisition and speaking fluency over grammatical accuracy. This would allow them to reach the expected oral B1 level (independent user) by the time they graduate from the 9th grade.

Out of the four basic language skills (reading, listening, speaking, and writing), the productive skills – speaking and writing – have an important function in academic and professional fields, and cannot be undervalued. CEFR (Council of Europe n.d: 14.) emphasises that particular social value is attached to them, since judgements are made on fluency in speaking and delivering oral presentations. Oral communication, therefore, makes up only one part of the language skills, but has a significant effect on a person’s academic, professional and social life.

When discussing oral productive skills, authors often speak about fluency, oral production and oral communication. Cadena Aguilar et al (2019: 29) define “oral fluency” as “length of runs, silent pauses, length of pauses, filled pauses, and pace”. McDonough and Sato (2019: 379) also mention the number of pauses in their definition for “fluency”, but list the number of false starts and self-corrections as the other criteria for fluency instead. On the other hand, Lennon’s (Lennon 2000: 26 cited in Cadena Aguilar et al 2019: 31) definition of “oral fluency” is more general, referring to “the rapid, smooth, accurate, lucid and efficient translation of thought or communicative intention into language under temporal constraints of on-line processing”, and is

used as the basis for the given thesis. Castillo et al (2018: 109) define “oral production” as “the process in which learners express, with fluency and accuracy, their thoughts and ideas”. However, Díaz Larenas (2011: 86-87) explains that describing oral production leads to oral communication, and both of them can be defined as “any type of interaction that makes use of spoken words, an interaction that is /.../essential nowadays”. The author (ibid.) adds that unlike oral production, oral communication involves the interaction of the speaker and the listener.

According to Díaz Larenas (2011: 86), the main aim of communicative language teaching is to help students develop their ability to communicate in the target language, and that the teacher acts as a facilitator of the communicative situation, monitoring students’ attempts to communicate in the target language. Díaz Larenas (ibid.) states that “the correction of errors is left behind as the focus is to promote students’ participation and motivate them to produce speech in the target language”. The same principle applies to mistakes, which students are able to correct themselves, unlike errors that are caused by not knowing the rule yet. It does not mean that both errors and mistakes are not corrected at all. Instead, the teacher may take notes and initiate language-focused discussion or give advice after the activity. In essence, communicative language teaching satisfies several of the requirements for the modern language teaching principles: it is student-centred, reduces the fear of making mistakes, and focuses on fluency over grammatical accuracy.

While oral communication classes pose problems for many EFL learners, research has demonstrated that meaningful tasks such as student-generated questions (SGQ), project-based learning, interviewing and role-playing could alleviate reticence to speak in foreign language classes. Song, Oh and Glazewski (2017: 1425) suggest that using technology to create SGQ may promote “classroom interactions where students are able to practice the target language through conversation with an instructor and peers”. Vaca Torres and Gómez Rodríguez (2017: 57)

discovered that project-based learning “encouraged students to increase oral production through lexical competence development” and “helped them to overcome fears of speaking in L2”. Al-Garni and Almuhammadi (2019: 72) agree on the effectiveness of problem-based learning on EFL students’ speaking skills, and add that interviewing and role-playing also bring superior results compared to using “traditional methods”. Therefore, while students may experience reluctance to communicate in a foreign language, this could possibly be overcome by using a more student-centred approach (SCA) in EFL oral communication classes. Furthermore, reluctant students may benefit from activities in which they take on roles that in the teacher-centred model are reserved for the teacher such as generating questions based on the covered material. One of the questions that arises from the positive effect of the use of SGQ on reluctant EFL oral communication students, is whether extending other traditional teacher-role responsibilities to their studies could benefit their oral communication skills as well. More specifically, whether student-constructed videos explaining the covered topics to their peers would have a positive effect on their speaking fluency and vocabulary acquisition.

While creating audio and audio-visual content by students has been covered extensively in literature (for example, Lee et al 2008, Akef and Nossratpour 2010, Castañeda and Rodríguez.González 2011, Lee 2014, Göktürk 2016, Safari and Koosha 2016, Mills et al 2018, Gaston and Havard 2019), only a few studies concentrate on fluency as well as vocabulary acquisition (for example, Kormos and Dénes’ 2004, Kim 2014, Iman’s 2017, Kilic 2019, Angelini & García-Carbonell 2019, Bataineh et al 2020). Furthermore, many audio-visual content related studies focus on the creation of digital stories and animations, rather than students taking on the traditional role of a teacher to explain the covered topics to their peers as a way to advance their oral fluency and vocabulary skills. Also, many studies examine the effect of giving normally

traditional teacher-centred roles to university students (for example, Lee et al 2008, Gehringer and Miller 2009; Pharo and De Salas 2009, Yu and Su 2015, Kurtz et al 2019), but much less is known how this approach affects younger learners. It is important, therefore, to find out whether younger ESL learners would also benefit from acquiring normally teacher-centred roles, like content-creation, similarly to university students. Therefore, the aim of this thesis is to examine how a group of Estonian 9th graders perceive the effect of creating revision videos with revision questions at the end for their peers based on the previously covered topics in their EFL oral communication class. More specifically, the subjects assess the technique's effect on their vocabulary acquisition and speaking fluency, and the technique's overall usefulness. The study focuses solely on the learners' own perception of these aspects. This approach was chosen, firstly, because the author of the thesis had little previous knowledge of the students' skill levels prior to the experiment and only teaches the group once a week. Secondly, because while oral language assessment in free production is always subjective, the participants are arguably able to sense their progress more accurately than a teacher who meets them once a week. Based on the purpose of this MA thesis, the research questions are as follows:

1. What learner-perceived effect does the process of creating learner-generated revision videos (LGRVs) with revision questions have on students' vocabulary acquisition and speaking fluency?
2. How useful do the students find creating revision videos and questions for learning EFL?

Therefore, this study may add a new dimension to research by revealing how younger students are able to take on a traditionally teacher-centred role, and whether they find the technique useful for EFL fluency and vocabulary acquisition.

The effect of student-constructed materials on academic achievement

As previously suggested, a more student-centred approach (SCA) may help learners to overcome the reluctance to speak in oral communication classes. The following section, therefore, firstly explores SCA in the context of language learning, addresses the role of collaboration in SCA, and discusses their role in academic achievement and oral communication. Secondly, the literature review covers how vocabulary and fluency affect oral communication skills. Finally, the usefulness of student-constructed audio-visual material creation, and student-generated questions and tests is explored as these elements were used by the participants of the present study.

2.1 Student-centred approach

One of the opportunities to manage the shift in language learning, which acknowledges that effective communication needs a variety of competences, is student-centred approach (SCA). Garrett and Shortall (2002:26) view SCA as instruction where the focus is on what the student is doing, and the teacher is not the focal point of the activities. They (ibid.) also view pair and group work as an important aspect of student-centred classroom activities. Lee and Hannafin (2016: 707) add that student-centred learning “identifies students as the owners of their learning”. Lan (2018: 859) notes that with the perception of learner ownership, learners are “more independent and responsible” and “do not suffer from the lack of learning motivation”. Furthermore, they are usually “proactive” and “willing to take risks during the learning process” (ibid.). According to Lee and Hannafin (2016: 712-713), intrinsically motivated students tend to set goals to understand the task, acquire new knowledge, and develop their abilities. As a result, SCA helps to “cultivate individual responsibility for engaging learning opportunities, which enhances academic performance as well as student autonomy” (ibid.). It is important that EFL classes help to facilitate

SCA in order to enhance the learners' academic performance and skills. Creating revision videos with revision questions is an example of SCA, as the students have complete freedom to choose how to cover the studied topics, while the teacher only acts as a guide.

Research supports the view that SCA can enhance motivation, interest and academic performance. For example, Gehringer and Miller (2009: 83) note that active learning increases attentiveness during class, while the subjects in the study by Yu and Su (2015: 693) claim that creating questions and tests based on the studied material was “novel”, “interesting” and “lively”. Increase in motivation and a sense of responsibility is also reported by Fukushima (2007: 83). SCA may also lead to the realisation of the learner's weaknesses and finding solutions, as illustrated by Lee et al (2008: 513). Their (ibid.) study investigating how the creation of podcasts leads to collaborative knowledge building reveals that although the student-producers were not provided with a textbook, they reported carrying out self-directed research by reading books and Internet sites in their own time. In addition, some authors point out the positive effects of SCA on academic achievement. Yu and Su (2015: 694) report that more than 60% of the respondents felt that student-generated tests (SGT) could promote learning, and another study (Yu 2019: 226) confirmed that there was “a significantly positive correlation between students' academic achievement and their generated questions cited by peers”. Tilfarlioglu and Doğan (2011: 1284) also reveal a positive relationship between learner autonomy and academic success. In a study (Tseng et al 2020:1) exploring the effects of implementing a 3D vocabulary learning program on vocabulary acquisition in an EFL class, the findings illustrate that the individual and paired autonomous use of the program instigated “a more profound retention of vocabulary than teacher-directed use”. All these studies highlight that SCA could benefit the learners in more ways than one.

A few studies have also been inconclusive on the effectiveness of SCA. Gehringer and Miller (2009: 83) report that students were “only neutral on whether they learned a lot from devising active-learning exercises”. Yu and Su (2015: 694) note that nearly 30% of the participants saw no differences between the effectiveness of teacher-constructed and student-constructed tests. In a study by Pharo and De Salas (2009: 202), in which students had to peer review a scientific report introduction before submitting it to the teacher for grading, only a minority thought it helped them to understand the assessment better, most did not find it helped their confidence, and they did not find it enjoyable. Therefore, SCA may not always bring the desired results.

Felder and Brent (1996: 44) emphasise that it is not that SCA does not work when done correctly. They (*ibid.*) claim that instead, the benefits are often neither immediate nor automatic because students whose teachers have been telling them everything they needed to know from the first grade onwards, do not “necessarily appreciate having this support suddenly withdrawn”. Ryan and Deci (2006: 1575) further explain that giving students too much choice can sometimes be counter-productive. They (*ibid.*) warn that “an excessive number of options can be daunting and wasteful of energy”. The authors (*Ibid.*: 1577) expand that this may cause the learners to feel “overwhelmed and resentful at the effort of entailed decision making”. Felder and Brent (1996: 44) stress that giving up on SCA would be a mistake because the benefits are a lot greater than the initial feeling of awkwardness by the teachers and the hostility of the students. SCA could help Estonian EFL students not only achieve communicative language competence, but also other broader core values and competences, such as social and citizen competence, self-management competence, learning to learn competence, communication competence and social values among others. Furthermore, SCA could be beneficial for achieving the shift from the focus on grammar to the more communicative approach.

One way to cultivate SCA and oral communication practice opportunities in oral EFL classes is by collaborative learning as previously suggested by Garrett and Shortall (2002:26). Dillenbourg (1999 cited in Lee et al 2008: 508) admits that collaborative learning is a complex and often disputed term, but that there seems to be agreement that “collaboration involves participants engaging in a coordinated effort to complete the task”. Kirschner (1999 cited in Wilson 2004: 87) agrees and elaborates that learners need to have already achieved “foundational knowledge in a subject area” and that “working in semi-autonomous groups exposes students to multiple viewpoints and methods”. Kirschner (ibid.) believes that through collaborative learning “knowledge will be socially constructed and refined through interactions with others”. Fallows and Chandramohan (2001: 232) explain that in collaborative learning, including peer assessment, “the normal hierarchical arrangements are eliminated since the peers are of equal or equivalent academic status”.

Most of the authors examining collaborative learning mainly focus on its effect on academic results. A study (Yu 2019: 229) in which 5th graders created yes-no questions and peer-reviewed constructed tests about the covered topics, claims that significantly more participants supported and preferred citing over no citing since it allowed them to “attend to areas pinpointed by their peers but initially ignored by them, thus making social construction of knowledge possible”. Another study (Kurtz et al 2019: 1) about learner-generated multiple-choice questions finds that collaborating with peers is beneficial for different learning and approaches. While these authors indirectly suggest a connection between collaborative learning and academic achievement through the acquisition of new approaches, others show a more direct link. Some studies (Shadiev et al 2018: 893; Liu et al 2018: 1009) demonstrate that compared to students completing tasks individually, students who complete tasks collaboratively have better learning performance and

outperformed those working individually. Others examine vocabulary acquisition through collaborative learning and also report a positive correlation. A study by Tseng et al (2020: 1) concludes that pair work enhances longer vocabulary retention than individual practice. Teng and Reynolds (2019: 1) come to a similar conclusion, but elaborate that learning is most effective collaboratively with metacognitive prompts. According to Omrod (2012: 100 cited in Rasmussen & Stewart 2018: 19), metacognition can be defined as “knowledge and beliefs about one’s own cognitive processes, as well as conscious attempts to engage in behaviours and thought processes that increase learning and memory”. Metacognitive prompts, therefore, are instruments that help learners “to reflect on their individual learning needs, understanding how to carry out their plan for learning, and how to meet their learning objectives” (Henrikson 2019: 18). As research suggests, collaborative learning may contribute to academic achievement through the social construction of knowledge since it creates opportunities to learn through observing, and comparing and contrasting oneself with the peers. Since collaborative learning seems to create more interaction among students, it may also help to promote communication opportunities in oral EFL classes. This is only feasible, however, if the students use the target language, not their first or common language, while doing group work.

Although much of the research suggests positive outcomes for collaborative learning, a few also mention challenges or even negative outcomes in particular circumstances. The teachers participating in Gaston and Havard’s (2019: 28) study about collaborative video production revealed that the students assisted each other and other groups, and overall seemed to enjoy the creation process, but also described it as “challenging” and “a productive struggle”. This indicates that collaborative learning does not come naturally for students, and needs cooperation and communication skills, as well as sufficient content knowledge. Another study (Retnowati et al

2017: 666) about individual and collaborative learning in problem-solving and worked examples among 7th graders shows that collaborative learning is more effective than individual learning when learning from problem-solving situations, but may be counterproductive when studying worked examples. According to Clark et al (2011 cited in McGinn et al 2015: 27), a worked example in mathematics is “a problem that has been fully completed to demonstrate a procedure”. Neither of the studies conclusively proves that collaborative learning is ineffective. Rather it demonstrates that in some situations it requires more effort from the learners, and that individual work has its place in learning as well. It seems, however, that activities that focus on creation may benefit from collaborative learning over individual ones.

2.2 The role of fluency and vocabulary in oral communication

As highlighted earlier, fluency is becoming increasingly important in foreign language studies, so learners need a wide enough vocabulary to clearly and efficiently express their thoughts. Wilkins (1972 cited in Tang 2020: 89) concludes that “one couldn’t express many things without grammar, but one could express nothing without vocabulary”. Díaz Larenas (2011: 87) agrees and emphasises that it is better for the teacher to use short sentences and appropriate vocabulary for the learners to develop more complex ways of extending sentences since learners first need to become skilled in producing utterances to achieve fluency. Kilic (2019: 133) confirms that vocabulary knowledge (including vocabulary size, receptive vocabulary size, and depth of vocabulary knowledge) correlates significantly with performance in speaking. Kilic’s (ibid.) analysis shows that vocabulary knowledge accounts for 17% of variance in speaking performance. Vocabulary, therefore, is a significant aspect of oral productive skills.

Some studies indicate a less important role of vocabulary knowledge in fluency and speaking skills than the previous authors suggest. Iman's (2017: 87) study investigating the effect of debate on the students' critical thinking and speaking skill demonstrated that while there was a significant improvement in both areas, the contribution of vocabulary toward the overall speaking skill was only 1.4%, while fluency counted for 67.4%, grammar 13.7%, pronunciation 8.3%, and comprehension 5.4%. Kormos and Dénes' (2004: 145) study highlights how different variables predict native and non-native speaking teachers' perception of students' fluency. The authors (ibid.) report that for both groups of teachers the best predictors of fluency scores were speech rate, the mean length of utterances, phonation time ratio and the number of stressed words produced per minute. The raters, however, differed as regards to how important they considered accuracy, lexical diversity and the mean length of pauses, while the number of filled and unfilled pauses and other disfluencies did not influence their perceptions of fluency (Kormos & Dénes 2004: 145). The insignificant effect of disfluencies on the perceived fluency are explained by Erten (2014: 68) who claims that "spontaneous speech naturally includes disfluencies", such as fillers like "Well, Uhm and How to say that", which even native speakers resort to when they want to "buy time". Although these studies cast doubt on the importance of vocabulary knowledge on fluency perception, it is undoubtedly one of the foundations of speech without which sentences could not be constructed.

Vocabulary can be acquired by various means. Although listening is a major part of oral communication, research suggests that vocabulary acquisition through listening is debatable. For example, Teng (2018: 274) compares the effect of reading-while-listening task with reading-only task on incidental vocabulary acquisition, and concludes that the former is more effective. His (ibid.) results, however, reveal that while incidental acquisition of word form and grammar is

positively affected by word exposure frequency, the word meaning and collocation acquisition remain unaffected. Van Zeeland and Schmitt (2013: 609) discovered that knowledge of word form recognition and grammar immediately after listening is more sensitive to attrition than the word meaning recall. It appears that for listening to be a valuable source for vocabulary acquisition, exposure frequency and extensive meaning processing are necessary. Unlike listening, technology-aided activities appear to have a more reliable outcome on vocabulary acquisition. A study (Angelini & García-Carbonell 2019: 3) investigating the effects of web-based simulation L2 learning on the students' oral production demonstrates that students progressed in vocabulary, pronunciation, variety of expressions, and grammar. Another study (Bataineh et al 2020: 25) examining the effectiveness of Web 2.0-supported project-based learning on the 11th grade EFL students' speaking fluency, and grammar and vocabulary accuracy showed a positive trend in all of these aspects. Therefore, technology-aided vocabulary learning could be effective, especially when combined with other techniques.

In addition to vocabulary acquisition through listening and technology-aided means, Wilson et al (2016: 52, 53) have highlighted that providing structured opportunities to practice oral language skills, including both academic and content vocabulary, in pairs and small groups helps to deepen the learning and reduce speaking anxiety. The authors (ibid.: 53) also emphasise that teachers should pre-teach essential vocabulary needed to engage in the oral activities, and only focus on three to five key vocabulary words to avoid overwhelming the students. Similarly to van Zeeland and Schmitt (2013) and Teng (2018), Wilson et al (ibid.: 53) note the importance of vocabulary exposure frequency, claiming that teachers need to provide six to ten opportunities for students to use the new vocabulary throughout the new unit. Therefore, vocabulary appears to be

best acquired through high exposure frequency and practice opportunities, and by including an element of technology use.

Vocabulary is only one requirement for fluency. Some studies remain inconclusive whether meaningful practice opportunities, such as project-based learning, lead to increased oral fluency. Spring (2020: 1) defines project-based learning as “a teaching methodology in which students learn or practice a foreign language by participating in project work in the target language”. In his (ibid.) study investigating the effect of creating short videos on fluency, complexity and accuracy in an ESL class, he reports that participants only made marginal progress in fluency reducing the number of pauses and increasing their raw speech rate slightly, but that their lexical complexity remained unaffected. Castillo et al (2018: 115) investigated the effect of the different structuring of activities on oral fluency in EFL tutoring sessions, and noted that the learners’ goals, age, and prior experience with English enhanced or hindered spoken interaction. Younger learners (between 15 and 25 years old) scored lower in participation than older learners (25-40 years old) (ibid.). This means that the younger learners had fewer opportunities to practice, thus hindering their fluency. Nonetheless, the authors (Castillo et al 2018: 115) point out that learners considered conversations in English as the second most useful out of different activities, surpassed only by games. Similarly, McDonough and Sato’s (2019: 379) study examining the effectiveness of interactive activities reports that the intervention increased the learners’ accuracy, but their production of disfluencies remained unchanged. However, as previously mentioned, disfluencies appear even in native speakers’ speech, and do not appear to affect the perception of fluency. There is also evidence that increasing time pressure in task repetition could advance fluency. According to Thai and Boers’ findings (2015: 369), fluency is “enhanced most markedly” in shrinking time conditions with no significant changes to complexity or accuracy. It can be concluded that fluency

and vocabulary are best acquired through a variety of means, including repetition, meaningful practice opportunities, and an added technological component. This could be promoted through LGRVs that expose the learners to content-related vocabulary through production as well as reception. Furthermore, planning and practicing for the videos also demands repetition that could further enhance the learners' vocabulary and fluency.

2.3 Learner-generated audio and audio-visual materials

According to Lan (2018: 860), creation is an “autonomous learning process during which learners are actively engaged in investigating matters, solving problems, reflecting ideas and producing contents”. In Bloom’s taxonomy (Anderson et al 2001: 68), creation is the highest of the cognitive processes dimensions and involves “putting elements together to form a coherent or functional whole”. According to the taxonomy (ibid.: 85), creation requires students to “draw upon elements from many sources” and put them together into a novel and organised structure or pattern relative to their prior knowledge. One of the possibilities to introduce creation into EFL oral communication classes is by audio or audio-visual material production through which students may demonstrate their understanding of the covered material. As such, LGRVs allow students to create material that requires cooperation, reflecting on the studied topics, and the use of the new vocabulary through communication in the target language.

Positive effects of learner-generated audio and audio-visual material (LGAM/AVM) creation have been observed in language studies as well as in other fields. Some studies, especially those conducted in fields other than foreign language learning, indicate that LGAM/AVMs help students understand the topic better. For example, the authors (Lee et al 2008: 505) of a study, in which undergraduate students created radio show style podcasts for distribution to their peers, note that creating the podcasts “would give the student-producers the opportunity to reinforce and

consolidate the knowledge acquired in the unit through ‘teaching’ it to other students, as well as allowing them to develop new, practical skills”. They (Lee et al 2008: 516) also point out that the fact that podcasts were only semi-scripted, allowed “variation and improvisation”, which advances listening and reacting to the partner’s utterances in a limited time, thus promoting oral communication skills. Gaston and Havard (2019), and Mills et al (2018) also observe the positive effect of learner-generated audio-visual material on the students’ content knowledge. Similarly to Lee et al (2008: 505), Mills et al (2018: 165) found that students’ ideas increased in sophistication through ‘teachable moments’, wherein students learned through teacher-student and student-student exchanges as they had to explain their newfound understanding to their peers. While Gaston and Havard (2019: 23) do not mention the benefits of teachable moments, they agree with the previous authors that collaborative video production has a positive influence on perceived learning and content interest. They (ibid.) also claim that collective video production can be used for “a variety of content topics, grade levels, and learning environments”. Therefore, LGAM/AVMs may help to raise content knowledge and possibly oral communication skills in the target language.

Several authors have observed positive outcomes in other important aspects as well. Kim (2014: 20) claims recorded stories with online self-study resources “build considerable self-confidence”. Göktürk (2016: 71) agrees that digital video recordings may bolster the learners’ self-confidence. LGAM/AVM creation could also boost self-reflection and self-assessment as indicated by Lee (2014), and Safari and Koosha (2016). Lee (2014: 338) states that creating digital news empowered students to “use their own voices for self-expression”, and the social interaction helped to form “a sense of community in which students supported each other by offering new ideas and feedback”. Kim’s (2014: 20) study further indicates that learning through storytelling

can be learner-centred and “increase autonomy in oral proficiency”. These reported outcomes of LGAM/AVMs are also necessary in EFL oral communication classes.

Studies in foreign language learning generally support the findings in other fields. Several authors report a positive impact of LGAM/AVMs on oral skills (Akef and Nossratpour 2010; Castañeda and Rodríguez.González 2011; Lee 2014; Göktürk 2016; Safari and Koosha 2016). While the other authors mention only the positive effects of LGAM/AVMs, Göktürk (2016: 71) also points out that although creating digital video recordings in speaking classes improved the learners’ overall speaking proficiency, it did not significantly improve the learners’ oral fluency. This could be interpreted that creating digital video recordings allowed the learners to deliver their message more effectively due to the improved vocabulary, grammar and pronunciation, although not rapidly and smoothly. Nonetheless, Göktürk (2016: 71) admits the digital video recordings may encourage the learners to take more risks with the target language.

Although most of these studies report mainly positive effects of LGAM/AVMs, some also note negative ones. Gehringer and Miller (2009: 84) observed that students who were negative and considered the course to be challenging also did not want to teach the covered topics, and thus derived no benefits. Mills et al (2018: 170) note that students’ conflicting ideas and uncertainty were mainly resolved by teacher-student exchanges and less through student-student exchanges. It indicates that students may be more reliant on the teacher to explain unclear aspects than use the ‘teachable moments’ they would get from explaining the topics to their peers. Nonetheless, much of the evidence supports the idea that LGAM/AVM creation may effectively be used for raising interest, advancing content knowledge, increasing learner-centeredness, autonomy, and self-confidence. These skills are necessary to overcome learner reticence and encourage students to experiment with the language in foreign language oral communication classes.

2.4 Student-generated questions

Another usually teacher-centred activity is teacher-questioning. This is mainly used by teachers to determine whether the learning objectives have been achieved. Several studies, however, have examined how student-generated questions (SGQ) affect the learners' abilities, although this is still a relatively little-researched topic. Yu and Wu (2015: 89) define SGQ as a "learning activity during which students generate a set of questions corresponding to specific previous instruction or experiences they deem educationally important and relevant for self- and peer-assessment purposes". Yu (2019: 227) claims that SGQ provide students with "meaningful and empowering learning opportunities by inducing them to reflect back on what they view as relevant and important with regards to past learning experience". Yu and Wu (2015: 90) go further and examine student-generated tests (SGT), which emphasise the same learning goals and concept as SGQ but also involve other aspects such as "complete and appropriate coverage of main ideas and adequate item sequencing". Due to the previously mentioned education shift, educators need to equip students with the skills to continue life-long learning. Inquiry and questioning through SGQ or SGT is one way to achieve this.

Studies show that SGQ and SGT have numerous benefits. Several authors describe cross-coverage of ideas, content integration and critical thinking as some of the positive outcomes. Verman-de Olde and De Jong (2004: 859) note that students actively used their prior knowledge during the question designing process, and thus strengthened their knowledge by retrieving and explaining problem-solving steps. Yu and Su (2015), and Kurtz et al (2019) agree with Verman-de Olde and De Jong. Both (Yu and Su 2015: 686; Kurtz et al 2019: 1) add that SGQ and SGT may help students to compare features among contrasting concepts and make subtle distinctions between similar aspects. Kurtz et al (ibid.: 7) report that 60% of the students believed that writing

the answer choices required critical thinking. Furthermore, the authors (Kurtz et al 2019: 7) note that the students perceived that writing multiple choice questions required more problem-solving and content-integration than their usual study strategies such as re-reading lecture slides, re-writing notes, and reviewing flashcards. Yu and Su (2015: 685) stress that SGT encouraged a majority of the students to generate questions involving cross-chapter topics and engage in question revision indicating “knowledge integration and elaboration”. As in the research by Kurtz et al (2019), some of the subjects in Yu and Su’s (2015: 693) study stressed that SCT provide opportunities for “exercising higher-order thinking skills”, including cognitive strategies such as building linkage to daily life, other subject domains, and locating the main ideas of the study content. The authors (ibid.: 694) also report that the majority of the created tests had cross-chapter items, and that more than 20% of the participants included cross-chapter questions accounting for more than 20% of their constructed tests. Therefore, SGT and SGQ help students to make connections and develop critical thinking to solve problems according to the previous studies..

Another benefit of SGQ and SGT is that they allow effective revision and contribute to academic achievement. Wilson (2004: 87) and Johnson (2018: 65) claim that SGQ helped students to recall and understand the course content. Although Wilson (2004: 87) examines SGQ and Fukushima (2007: 75) SGT in their works, both conclude that these methods are effective and beneficial for revision. Wilson (2004: 87) notes that SGQ are important for succeeding in the course. Song et al (2017: 1425) agree, and report a “significant difference in students’ achievement between the pre- and post-test”. Fukushima (2007: 75) adds that the students considered the technique important in succeeding in the course. Yu and Su (2015: 685) go even further and highlight that a significant proportion of the participants considered SGT as “their preferred assessment and learning approach, highlighting its affective and cognitive potential, in comparison

to the traditional teacher-constructed tests”. Therefore, SGQ and SGT help students effectively review the studied material, and thus achieve their academic objectives.

Lastly, other reported benefits of SGQ and SGT are increased interaction, engagement, and motivation. Wilson (2004), Song et al (2017) and Johnson (2018) all mention increased engagement and motivation. Wilson (2004: 87) notes that most of the students found the process of developing exam questions to be “intrinsically motivating and an interesting part of the course”. Johnson (2018: 65) lists engagement and motivation as some of the additional benefits of SGQ. Song et al (2017: 1425) agree with the two previous authors and mention engagement, but in a different context. Rather than focusing on engagement in terms of being interested in the work, the authors (ibid.) observe engagement in terms of collaborative interactions in foreign language courses. Their (ibid.) results suggest that student-generated questioning fosters collaborative interactions and the frequency of student engagement, and that using technology for student-generated questioning may result in promoting classroom interactions where “the students are able to practice the target language through conversation with an instructor and peers”. Therefore, SGQ and SGT may not only increase students’ motivation but also result in greater classroom interaction using the target language, thus advancing the communication skills in the target language.

A few authors who have compared SGT and SGQ note that SGT is more effective than SGQ. Yu and Su (2015: 693) highlight that compared to SGQ, the SGT activity helped the students “cultivate a global and macro view that highlighted the integration and inter-connectedness of the entire study material”. Furthermore, the participants of the study (ibid.) noted that SGT helped them gain a more “comprehensive”, “integrative” and “holistic” view of the concepts. Similarly, Yu and Wu (2015: 89) conclude that students who engaged in SCT activities generated questions that covered significantly more concepts and levels of subordinate concepts, and built significantly

more links between clusters of study topics compared to the SGQ group. Although some evidence suggests that SGT is more beneficial than SGQ, it does not mean SGQ has no benefits. It must also be noted that all of the conducted experiments with SGT involved university students who are more likely to have developed better cross-concept analysis skills compared to basic school students. Furthermore, the studies intended the students to create SGT across different topics, whereas in the current thesis the students were expected to summarise topics one by one for revision purposes. As a result, SGQ was preferred over SGT in the study conducted for this thesis.

3. The study of the perceived effect of the process of creating learner-generated revision videos with revision questions

In the following section, the methodology and procedure of the conducted experiment is outlined, and the results of the study are presented and analysed. Finally, conclusions are drawn on the perceived usefulness of using LGRVs with revision questions in the 9th grade EFL oral communication class.

3.1 Background

The present thesis examines the use of learner-generated revision videos (LGRVs) with revision questions in the 9th grade EFL oral communication class with a focus on vocabulary and fluency. Out of the thirty-six 9th graders from A, B and C classes (twelve students in each), altogether twelve students and their guardians gave consent to participate in the present study. Between classes A, B and C, consent was given by two, six and four students and their guardians respectively. Three of the participants were boys and nine were girls. Classes A and B have students whose first language is Estonian. Class C has students whose first language is Russian. The variances in the results among the students with different first languages, however, will not be discussed in the present study. Nonetheless, it is important to note that the students from A and B classes have had English lessons from the 2nd grade onwards, while the students from class C have studied English one year less. The general level of English in class C is considerably lower, and they often resort to using Russian instead of English. Generally, most of the participants were considered to be motivated students by the teachers.

The study was conducted in a state school with approximately 550 students in a small town in Harjumaa. The majority of the students speak Estonian as their first language, and about a third

of all students have Russian as their home language. The 9th graders in the given study have altogether three 45-minute EFL lessons per week. One of these is an oral communication class, mainly focusing on vocabulary and fluency in speaking and communication, although this is done through various written, audio and audio-visual texts to present the new vocabulary in context. The oral communication classes are taught by the author of the thesis who does not teach the other remaining EFL classes, which focus mainly on language structures. This system was implemented from the 9th grade onwards two years prior to the given study in this school. It was due to the concern that students were lacking EFL communication skills by the time they reached the 9th grade. Many of the students were reluctant to speak and communicate in English, even when they could perform other EFL skills.

3.2 Methodology and procedure

Before the study was conducted on the 9th graders, a pilot study was held with the 10th grade students in the same school a year earlier. The students were considered to have low motivation and English skills, and lacked effective group dynamic. Unlike the course for the 9th graders, the course for the 10th graders did not focus solely on communication. Therefore, the initial task for them was to create revision materials for their classmates, mainly covering language structures and vocabulary rather than vocabulary and fluency. This much broader approach allowed the students to choose from a variety of formats (games, presentations, tests, videos etc.). Students often did not finish the tasks due to low motivation and resorted to using generic online gap-fill multiple-choice games like Kahoot and Quizizz resulting in unrelated sentences with multiple spelling and grammar mistakes. The pilot study revealed problems in the methodology and allowed adjustments to be made.

For the real study, pre- and post-task questionnaires were firstly prepared (Appendix 1 and 2). Both pre- and post-task questionnaires were necessary to detect any shifts of opinion as a result of creating the revision videos. The questionnaires include statements regarding elements of writing, listening and reading (for example, understanding the new vocabulary when seeing or hearing it in an unfamiliar text or being able to identify misspelled words) because much of the studied material was presented through various written, audio and audio-visual texts as well as short writing exercises. Furthermore, the author assumed that the learners would likely make written notes in preparation for the filming of the videos or look for further information online. The questions were designed by the author of the thesis since previous studies did not provide a suitable example. The results from the questionnaires were then used to design questions for the semi-structured interviews (Appendix 3).

At the beginning of the course, each 9th grade student was given an assessment sheet that would be used by the teacher to grade their videos. The study was conducted over three academic periods from September until mid-February during which three major topics were covered: travelling, the environment, and future plans and careers. The basic class progression is represented in Table 1.

Table 1. Class progression

Lesson	Topic		
	Travelling	The environment	The future and career
1	Introduction. Article rules for geographic points.	The negative effects of tourism. Vocabulary. Phrases for agreeing and disagreeing.	Future plans. Vocabulary.
2	Vocabulary. Phrases to express opinion.	The environmental impact of travelling. Vocabulary related to environmental problems. Debates.	Preparing for job interviews. The Do's and Don'ts of job interviews. Talking about yourself and your achievements.
3	Task: planning a trip abroad.	Individual presentations about different environmental problems.	Job interview.
4	Creating the revision video.	Debates.	Creating the revision videos.
5	Revision: watching the videos and answering the revision questions at the end.	Creating the revision video.	Revision: watching the videos and answering the revision questions at the end.
6	Graded task: A pair conversation about planning a trip	Revision: watching the videos and answering the revision questions at the end.	Graded task: A job interview.
7		Graded task: A debate.	

The material was designed to be around the CEFR B1 and B2 level. After each covered topic students had to form pairs or groups of three and think of a format for their revision video as homework (for example, a talk-show, evening news, friends discussing the topic etc.). The task was completed three times by the same students. This approach was chosen to see whether students' perception of usefulness of the activity changed once they became more skilled in completing it. The learners were provided with general guiding questions that needed to be answered in their video. They were also instructed to include the new vocabulary in the videos. They then had one oral communication lesson to make a more specific plan for the video and film it. Each video had to end with five revision questions for their classmates to which the answers had to be found in the video. Before they started working on the video in class, the students who had given consent to participate in the study filled out a pre-task questionnaire. The video was finished as homework. By the next lesson, students had to upload their videos in a Microsoft Teams

folder. The LGRVs with the revision questions were then used in the following revision lessons in which students would watch the videos created by their peers and answer the revision questions. Before watching the videos, however, students who had agreed to participate in the study filled out a post-task questionnaire. The post-task questionnaires were finished before the revision to ensure that students write their answers based on the process of creating the LGRVs, not on the in-class revision by watching the videos and answering the questions. The revision lessons were meant to prepare the learners for the main graded communicative assignments. The revision videos were graded too, but the grade was less important than the grades for the main communicative assignments.

While twelve students participated in the study, their questionnaire answers could not always be included in the data. If the student was absent during the lesson where the pre-task questionnaires were filled out and the revision videos were planned, they would not have the chance to fill out the pre-task questionnaire, so their answers would not be included in the data. The pre-task questionnaire could also not be filled out later because the absent student usually started and finished the video as homework for the next lesson. There were three reasons for not including some of the post-task questionnaires in the data. Firstly, one of the participants did not present their LGRVs claiming he could not find it from his files anymore. Secondly, if a student presented a video in which their fluency and vocabulary could not be assessed (for example, if the student did not speak in the video), their post-task questionnaire could not be included in the data. Thirdly, some of the students presented their LGRVs after the deadline or after the main graded communicative task, so it would have been questionable whether they filled out the post-task questionnaire based on doing the LGRV, watching their peers' videos or doing the main graded communicative task.

Since altogether only twelve students agreed to participate in the study, and not all of their questionnaires could be counted, reliable and definitive quantitative analysis could not be made. As a result, the data from the questionnaires was only used to detect possible general problem-areas, trends and attitudes, and was then used to design interview questions for the more comprehensive qualitative analysis. Semi-structured group interviews were held in February. While all thirty-six students from A, B and C classes created the videos, only those who had given consent to participate in the study filled out the pre- and post-task questionnaires and were interviewed. All twelve students, who had previously agreed to participate in the study, took part in the interviews. The interview groups were separated according to the three participating classes. Group interviews were preferred over individual interviews to ensure students feel at ease when they are not in the centre of attention. As the participating classes are considered to have a good group dynamic, it was assumed that students would feel comfortable expressing their ideas in a group interview. The interviews were conducted in Estonian to ensure the students' English skills would not impact the complexity of their answers. During the interviews, the questions were provided for the students both in English and in Estonian. Later, the quotes were categorised and translated into English.

3.3 Results and discussion

In the following section, the results of the questionnaires (Table 2) are summarised and the analysis of the interviews is presented in three categories: vocabulary, fluency and usefulness of the LGRVs. The number of respondents for the questionnaires were as follows: LGRV 1 (pre-task: N=12; post-task: N=8), LGRV 2 (pre-task: N=11; post-task: N=8) and LGRV 3 (pre-task: N=10; N=9 for Q3 and 5; post-task: N=7). The post-LGRV 3 questionnaire had the fewest number of respondents, thus skewing the results, especially due to the absence of most of the stronger students. Furthermore, the third topic was partially covered during a long-distance learning period due to COVID 19. As a result, many students did not participate in the video lessons, and consequently had less chance to communicate and practice the new vocabulary.

Table 2. Questionnaire statistics

		Vocabulary statements (Q)					Fluency statements (Q)				Usefulness statements (Q)					
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
PRE 1	N	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12
	SD	.669	.996	.793	.669	1.030	.953	1.030	1.084	.985	.996	.669	.674	.452	.669	1.240
	Mean	4.42	3.92	4.42	4.58	4.17	4.00	4.17	3.92	3.67	4.08	4.42	4.50	4.75	4.42	4.08
	Median	4.5	4.0	5.0	5.0	4.5	4.0	4.5	4.0	3.5	4.0	4.5	5.0	5.0	4.5	5.0
POST 1	N	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8
	SD	.518	.886	.756	1.061	.916	.756	.916	1.035	.991	1.309	1.458	1.512	1.488	1.512	.886
	Mean	4.62	4.25	4.50	4.37	4.38	4.50	4.38	4.25	4.13	4.00	4.13	4.00	3.75	4.00	4.25
	Median	5.0	4.5	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.5	4.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	5.0	4.5
PRE 2	N	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11
	SD	1.009	.820	1.250	.944	1.095	1.036	1.079	1.095	1.079	1.214	1.250	1.183	1.214	1.221	.751
	Mean	4.27	3.55	3.85	3.91	4.00	4.45	4.18	4.00	3.82	3.45	4.18	4.00	3.55	3.91	4.18
	Median	5.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	4.0	3.0	4.0	4.0
POST 2	N	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8
	SD	.744	.535	.916	.756	.835	.756	.756	.744	.756	.707	1.195	.744	1.488	.886	1.282
	Mean	4.38	4.00	4.38	4.50	4.13	4.50	4.50	4.38	4.50	3.75	4.00	4.38	3.75	4.25	3.75
	Median	4.5	4.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	4.5	5.0	4.0	4.5	4.5	4.0	4.5	4.0
PRE 3	N	10	10	9	10	9	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10
	SD	1.229	.994	.726	.994	.833	1.317	1.054	.919	1.398	1.197	1.287	1.229	1.491	1.229	1.101
	Mean	4.20	4.10	4.44	4.10	4.22	4.20	4.00	4.20	3.80	3.90	3.90	3.80	4.00	4.20	3.90
	Median	4.5	4.0	5.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	4.0	4.5	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	4.5	4.0
POST 3	N	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7
	SD	.816	.690	1.113	.900	.951	.951	1.113	.951	.951	1.528	1.464	1.397	1.134	1.380	1.254
	Mean	4.00	3.86	3.71	4.14	3.71	4.29	3.71	4.29	3.71	3.00	3.86	3.43	4.43	3.71	3.71
	Median	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	4.0	5.0	4.0	3.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	4.0	4.0

3.3.1 Vocabulary

The data from the questionnaires revealed that the LGRV 1 mean ratings for vocabulary knowledge were relatively high for both pre- and post-task (all above 3.92) but slightly declined for the LGRV 2 (lowest 3.55). The students saw an improvement in their vocabulary skills after finishing the first two videos since the mean scores for almost all the statements rose slightly after both tasks. The pre-task mean scores were high for LGRV 3 (above 4.00) for all the statements but declined post-task, especially in the participants' perceived ability to understand the new vocabulary when hearing it in an unfamiliar text (Q3 mean=3.71) and using it when speaking for a longer period of time (Q5 mean=3.71). This indicates that some students consider having a conversation, which requires both receptive and productive skills, difficult.

Before creating the LGRV 1, the participants were most divided on whether they could correctly use the new vocabulary when speaking for a longer period of time or in a conversation (Q5 SD=1.030). After creating the LGRV 1, they were the most divided on whether they could use it when saying single sentences (Q4 SD=1.061). Therefore, some students found the productive skills more difficult than the receptive ones. After creating the LGRV 2, the standard deviation (SD) scores for all the vocabulary statements declined, showing there was less division on the participants' perceived vocabulary skills. A similar trend occurred after filming the LGRV 3. The post-task SD scores dropped for all the vocabulary-related statements, except for the ability to spot and correct misspelled words (Q2) and using the new vocabulary when speaking for a longer period of time or in a conversation (Q5). The post-LGRV 3 questionnaire data does not explain whether the lower post-task SD scores resulted from the process of creating the revision video or from a more homogenous group of respondents (the weaker students). Overall, the participants were divided on both their perceived receptive and productive vocabulary skills depending on the

topic. While the productive skills could be more difficult for the weaker students, the divided perception of receptive skills could be due to the fact that reading and listening exercises are the smallest part of the course. Based on the data from the questionnaires, the following questions were raised, and used to devise the interview questions:

- How did creating the LGRVs affect the participants' perceived understanding and use of the new vocabulary for receptive and productive skills? (Interview questions 4 and 5)
- What changes did the participants notice in their vocabulary before and after creating the videos? (Interview questions 2 and 6)
- Which topics had the easiest and the most difficult vocabulary, and how did it affect the perceived vocabulary knowledge? (Interview question 3)

The interviews show that the participants generally consider creating the LGRVs beneficial for vocabulary acquisition. Both receptive and productive skills were highlighted during the interviews. Two students claimed they started recognising the new vocabulary after creating the LGRVs ("I notice the new vocabulary more outside the lessons now and pay more attention to it"; "I just watched an environmental documentary after making the video and it was much easier to understand"). Another explained that hearing her friends and herself speak during the video production helped her understand the new words and improved her general receptive skills ("I could hear others and myself speak when making the videos, and I felt I could understand them better. Even now when we have a listening exercise during a test, I can understand the text better thanks to these videos. Even when I hear mistakes, I think about them and can understand better"). Five participants claimed that creating the LGRVs improved their productive skills. Four of them believe the process of creating the LGRVs raised their confidence and reduced their fear of using the new vocabulary when speaking ("The words come to me more easily and I'm not afraid to use them. I would not be afraid to use them in a new situation now"; "I feel more confident at using

these new words now. I know what the word means exactly, and I can use it better”; “I’m more confident at the correct use of the new words”; “I feel more comfortable”). One interviewee admitted that the requirement to use the new vocabulary in the LGRVs meant they had to rely more on memorising the script and less on natural communication. While it may have affected the fluency, the participants also acknowledge the value of memorising the script on vocabulary acquisition (“The fact that we had to use the new vocabulary in our videos meant that we had to memorise the script more, but it also helped us to memorise the new vocabulary better. I would say that it’s positive that we had to use the new words in the videos. At least in my opinion”). The creation process of the LGRVs also helped the students to understand the meaning and background of the new vocabulary, allowing them to use it in context (“I can use the new words in context now”; “The words now have a background. They’re not just words, instead you know about them and can talk about them. You create connections and can even use them in different contexts”; “We had the new words on a worksheet before. I can connect them with their meaning there, I can understand them, and maybe at that moment I think, “Oh yes, that makes sense!” But in order for my brain to register that these words belong to this topic, that only occurred to me when creating the videos. And that I can use them in real life, too. Making the video consolidated these phrases”). Therefore, the participants believe creating the LGRVs had a positive effect on their ability to notice the new vocabulary outside the classroom. It also allowed them to use the new words in context, thus raising their confidence in being able to use them correctly.

The participants also mention drawbacks of creating the LGRVs on vocabulary acquisition. While two participants struggled with the vocabulary due to the difficulty of the new words from certain topics or the general lack of English skills (“There were lots of difficult words to remember for the environment topic”; “My partner couldn’t speak English, so he needed to read from the

script”), two students were already too familiar with the covered vocabulary before they started filming (“For us, speaking about travelling was easier. We already knew the topic more or less”; “My vocabulary use generally hasn’t changed much”). Although the interviewees generally believed creating the LGRVs provided context for the new words, some also highlighted problems they faced. Two of them admitted that the requirement to use the new vocabulary in their LGRVs hindered their ability to use it in context (“The new vocabulary was so tightly compressed into the video in order to use as many new words as possible in a short time. That’s what made using the new words in context more difficult”; “For me, using the new words in context became increasingly difficult. At first we had a long script. It took us relatively little time to go through it, although the filming took us longer. In the end, we had a shorter script, but going through it took us longer because learning the text by heart took us much longer”). The third student stated that understanding single words was easier than using them in sentences. The latter highlights the issue that knowing the word meaning does not guarantee the ability to use it in context in a communicative situation. Therefore, the requirement to use the new vocabulary in the LGRVs may both aid and hinder the vocabulary acquisition. Finally, the level of vocabulary covered in the lessons and the students’ previous vocabulary knowledge affect how useful they find creating the LGRVs in terms of vocabulary acquisition. Despite the drawbacks, the participants still agreed that creating the LGRVs increased their vocabulary knowledge. For example: “We had to re-film the videos several times, so we eventually remembered the new vocabulary”; “I believe I can remember and use the new vocabulary better now”; “My vocabulary is definitely better after making the videos [other interviewees nod with agreement]”. One stated that although she could not remember the facts, she remembered the new vocabulary. It can be concluded that the participants perceived creating the LGRVs beneficial for their vocabulary acquisition.

3.3.2 Fluency

According to the data from the questionnaires, the mean ratings for the perceived fluency skills remained above average both pre- and post-task for all three tasks (LGRV 1 lowest 3.67; LGRV 2 lowest 3.82; LGRV 3 lowest 3.71). Pre- and post-LGRV 1, the participants unsurprisingly rated their fluency in the easier productive skills, such as speaking about the topic in English (Q7 pre-task mean=4.17) and saying single sentences (Q6 post-task mean=4.50), the highest. Both allow memorising the text, whereas having a conversation does not. More difficult skills, like discussing various viewpoints in English regarding the topic, remained lower both pre-task (Q9 mean=3.67) and post-task (Q9 mean=4.13). Although the ability to discuss various viewpoints in English was also rated the lowest before filming the LGRV 2 (Q9 mean=3.82), it became one of the highest rated statements post-LGRV 2 (Q9 mean=4.50) along with the perceived ability to say single sentences about the topic (Q6 mean=4.50) and the ability to talk about the topic in English (Q7 mean=4.50). This means that the process of filming the LGRV 2 positively affected the participants' skill to discuss various viewpoints about the environment. Overall, the participants saw minor improvement in their fluency skills after filming the first two revision videos. After the LGRV 3, they rated their skills of saying single sentences and having a conversation about the covered topic as having slightly improved. Nonetheless, they believed their skill to talk about the studied topic and discuss various viewpoints decreased after filming the revision video. Similarly to the topic of travelling (LGRV 1), practicing for job interviews (LGRV 3) does not easily support discussing various viewpoints.

Before creating the LGRV 1, the participants were the most divided on their ability to easily talk about the topic in English (Q7 SD=1.030) and to have a conversation about the topic in English (Q8 SD=1.084). The SD for the ability to have a conversation about the topic in English remained

the highest after finishing the LGRV 1 (Q8 SD=1.035). This means, some participants found the higher productive skills significantly more difficult than others. The SD scores exceeding 1.000 for all the fluency statements pre-LGRV 2 confirm that fluency posed problems for some students before filming the second revision video. The declined SD scores (below 1.000) for all the fluency statements post-LGRV 2 indicate that more students were confident about their fluency skills after filming the second revision video. Since the SD scores rise again according to the pre-LGRV 3 questionnaires, it can be concluded that rather than perceiving generally improved fluency skills, the respondents believed their fluency skills increased only regarding the topic of the environment. Based on the data from the questionnaires, the following questions were raised and used to devise the interview questions:

- Were there any topics that the participants struggled to speak about? If so, why? (Interview question 7)
- Were there some topics that were easier to do the task for? Why? (Interview question 3)
- How did doing the tasks affect the perception of the participants' fluency skills? (Interview question 9)
- What was the preparation process for the LGRVs like? Did the participants rely on notes, memorising the text or natural conversation? Did the process change over time? (Interview question 8)

During the interviews the participants pinpointed both positive and negative effects of the LGRVs on their fluency skills. Fear or the lack of it was one of the major contributors to better perceived fluency skills. Although one student claimed that her fluency skills improved due to being nervous when creating the LGRVs ("I start speaking English well when I'm nervous. I don't know why. I was nervous to talk to the audience when filming the videos, and I spoke more fluently thanks to that. Good experience. I know I must speak well. That it's not funny. It's important that others understand what I'm trying to say. It is important for me"), others reported a similar effect

from reduced fear. Firstly, it was due to creating the LGRVs with friends (“I wasn’t nervous when I was making the videos in English. I know they are my friends, they will help me, I don’t feel ashamed”; “There were no other people around you. Just the camera”; “And I think I had great problems with my accent, and I was afraid to speak. I tried to reduce my accent when making the videos with my friends”). One student admitted that knowing they could re-film the video was encouraging. Also, creating the LGRVs put the learners in a position in which they had no option but to speak. In turn, two of them discovered they could speak despite the fear (“I speak very little in the lessons because everyone else speak. But when we were doing the videos, I simply had to speak”; “In the 8th grade I spoke very little in the English lessons. I had the grammar, but I couldn’t speak. When we started having the oral communication lessons, I realised that I can, but I’m afraid. And after making the videos I started speaking more. I realised that I can”). Therefore, fear, but mainly the reduction of fear to speak in English during the creation of the LGRVs, positively influenced the participants’ perceived fluency skills.

The interviewees also claimed that creating the LGRVs affected their fluency skills differently depending on the topic. Overall, the first and the third topic (travelling, and the future and career) were considered easier to talk about (“The third video was very easy for me because we would talk about ourselves, and that was easy”; “The first video was also easy because we would just talk about where we wanted to go”). On the other hand, the second topic (the environment) was generally reported to be more demanding, thus affecting the perceived fluency skills (“The environment topic is a wide topic, and it is difficult to talk about it”; “It was difficult to talk about the environment because it was more scientific and contained more numbers. I think I still would be unable to speak about this topic fluently. Yes, I know the vocabulary, and I know what I would like to talk about, but I think I would have difficulties...because this topic has a lot

of numbers, a lot of facts”; “With the travelling topic you could simply talk about liking travelling to Italy. But with the environment topic you have to speak about agriculture. Then you need to know more specific information”; “At least for us, we spoke based on the script, not naturally. We didn’t naturally produce sentences but had to know facts, and that was difficult”). Therefore, the participants’ perceived fluency skills were higher after filming the LGRVs on topics that focused more on themselves than on knowing facts.

About half of the participants admitted they either read from the script or memorised the text for the videos rather than communicating naturally. Inevitably, it affected their perceived effectiveness of the LGRVs on fluency. For example: “We met before the deadline, wrote the script in full sentences, turned the camera on, and read the text out loud. I then edited it, and sent it to you”; “It was difficult for us to talk about the topics, we simply read the script out loud in the video”; “Me and my partner wrote the script in full sentences and learned it by heart. But I always memorised it so-so”; “It was easier to learn a little bit at a time, then film it. We divided the video into about three sections and then combined them into one video. About half the time we used the memorised text, and about half the time we improvised, though I think we used the memorised text more”. Six of the participants admitted to writing a script but relying less on memorising it, although two of them had previously confessed to memorising the whole script for the majority of the time (“We wrote a script with full sentences, exactly as we were planning to speak about the topic. During the filming, we spoke more freely”; “We made the topic clear enough for ourselves so that we could talk about it with the sentences we had written down. And when we forgot something, we found a different way of saying it”; “During the last video, we were able to communicate more freely because it was late, we were tired and we just wanted to get it done. So we found easier ways to do it. We wrote a script at first, but we never put it into use. Some

sentences immediately start to seem strange if you do it in real life. But we often changed the script while filming the videos”; “We wrote the script using full sentences, read it several times, and afterwards spoke using our own words. When something went wrong, we re-filmed the video. We didn’t learn it by heart. After practising it several times we just remembered it [S9, S10 and S12 agree]”).

Two students admitted that while they used a script at the beginning of the course, they changed their preparation process for the last two videos, and relied more on natural communication (“We understood the topics, we just thought about how to speak about it using our own words. During the first video we just read the text out loud. Afterwards, we realised that it would affect our grade and decided not to read. To do it ourselves”; “We learned the script by heart for the first video, and it was very time-consuming. But it is not real, and from the second video onwards we spoke using our own words”). Two participants simply believed natural communication during the LGRVs was more beneficial and easier (“It was easier to speak using our own words. You didn’t have to learn the text by heart”; “We have to show our own ability to speak [stresses the word *speak*] as well as we can”).

Surprisingly, the stronger students relied more on memorising the script than the weaker ones. One of the reasons was the requirement to use the new vocabulary in the videos (“We had to use these new words and phrases, so we had to learn the script by heart and couldn’t speak freely. It could have just been our problem, though”; “We had the worksheet about the current topic open and we wrote the script. Especially with the travelling topic because it contained a lot of adjectives and verbs. So we just pressed them all in the script. That helped. Otherwise, we wouldn’t have been able to make such good videos”). Two of the participants claimed they relied more on memorising the text to avoid leaving out important information (“We did consider communicating

more freely, but we remained in our comfort zone. We wrote the text, memorised it and filmed the video because it was the most effective and the fastest approach. To make sure we didn't skip anything, so that there was no confusion whose turn it was to speak. It was all planned"; "We were afraid that we would skip something, like an important topic or word. That forced us to follow the script more. And since we were required to use the new vocabulary, we had to follow the script"). It appears that striving for high-quality videos came at the expense of advancing the stronger students' fluency skills.

Those who relied less on memorising the script and more on general notes largely reported that creating the LGRVs had a positive influence on their fluency skills. For example: "My fluency is definitely better after making the videos"; "Of course I spoke more fluently after making the videos since I knew the topic, new vocabulary, and could use them better than before"; "I can speak better after making the videos since I know the new words now, I used them in the videos, and I can remember them better in a conversation". Those who relied more on memorising the script or reading, however, remained sceptical whether creating the LGRVs increased their fluency skills ("I would say my fluency has not changed by making the videos"; "I wouldn't say I can speak fluently about a topic if I memorise these two sentences, film a clip, and then forget the sentences, take the next two sentences, memorise them and film another clip"; "I think that straight after filming the videos I could have talked about the environment topic fluently, but if I had to speak about it now, I wouldn't know anything. I think I could remember some things, but...I don't remember the facts, but I do remember the vocabulary. At the time it was more about memorising facts to say the sentences we had written down"). Therefore, the preparation process for creating the LGRVs greatly influenced how much the participants practiced their fluency during the

filming, and consequently, whether they perceived any positive effect on their fluency by creating the LGRVs.

Two interviewees also believed their fluency skills improved from task to task (“Speaking in front of the camera became easier in time. We could automatically think and improvise on the spot. When I couldn’t remember something, I restructured what I wanted to say”; “The first time we filmed the video, we couldn’t stop laughing, so we couldn’t speak properly. But during the third video we could speak in English properly”). On the other hand, one student saw no change in her fluency skills because she considered herself to be already fluent on the topics before they were covered in the lessons (“I had no problems with fluency. I could already talk about these topics fluently before making the videos”). Another student confessed that his partner’s lack of English prevented him from having a fluent conversation during the video creation but found a way around it by providing his partner with a script with multiple answer choices (“I had written a text for my partner and the answers he could use. Every time I asked something or spoke, he could choose from a selection of answers to reply. At first, I wrote a script for him so he could read exactly as it was written there, but later I changed it so he could choose his answers”). Therefore, the level of English required from the students to produce the LGRVs, practice and repetition, and pairing students with similar language skills for the task are all significant factors in determining the extent to which the students perceive positive changes in their fluency skills after filming.

3.3.3 Usefulness

Overall, the mean and median scores from the questionnaires clearly show a downward trend for the tasks’ perceived usefulness over time. Before the LGRV 1, the mean ratings for

usefulness were generally high (all above the 4.00 score). After filming, however, almost all the mean ratings dropped slightly. The mean rating for Q13 decreased by a whole point (from 4.75 to 3.75) indicating that after finishing the first revision video, the participants were less confident that doing the task as pair work helped them understand things they did not understand before. The participants scored usefulness similarly in the pre-LGRV 2 questionnaire as they had in the post-LGRV 1 questionnaire, indicating that they started the second video with similar expectations to the task's usefulness as they had had when they finished the LGRV 1. The post-filming LGRV 2 mean scores, however, show slight improvement in the participants' perception of the task's usefulness. Despite this, the post-LGRV 3 mean ratings again demonstrate a generally downward trend compared to the pre-task ratings, and most of the post-LGRV 3 usefulness ratings remain below 4.00. The only mean score remaining above 4.00 in both questionnaires was for Q13, indicating that the participants believed creating the revision video as pair work helped them understand things they had not understood before. One of the sharpest rating drops from LGRV 1 to LGRV 3 was for Q10 ("doing the task is interesting"). This is understandable since the students had already done a similar task twice before and were likely getting bored with the format. The downward trend of the scores suggests that creating the revision videos did not match the participants' expectations for its usefulness, although it must be noted that none of the usefulness mean ratings ever fell below the average of 3.00.

The high SD scores also highlight a wide division among the participants on whether creating the revision videos was useful. It must be emphasised, however, that there was one participant whose ratings for usefulness dropped drastically (scoring 1s) after he got a negative mark for the LGRV 1. His bias undoubtedly affected the data, especially the SD scores, as he was one of the very few scoring usefulness so low. When examining the median of the usefulness

statements, the score generally remains 4.00 or above. The only median score dropping below 4.00 post-LGRV 3 is for Q10 (“doing the task is interesting”). This shows that the majority of the participants still perceived creating the revision videos useful. Based on the data from the questionnaires, the following questions were raised and used to devise the interview questions:

- What things did creating the videos help the students to understand they had not understood before? (Interview question 10)
- What did the participants find useful/ not useful about the task? (Interview questions 1 and 11)
- How the participants’ view of the task's usefulness change over time, and what caused it? (Interview questions 1 and 12)
- How useful did the participants find creating the revision questions? (Interview question 13)
- How often and in what situations should this type of a revision technique be used in ESL classes in the participants’ opinion? (Interview question 14)

The interviews revealed that despite the downward trend of the perceived usefulness of creating the revision videos, the participants believed the process was still useful (“I liked everything we did”; “Making the video was very fun. I liked that we could make jokes in the video”; “There was nothing useless about making the videos”). The students mentioned both linguistic and non-linguistic aspects when discussing the usefulness of creating the LGRVs. The non-linguistic aspects included the novelty of the tasks, gaining new knowledge about technology and the studied topics, taking an active role in learning, and improving time management skills. Firstly, the interviewees appreciated how different the video-making was from their usual lesson activities (“And it was something different. We have never had to create videos like these in any other lesson”; “I became more enthusiastic about the task over time. Usually it is just doing worksheets, but in the oral communication classes we make videos. I like the process of making

them and the fact that the task was so different”). One student also enjoyed the practicality of the video-creation (“I liked that we had a practical task that helped us revise instead of simply learning the material and then never returning to it again. At first, I wondered what the point of the task was because we had never done anything like this before”). Therefore, the participants considered the creation of LGRVs to be useful because it gave them a practical approach to language learning and offered a break from a more traditional learning approach.

Since the students had to create and edit videos, they had to become familiar with different programs. They were neither directed to a particular program nor taught how to use one prior to creating the videos. Rather than viewing it as an obstacle, three of the participants listed researching the programs in their own time and testing them as one of the most useful aspects of the LGRVs (“I liked that we could use different programs for creating the videos. I used programs I had had no previous experience with because I have never edited videos before”; “Using the technology, how to upload the videos into the computer, the technical side of making the videos”; “Getting to know the different programs, for example”). The students also considered the more in-depth knowledge they gained from creating the videos to be useful (“I know more about climate change and the environment now, and how travelling affects the environment. I can make connections better”; “I knew something [stresses the word *something*] before making the videos, but I have learned more and can make connections better after making the videos. More or less as before, but more facts”). One pair also independently sought out further information on the topics throughout the video-creation process (“When neither of us understood it, we googled it”). One student enjoyed taking an active role in her studies, rather than just being a recipient of a more teacher-centred approach (“I liked that I could devise my own texts and speak more about the topics. In regular lessons we learn the topic, maybe do a test and move on to another topic”).

Therefore, creating the LGRVs was considered useful because it led the students to independently seek out new information, be an active part of the studying process, and learn other useful skills aside from linguistic ones.

The time spent on creating the LGRVs affected the participants' view of its usefulness both in a positive and negative way. On the one hand, they considered the process of creating the videos to be overly time-consuming ("It took so much time. That you had to do it during your free time. It was difficult to find the time because it had to be on the weekend. And who likes doing homework on the weekend?! Or it had to be right after school, which was the time for other things. That sucked a bit"; "When we didn't find the time to do the video together. Sometimes we had to film it separately"; "Maybe the long process... On the other hand, knowing technology is a good thing. But it was a long process"). In hindsight, however, they still appreciated the advanced time management skills creating the LGRVs gave them ("Time management was also useful. That you know when and how you do things"; "We understood later on how long it approximately takes us to create the videos. And we also realised that we don't need to be together to film the videos. That we can each film the clips at our own places, and then combine the clips later on"). Therefore, the time-consuming process of creating the revision videos made the participants look for ways they could save time and work more efficiently.

Seven participants also considered creating the LGRVs linguistically beneficial. They believed it helped them sum up the topics and advanced their vocabulary skills ("It summed up the covered material well"; "It helped to revise the vocabulary"; "It helped to remember the new vocabulary of the topic"; "I found out new words I didn't know before"; "Doing the videos became more useful over time. Especially regarding practising the new vocabulary"). One student even mentioned that it helped her with the spelling, although spelling was not the focus of the videos

(“It helped to revise how to write some of the words”). Two students believed creating the revision videos was also useful for grammar revision (“I became better at grammar when we wrote the scripts”; “For me it was also the grammar that improved when I wrote the scripts”). It appears that the unexpected positive effect of writing the scripts included better perceived spelling and grammar skills. In addition, both those who relied and did not rely on using scripts also considered creating the LGRVs useful for vocabulary acquisition.

While most of the interviewees perceived generating the LGRVs useful for vocabulary acquisition, spelling and grammar learning, some were sceptical whether it was useful for fluency advancement. While script-writing was considered beneficial for spelling and grammar revision, it negatively affected the perceived usefulness of LGRV-generation on fluency. As previously discussed, at least two pairs of stronger students believed creating the LGRVs was not useful for advancing fluency due to not being able to communicate naturally. One of them also criticised the effect of using a script and guiding questions on vocabulary acquisition (“It is quite useless when you just put all the new vocabulary we have covered on top of each other. I will only remember, like, two words. Maybe it would have been better if we had been able to pick the most important points for each topic ourselves”). Nonetheless, the weaker students who relied less on prepared scripts, perceived creating the LGRVs useful for progressing general language skills, including fluency (“It helped me practice my language skills, and as a result, they improved”). It has to be mentioned, however, that the weaker students’ videos were generally shorter, and included fewer new words and more mistakes than those of the stronger students. This could indicate either that the weaker students did not challenge themselves enough or that their zone of proximal development was simply lower to begin with, thus making it more difficult for them to reach the

same level as the stronger students without additional support. Even so, the students remained divided on whether they perceived the LGRV-generation useful for promoting fluency.

Finally, the participants listed reduced fear and being able to collaborate as some of the useful elements of LGRV-generation. The weaker students believed creating the revision videos was useful because it helped them overcome the fear of communicating. For example: “I’m not so afraid to talk to other people now”. The stronger students agreed that collaborating with their peers was useful and enjoyable (“The collaboration was useful”; “I liked that we could do group work”). Doing the videos in pairs or groups allowed the participants to gain better understanding of the target language as well as get support (“And you got to discuss things with your partner. When you didn’t understand something, she could help or correct you. So you eventually understood the topic better. When I didn’t understand a phrase, I could ask my partner”; “The collaboration with your partner. When one of us messed up, we tried again and helped each other so both of us could equally understand the material”). Therefore, the weaker students perceived the LGRV-generation useful due to reduced fear of communicating in English, while the stronger students considered it useful due to the possibility to learn from their peers.

Aside from fluency, the disadvantages of creating the LGRVs were as follows: having lots of information to memorise, being already familiar with the topics, and showing the videos to classmates. At least one pair disliked the amount of information they had to remember due to memorising the script (“Maybe remembering the text, too. You had to film several times to get the text as expected”), while surprisingly only one was concerned about the videos being shown in class (“I didn’t like the idea of filming because I don’t even like being in pictures or looking at pictures of myself”). Some of the students disliking the idea of their video being shown to their classmates, however, were not part of the study and could not voice their views during the

interviews. Participants who were already familiar with the topics and the vocabulary considered the video-creation less useful (“I knew and had researched many of the topics we covered. For example, I have researched a lot about the climate and job interviews in English, so there was little new for me. I already knew the new words we studied when we covered the climate topic”; “Everything was clear to me before we started filming the videos. After filming it, I only knew a few extra details”). Furthermore, about half of the participants confessed that their perception of the task’s usefulness declined over time, or they approached it with increasingly negative emotions. For example: “We didn’t start filming with positive emotions by the end”; [As a reply to the question how the task changed over time] “I would say downhill. The task became a bit repetitive. At first, it was interesting, that it was kind of a new thing. But in the end it was already like, “Ah, we have to get together and do it.” You began to concentrate more on why the task doesn’t help you. Obviously, when you start something new, it’s interesting at the beginning, but will become an obligation in the end”). Therefore, finding alternatives to students who do not wish to show their video in class, not overusing the technique and making sure the covered material is of suitable difficulty would help to raise the students’ perceived usefulness of creating the LGRVs.

The participants were also divided on whether creating the revision questions for their peers was useful. On the one hand, they believed the questions were useful for revision purposes for their classmates, and for revising the new vocabulary (“It was useful in my opinion, since I had to think more about what my classmates would get from our dialogue. It helped with using the vocabulary because I knew the vocabulary but hadn’t had many opportunities to use it. I knew what the most important parts of our text were and what should be the focus”; “I think it was useful because this way my classmates could learn more about this topic. Usually I cannot use the new vocabulary anywhere but here I could”). One also believed they were useful for using imagination,

and another believed they helped to check the quality of the produced video (“It helped to understand whether you have done the video correctly, and whether the answers to your questions can actually be found in the video”). On the other hand, five participants did not find creating them useful because creating the video itself had provided them enough opportunities to revise the topic and the new material (“I had already understood the topic while making the video. So I just picked a sentence from the script and rephrased it as a question. Equally, I saw no point in answering them, because although it made me listen to other people’s videos...I listen to them anyway. Perhaps it makes some people listen to the videos more, but I saw no point in the questions [S4, S5 and S6 agree by nodding]”; “I personally didn’t notice that making the revision questions helped me find the important information from our text”). One interviewee simply disliked creating the questions because forgetting to add them affected their mark (“I didn’t like that we had to create the five revision questions because sometimes we forgot them, and then it affected our mark”). Therefore, those participants who thought about how the revision questions would help their peers rather themselves were more favourable about their usefulness.

The students also disagreed on how often the LGRVs should be used in the EFL lessons. Three participants believed they should be created once a period to revise the covered topics. For example: “I think it’s good that we create revision videos in the English lessons. We should do them every period, not after each topic. Then we could create connections between several topics, and study independently even more”. Two interviewees disagreed, and proposed creating them less often since they required a lot of work (“Definitely not every period because it is a big project and requires a lot of time”; “It depends on the topic. I’m not even sure whether it’s better to use them for easier or more difficult topics. Because when used for easier topics, it would help to improve your fluency. But when used for difficult topics, it would make the topic clearer. But I

would say, maybe twice a year”). Despite the suggestion to create the LGRVs less often, none of the participants proposed not doing them at all. In conclusion, the interviewees believed creating the LGRVs to be generally useful.

Considering the results of the study, using the LGRVs with teenagers in EFL oral communication classes is more successful when the covered material is of a suitable difficulty, and the learners are motivated. It is also important that the technique is not overused to avoid the decline in novelty. The learners must understand the negative effects of script reading and memorisation. Although using the LGRVs is a suitable technique for teenagers of varying English levels, it must be acknowledged that younger learners may be unable to rationalise that they are learning for themselves. Consequently, they might be inclined to use methods, such as reading and script memorisation, that give them better short-term results but will not benefit them long-term. This could be resolved by having a discussion with the students on the matter prior to using the technique. Discussions could also help to avoid other possible pitfalls of the technique. For example, these could be used to raise the perceived usefulness of SGQ. Before starting the LGRVs, the learners should be more informed of their purpose, and a discussion on how to form meaningful questions should be held. Finally, assessing the finished videos together with the learners would give them an indication of how they could improve their preparation for the filming, the content and their linguistic skills.

4. Conclusion

The perceived effect of creating the LGRVs on vocabulary acquisition was generally positive. An increase in the receptive and productive vocabulary skills was reported by both the stronger and the weaker students, and most were confident that creating the LGRVs advanced their vocabulary knowledge. These findings correlate with the studies by van Zeeland and Schmitt (2013), Teng (2018) and Wilson et al (2016) highlighting the importance of vocabulary exposure frequency on vocabulary retention, and with the study by Vaca Torres and Gómez Rodríguez (2017) reporting a positive effect of project-based learning on lexical competence. Partnering with a student with low-level English skills, difficult or overly familiar vocabulary, and using the new vocabulary in context were listed as drawbacks for vocabulary acquisition through the LGRVs. The latter was pointed out by the high-achievers who relied more on memorising full scripts to ensure they covered as much of the new vocabulary and material as possible. Consequently, they perceived integrating the new vocabulary more challenging than students who concentrated on a more natural communication. Nonetheless, the findings suggest that creating the LGRVs contributes positively to the learners' perceived vocabulary acquisition. To increase the vocabulary acquisition through creating the LGRVs, the new vocabulary needs to be at the correct level, students with similar language skills should be paired together, and students should be directed to use bullet points rather than full scripts during the production.

The participants disagreed on whether creating the LGRVs influenced their fluency skills, reflecting the findings by Spring (2020) and Castillo et al (2018). The sceptical interviewees believed creating the LGRVs did not increase their fluency skills because the high-level vocabulary and fact knowledge of some topics made natural communication challenging. The questionnaires suggest that some participants found the higher productive skills more difficult than

others. These may have been the weaker students, although during the interviews they reported a greater increase in fluency skills than the stronger students. Again, this was due to the weaker students relying more on natural communication rather than scripts, thus rating the effectiveness of the LGRVs on their perceived fluency skills higher. On the other hand, reducing the fear of speaking and communicating in English due to creating the revision videos with friends and knowing that the video could be re-filmed were seen as positive influencers of fluency, therefore mirroring the conclusions by Vaca Torres and Gómez Rodríguez (2017). In conclusion, filming the LGRVs increased the perceived fluency skills among students who relied more on natural communication during the production. To improve the perceived fluency skills, students should be encouraged to abandon text memorisation. Also, difficult topics require more focus on content-knowledge and vocabulary practice beforehand to ensure students feel confident enough to speak about the topics fluently.

The perceived usefulness of creating the LGRVs declined with each video since the novelty subsided. Nonetheless, some remained positive about the usefulness even after the third video and believed creating them to have been fun. The perceived usefulness was higher among the weaker students, therefore contradicting the findings by Gehringer and Miller (2009) who noted more negative feelings towards LGAM/AVM creation from the students who considered the course to be challenging. Overall, the participants believed creating the videos was useful because it was novel, practical, and allowed them to take an active role in their learning-process. The participants also considered creating the revision videos useful because it allowed them to find out more about various editing programs and the covered topics, increased their vocabulary knowledge, helped to revise grammar and spelling, gave them better time-management skills, and reduced their fear of communicating in English, thus confirming the positive effects of LGAM/AVMs from previous

studies (Lee et al 2008; Lee, McLoughlin and Chan 2008; Mills et al 2018; Gaston and Havard 2019). The participants also enjoyed the collaborative approach of the task as it allowed them to easily ask for help, and thus construct knowledge through social interaction. The findings of this study, therefore, support Kirschner's (1999 cited in Wilson 2004) and Fallows and Chandramohan's (2001) research on the positive effects of collaborative learning, but contradict the findings of Mills et al (2018) that the students' conflicting ideas and uncertainty were mainly resolved by teacher-student exchanges, and less through student-student exchanges.

Students remained divided on whether creating the revision questions for their peers was useful, indicating a less optimistic outcome than the previous research suggests (Wilson 2004; Fukushima 2007; Yu and Su 2015; Johnson 2018; Kurtz et al 2019). Those participants who thought about how the revision questions would help their classmates rather than themselves were more favourable about the usefulness of the questions. It is, therefore, debatable whether using SGQ with younger students and in combination with the LGRVs is a useful technique.

In conclusion, all participants agreed that the LGRVs were useful and should be part of the EFL lessons, but disagreed on how often. This is a promising result indicating that shifting from a teacher-focused to a more student-centred approach is achievable with younger students as well as adults. Using the LGRVs with teenagers of different language levels is an appropriate technique for EFL oral communication classes provided that the covered material is of a suitable difficulty, the learners are motivated, and that the technique is not overused. Additionally, students should be aware of the possible pitfalls such as script reading and memorisation, and forming non-developmental SGQ. Discussing these issues with the students prior to starting the technique and assessing the finished videos together with the students would benefit the learners and make the LGRVs more effective.

References

- Akef, Kouroush and Shilan Nossratpour. 2010. The Impact of Keeping Oral Dialogue Journals on EFL Learners' Oral Fluency. *JELS*, 1:2, 127-142. Available at <https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/The-Impact-of-Keeping-Oral-Dialogue-Journals-on-EFL-Akef-Nossratpour/364435b64e26244240f53d0d10c65c02f5372d6c>, accessed September 3, 2020.
- Al-Garni, Shorouq Ali and Anas Hamed Almuhammadi. The Effect of Using Communicative Language Teaching Activities on EFL Students' Speaking Skills at the University of Jeddah. *English Language Teaching*, 12:6, 72-86. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v12n6p72>.
- Anderson, Lorin W., David R. Krathwohl, Peter W. Airasian, Kathleen A. Cruikshank, Richard E. Mayer, Paul R. Pintrich, James Rath and Merlin C. Wittrock (eds). 2001. *A Taxonomy for Learning, Teaching, And Assessing: A revision of Bloom's Taxonomy of educational objectives*. New York: Longman.
- Angelini, M. Laura and Amparo García-Carbonell. 2019. Developing English Speaking Skills through Simulation-Based Instruction. *Teaching English with Technology*, 19:2, 3-20. Available at <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1215381.pdf>, accessed December 27, 2020.
- Bataineh, Ruba Fahmi, Anwar Solaiman Migdadi and Muhammad Khalid Al-Alawneh. 2020. Does Web 2.0-Supported Project-Based Instruction Improve Jordanian EFL Learners' Speaking Performance? *Teaching English with Technology*, 20:3, 25-39. Available at <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1264229.pdf>, accessed December 27, 2020.

- Cadena Aguilar, Roso Freddy, Javier Hernando Ortega Cuellar and Albedro Cadena Aguilar. 2019. Daily 6: An Approach to Foster Oral Fluency of English as a Foreign Language in Adolescents. *Profile*, 21:2, 29-44. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15446/profile.v21n2.71364>.
- Castañeda, Martha and Eva Rodríguez González. 2011. L2 Speaking Self-ability: Perceptions through Multiple Video Speech Drafts. *Hispania*, 94:3, 483-501. DOI: 10.1353/hpn.2011.0066.
- Castillo, Rigoberto, Heidy Erika Silva-González and Leidy Sanabria-Chavarro. 2018. Task-Supported-Teaching to Promote EFL Oral Fluency. *GIST Education and Learning Research Journal*, 17, 106-127. Available at <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1200241.pdf>, accessed December 28, 2020.
- Council of Europe. N.d. *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, teaching, assessment*. Cambridge University Press. Available at <https://rm.coe.int/1680459f97>, accessed September 14, 2020.
- Diaz Larenas, Claudio. 2011. Exploring Knowledge of English Speaking Strategies in 8th and 12th Graders. *PROFILE*, 13:2, 85-98. Available at https://www.researchgate.net/publication/262448227_Exploring_Knowledge_of_English_Speaking_Strategies_in_8th_and_12th_Graders, accessed on August 27, 2020.
- Erten, Selcen. 2014. Teaching Fillers and Students' Filler Usage: A Study Conducted at ESOGU Preparation School. *International Journal of Teaching and Education*, 2:3, 67-79. Available at <https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Teaching-Fillers-and-Students%E2%80%99-Filler-Usage%3A-A-at-Erten/8701ba973978c67d4647e34d5c330891f2834383>, accessed December 28, 2020.

- Fallows, Stephen and Balasubramanyan Chandramohan. 2001. Multiple Approaches to Assessment: reactions on use of tutor, peer and self-assessment. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 6:2, 229-246. DOI: 10.1080/13562510120045212.
- Felder M., Richard and Rebecca Brent. 1996. Navigating the bumpy road to student-centered instruction. *College Teaching*, 44:2, 43-47. DOI: 10.1080/87567555.1996.9933425.
- Fukushima, Tatsuya. 2007. A student-designed grammar quiz on the web: a constructive mode of grammar instruction. *Educational Media International*, 43:1, 75-85. DOI: 10.1080/09523980500490901.
- Garrett, Peter and Terry Shortall. 2002. Learners' evaluations of teacher-fronted and student-centred classroom activities. *Language Teaching Research*, 6:1, 25-57. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1191/1362168802lr096oa>.
- Gaston, Joseph P. and Byron Havard. 2018. The Effects of Collaborative Video Production on Situational Interest of Elementary School Students. *TechTrends*, 63, 23-32. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11528-018-0363-9>.
- Gehring, Edward F. and Carolyn S. Miller. 2009. Student-generated active-learning exercises. *ACM SIGCSE Bulletin*, 41:1, 81-85. DOI: 10.1145/1539024.1508897.
- Göktürk, Nazlinur. 2016. Examining the Effectiveness of Digital Video Recordings on Oral Performance of EFL Learners. *Teaching English with Technology*, 16:2, 71-96. Available at <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1135917.pdf>, accessed September 1, 2020.
- Henrikson, Robin. 2019. Using Online Lectures to Promote Engagement: Recognising the Self-Directed Learner as Critical for Practical Inquiry. *Journal of Open, Flexible and Distance Learning*, 23:1, 17-32. Available at <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1221399.pdf>, accessed October 25, 2020.

- Iman, Jaya Nur. 2017. Debate Instruction in EFL Classroom: Impacts on the Critical Thinking and Speaking Skill. *International Journal of Instruction*, 10:4, 87-108. DOI: 8. <https://doi.org/10.12973/iji.2017.1046a>.
- Johnson, Christopher Nathanael. What Did We Learn Last Class? An Exploratory Study of Student-Generated Review Questions. *PASAA: Journal of Language Teaching and Learning in Thailand*, 56, 65-79. Available at <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1224426.pdf>, accessed October 10, 2020.
- Kilic, Mehmet. 2019. Vocabulary Knowledge as a Predictor of Performance in Writing and Speaking: A Case of Turkish EFL Learners. *PASAA: Journal of Language Teaching and Learning in Thailand*, 57, 133-164. Available at <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1224421.pdf>, accessed December 27, 2020.
- Kim, SoHee. 2014. Developing Autonomous Learning for Oral Proficiency Using Digital Storytelling. *Language Learning & Technology*, 18:2, 20-35. Available at https://scholarspace.manoa.hawaii.edu/bitstream/10125/44364/18_02_action1.pdf, accessed September 3, 2020.
- Kormos, Judit and Mariann Dénes. 2004. Exploring measures and perceptions of fluency in the speech of second language learners. *System*, 32:2, 145-164. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2004.01.001>.
- Kurtz, Josh B., Michael A. Lourie, Elizabeth E. Holman, Karri L. Grob and Seetha U. Monrad. 2019. Creating assessments as an active learning strategy: what are students' perceptions? A mixed methods study. *Medical Education Online*, 24:1, 1-10. DOI: 10.1080/10872981.2019.1630239.

- Lan, Yu-Ju. 2018. Technology enhanced learner ownership and learner autonomy through creation. *Education Tech Research Development*, 66, 859-862. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11423-017-9566-6>.
- Lee, Eunbae and Michael J. Hannafin. 2016. A design framework for enhancing engagement in student-centered learning: own it, learn it, and share it. *Education Tech Research Development*, 64, 707-734. DOI: 10.1007/s11423-015-9422-5.
- Lee, Lina. 2014. Digital News Stories: Building Language Learners' Content Knowledge and Speaking Skills. *Foreign Language Annals*, 47:2, 338-356. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1111/flan.12084>.
- Lee, Mark J.W., Catherine McLoughlin and Anthony Chan. 2008. Talk the talk: Learner-generated podcasts as catalysts for knowledge creation. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 39:3, 501–521. DOI: 10.1111/j.1467-8535.2007.00746.x.
- Li, Hui and Yuhui Liu. 2011. A Brief Study of Reticence in ESL Class. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 1:8, 961-965. DOI: 10.4304/tpls.1.8.961-965.
- Liu, Ming-Chi, Yueh-Min Huang and Yo-Hsin Xu. 2018. Effects of individual versus group work on learner autonomy and emotion in digital storytelling. *Education Tech Research Development*, 66, 1009-1028. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11423-018-9601-2>.
- Liu, Ngar-Fun and William Littlewood. 1997. Why do many students appear reluctant to participate in classroom learning discourse? *System*, 25:3, 371-384. DOI: [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0346-251X\(97\)00029-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0346-251X(97)00029-8).
- McDonough, Kim and Masatoshi Sato. 2019. Promoting EFL Students' Accuracy and Fluency through Interactive Practice Activities. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, 9:2, 379-395. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.14746/ssllt.2019.9.2.6>.

- McGinn, Kelly, Karin E. Lange and Julie Booth. 2015. A Worked Example for Creating Worked Examples. *Mathematics Teaching in the Middle School*, 27:1, 27-33. DOI: 10.5951/mathteacmiddscho.21.1.0026.
- Mills, Reece, Louisa Tomas and Brian Lewthwaite. 2018. The Impact of Student-Constructed Animation on Middle School Students' Learning about Plate Tectonics. *Journal of Science Education and Technology*, 28, 165–177. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10956-018-9755-z>.
- National curriculum for basic schools. 2014. Available at https://www.hm.ee/sites/default/files/est_basic_school_nat_cur_2014_general_part_1.pdf accessed December 12, 2020.
- Natividad, Mary Rose A. and Boyet L. Batang. 2018. Students' Perceptual Learning Styles and Attitudes toward Communicative Language Teaching. *TESOL International Journal*, 13:4, 104-120. Available at <https://eric.ed.gov/?q=communicative+language+teaching&pr=on&ft=on&id=EJ1244108>, accessed September 1, 2020.
- Pharo, Emma and Kristy De Salas. 2009. Implementing Student Peer Review: Opportunity versus Change Management. *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, 33:2, 199-207. DOI: 10.1080/03098260802276748.
- Rasmussen, Clay L. and Penée W. Stewart. 2018. Metacognitive prompts within an online course. *JISTE*, 22:1, 19-29. Available at <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1237532.pdf>, accessed October 25, 2020.

- Retnowati, Endah, Paul Ayres and John Sweller. 2017. Can Collaborative Learning Improve the Effectiveness of Worked Examples in Learning Mathematics? *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 109:5, 666-679. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1037/edu0000167>.
- Ryan, Richard M. and Edward L. Deci. 2006. Self-Regulation and the Problem of Human Autonomy: Does Psychology Need Choice, Self-Determination, and Will? *Journal of Personality*, 74:6, 1557-1585. DOI: 10.1111/j.1467-6494.2006.00420.x.
- Safari, Mahshad and Mansour Koosha. 2016. Instructional Efficacy of Portfolio for Assessing Iranian EFL Learners' Speaking Ability. *English Language Teaching*, 9:3, 102-116. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/elt.v9n3p102>.
- Saks, Katrin, Äli Leijen and Karin Täht. 2016. Inglise keele kui võõrkeele õppijate õpistrateegiad ja nende mõju õpitulemustele. *Eesti Haridusteaduste Ajakiri*, 4:1, 279-308. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.12697/eha.2016.4.1.10>.
- Savaşçı, Merve. 2014. Why are some students reluctant to use L2 in EFL speaking classes? An action research at tertiary level. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 116, 2682-2686. DOI: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.01.635.
- Shadiev, Rustam, Wu-Yuin Hwang and Tzu-Yu Liu. 2018. Investigating the effectiveness of a learning activity supported by a mobile multimedia learning system. *Education Tech Research Development*, 66, 893-912. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11423-018-9590-1>.
- Song, Donggil, Eun Young Oh and Krista Glazewski. 2017. Student-generated questioning activity in second language courses using a customized personal response: a case study. *Education Tech Research Development*, 65, 1425–1449. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11423-017-9520-7>.

- Spring, Ryan. 2020. Can Video-creation Project Work Affect Students' Oral Proficiency? An Analysis of Fluency, Complexity and Accuracy. *TESL-EJ*, 24:2, 1-17. Available at <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1268697.pdf>, accessed December 28, 2020.
- Tang, Zhongqing. 2020. A Review on Studies into Incidental Vocabulary Acquisition through Different Input. *English Language Teaching*, 13:6, 89-95. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v13n6p89>.
- Teng, Feng. 2018. Incidental vocabulary acquisition from reading-only and reading-while-listening: a multi-dimensional approach. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, 12:3, 274-288. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/17501229.2016.1203328>.
- Teng, Feng and Barry Lee Reynolds. 2019. Effects of individual and group metacognitive prompts on EFL reading comprehension and incidental vocabulary learning. *PLoS ONE*, 14:5, 1-24. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0215902>.
- Thai, Chau and Frank Boers. 2016. Repeating a Monologue under Increasing Time Pressure: Effects on Fluency, Complexity, and Accuracy. *TESOL Quarterly: A Journal for Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages and of Standard English as a Second Dialect*, 50:2, 369-393. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.232>.
- Tilfarlioglu, Filiz Yalcin and Fatma Şeyma Doğan. 2011. Supporting Self-efficacy and Learner Autonomy in Relation to Academic Success in EFL Classrooms (A Case Study). *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 1:10, 1284-1294. DOI: 10.4304/tpls.1.10.1284-1294.
- Tseng, Wen-Ta, Hao-Jyuan Liou and Hsi-Chin Chu. 2020. Vocabulary learning in virtual environments_Learner autonomy and collaboration. *System*, 88, 1-17. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2019.102190>.

- Vaca Torres, Marcela Ady and Luis Fernando Gómez Rodríguez. 2017. Increasing EFL Learners' Oral Production at a Public School Through Project-Based Learning. *PROFILE Issues in Teachers' Professional Development*, 19:2, 57-71. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.15446/profile.v19n2.59889>.
- van Zeeland, Hilde and Norbert Schmitt. 2013. *System*, 41:3, 609-624. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2013.07.012>.
- Verman-de Olde, Cornelise and Ton De Jong. 2004. Student-generated assignments about electrical circuits in a computer simulation. *International Journal of Science Education*, 26:7, 859-873. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/0950069032000138815>.
- Wilson, E. Vance. 2004. ExamNet asynchronous learning network: augmenting face-to-face courses with student-developed exam questions. *Computers & Education*, 42, 87-107. DOI: 10.1016/S0360-1315(03)00066-6.
- Wilson, Jane, Chloe Fang, Jenice Rollins and Destinee Valadez. 2016. An Urgent Challenge: Enhancing Academic Speaking Opportunities for English Learners. *Multicultural Education*, 23:2, 52-54. Available at <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1097857.pdf>, accessed 27 December, 2020.
- Yu, Fu-Yun. 2019. The learning potential of online student-constructed tests with citing peer-generated questions. *Interactive Learning Environments*, 27:2, 226-241. DOI: <https://doi-org.ezproxy.utlib.ut.ee/10.1080/10494820.2018.1458040>.
- Yu, Fu-Yun and Chia-Ling Su. 2015. A student-constructed test learning system: The design, development and evaluation of its pedagogical potential. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, 31:6, 685-698. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.14742/ajet.2190>.

- Yu, Fu-Yun and Chun-Ping Wu. 2015. The effects of an online student-constructed test strategy on knowledge construction. *Computers & Education*, 94, 89-101. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2015.11.005>.
- Zhao, Zhongbao. 2014. A Needs-Based Approach to the Development of a Diagnostic College English Speaking Test. *International Education Studies*, 7:6, 145-153. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/ies.v7n6p145>.

Appendix 1. Pre-task questionnaire

PRE-TASK QUESTIONNAIRE

Directions: Think back on the **last covered topic**. On a scale from 1 to 5, assess **how confident you are that you can perform each of the following activities?** 1 = not confident at all; 5 = very confident.

Mark the correct rating with a tick ☐.

Vocabulary (sõnavara)	1	2	3	4	5
1. I can understand the new vocabulary of this topic when seeing it in an unfamiliar text.					
2. When I am reading, I can spot and correct misspelled words covered in this topic.					
3. I can understand the new vocabulary when hearing it in an unfamiliar text.					
4. I can correctly use the new vocabulary when saying single sentences.					
5. I can correctly use the new vocabulary when speaking for a longer period of time or in a conversation.					
Oral fluency (ladusus suulises kõnes)					
6. I can say single sentences about the studied topic easily.					
7. I can easily talk about the studied topic in English.					
8. I can easily have a conversation about the studied topic in English.					
9. I can discuss various viewpoints in English regarding the studied topic.					

How much do you agree with these statements? 1 = disagree completely; 5 = agree completely. Mark the correct rating with a tick ☐.

Usefulness	1	2	3	4	5
10. I think creating the video and creating questions for my peers will be interesting.					
11. Doing the task will help me revise the covered vocabulary.					
12. Doing the task will help me revise the covered topic.					
13. Doing the task as pair work will help me understand the things I did not understand before.					
14. Doing the task is a useful way of revising the covered material.					
15. I will need to understand how the covered topics are connected to finish the task successfully.					

Appendix 2. Post-task questionnaire

POST-TASK QUESTIONNAIRE

Directions: Think back on the **last covered topic**. On a scale from 1 to 5, assess **how confident you are that you can perform each of the following activities?** 1 = not confident at all; 5 = very confident.

Mark the correct rating with a tick ☐

Vocabulary (sõnavara)	1	2	3	4	5
1. I can understand the new vocabulary of this topic when seeing it in an unfamiliar text.					
2. When I am reading, I can spot and correct misspelled words covered in this topic.					
3. I can understand the new vocabulary when hearing it in an unfamiliar text.					
4. I can correctly use the new vocabulary when saying single sentences.					
5. I can correctly use the new vocabulary when speaking for a longer period of time or in a conversation.					
Oral fluency (ladusus suulises kõnes)					
6. I can say single sentences about the studied topic easily.					
7. I can easily talk about the studied topic in English.					
8. I can easily have a conversation about the studied topic in English.					
9. I can discuss various viewpoints in English regarding the studied topic.					

How much do you agree with these statements? 1 = disagree completely; 5 = agree completely. Mark the correct rating with a tick ☐.

Usefulness					
10. I think creating the video and creating questions for my peers was interesting.					
11. Doing the task helped me revise the covered vocabulary.					
12. Doing the task helped me revise the covered topic(s).					
13. Doing the task as pair work helped me understand the things I did not understand before.					
14. Doing the task is a useful way of revising the covered material.					
15. I needed to understand how the covered topics are connected to finish the task successfully.					
16. If you compare creating the video for the first time, what was different this time? (only filled out after the 2 nd and 3 rd task)					

Appendix 3. Semi-structured interview questions

In English:

1. What did you like/didn't like about the tasks?
2. How did doing the tasks change for you over time?
3. What topics was it easier to do the task for? Why?
4. How do you feel doing the task affected your understanding of the new vocabulary when reading or hearing it?
5. How do you feel doing the task affected the use of the new vocabulary in speaking and communicating orally?
6. What did you think of your new vocabulary skills after finishing the tasks?
7. Were there any topics that you struggled to speak about fluently? If so, why?
8. How did you prepare for the tasks (learning the text by heart, using key points, notes, practice before filming – how many times? rely on your team-mates to prepare the task for you?). How did it change from task 1 to 2 to 3?
9. What did you think of your fluency skills after finishing the tasks?
10. What things did the task help you understand that you did not understand before?
11. What did you find useful/ not useful about the task?
12. How did your view of the task usefulness change from task to task?
13. How useful did you find coming up with the revision questions for your classmates?
14. How often and in what situations should this type of a revision technique be used in ESL classes?

In Estonian:

1. Mis sulle kordamisvideote tegemise juures meeldis ja ei meeldinud?
2. Mis muutus kordamisvideote tegemise juures? Võrdle esimest, teist ja kolmandat korda.
3. Milliste teemade kohta oli lihtsam kordamisvideot teha? Miks?
4. Kuidas mõjutas sinu jaoks kordamisvideote tegemine uue sõnavara mõistmist lugedes ja kuulmisel?
5. Mil moel mõjutas sinu jaoks kordamisvideote tegemine uue sõnavara kasutamist rääkimisel ja suhtlemisel?
6. Milliseks hindad oma uue sõnavara teadmisi peale kordamisvideote tegemist?
7. Kas oli teemasid, millest oli raske ladusalt rääkida? Kui jah, siis miks?
8. Kuidas valmistusid kordamisvideote tegemiseks (nt. õppisid teksti pähe, kasutasid märkmeid või põhipunkte, harjutasid enne filmimist (mitu korda?), lasid oma kaaslastel endale teksti valmis kirjutada jne.). Kas ja kuidas see muutus iga video puhul?
9. Milliseks hindad oma võimeid teemadest ladusalt rääkida peale kordamisvideote filmimist?
10. Millest aitas kordamisvideote tegemine sul aru saada, mis oli enne arusaamatu?
11. Mis oli kordamisvideote tegemise puhul kasulik/ kasutu?
12. Kuidas muutus sinu nägemus ülesande kasulikkuse kohta iga video tegemise järel?
13. Kui kasulik oli kordamisküsimuste loomine klassikaaslastele?
14. Kui tihti ja millistes olukordades võiks taolist kordamistehnikat võõrkeeletundides rakendada?

Appendix 4. Quotes from the interviews

Benefits of the LGRVs on vocabulary acquisition

General perception of the vocabulary knowledge after creating the LGVRs:

- “We had to re-film the videos several times, so we eventually remembered the new vocabulary.” (S11)
- “I believe I can remember and use the new vocabulary better now.” (S10)
- “Making the videos widened my vocabulary. The new words we studied are more familiar now.” (S9)
- “My vocabulary is definitely better after making the videos [other interviewees nod with agreement]” (S6)
- “I feel more confident about the new vocabulary after filming the videos.” (S9)
- “I remember the new vocabulary but not the facts.” (S6)

Receptive skills:

- “I notice the new vocabulary more outside the lessons now and pay more attention to it.” (S2)
- “I can recognise the new words better now when hearing them. For example, I just watched an environmental documentary after making the video and it was much easier to understand.” (S6)
- “I could hear others and myself speak when making the videos, and I felt I could understand them better. Even now when we have a listening exercise during a test, I can understand the text better thanks to these videos. Even when I hear mistakes, I think about them and can understand better.” (S12)

Productive skills:

- “I got better at using the vocabulary. The words come to me more easily and I’m not afraid to use them. I would not be afraid to use them in a new situation now.” (S1)
- “I feel more confident at using these new words now. I know what the word means exactly, and I can use it better.” (S6)
- “I’m more confident at the correct use of the new words.” (S2)
- “I feel more comfortable. I can use the new words in context now.” (S7)
- “The words now have a background. They’re not just words, instead you know about them and can talk about them. You create connections and can even use them in different contexts.” (S6)
- “We had the new words on a worksheet before. I can connect them with their meaning there, I can understand them, and maybe at that moment I think, “Oh yes, that makes sense!” But in order for my brain to register that these words belong to this topic, that only occurred to me when creating the videos. And that I can use them in real life, too. Making the video consolidated these phrases.” (S3)
- “The fact that we had to use the new vocabulary in our videos meant that we had to memorise the script more, but it also helped us to memorise the new vocabulary better. I would say that it’s positive that we had to use the new words in the videos. At least in my opinion.” (S3)

Drawbacks of the LGRVs on vocabulary acquisition

Language difficulties:

- “My partner couldn’t speak English, so he needed to read from the script.” (S1)
- “There were lots of difficult words to remember for the environment topic.” (S10)

Already being familiar with the new vocabulary before doing the videos:

- “My vocabulary use generally hasn’t changed much.” (S2)
- “For us, speaking about travelling was easier. We already knew the topic more or less.” (S3)

Using the new words in context:

- “In my opinion, understanding single words is easier than using them in sentences.” (S6)
- “The new vocabulary was so tightly compressed into the video in order to use as many new words as possible in a short time. That’s what made using the new words in context more difficult.” (S4)
- “For me, using the new words in context became increasingly difficult. At first we had a long script. It took us relatively little time to go through it, although the filming took us longer. In the end, we had a shorter script, but going through it took us longer because learning the text by heart took us much longer.” (S3)

Benefits of the LGRVs on fluency

General perception of fluency:

- “My fluency is definitely better after making the videos.” (S3)
- “Of course I spoke more fluently after making the videos since I knew the topic, new vocabulary, and could use them better than before.” (S11)
- “I can speak better after making the videos since I know the new words now, I used them in the videos, and I can remember them better in a conversation.” (S10)

Fluency improving from task to task:

- “Speaking in front of the camera became easier in time. We could automatically think and improvise on the spot. When I couldn’t remember something, I restructured what I wanted to say.” (S3)
- “The first time we filmed the video, we couldn’t stop laughing, so we couldn’t speak properly. But during the third video we could speak in English properly.” (S10)

Fluency depending on the topic:

- “The third video was very easy for me because we would talk about ourselves and that was easy.” (S11)
- “The first video was also easy because we would just talk about where we wanted to go.” (S10)

Reducing fear:

- “I start speaking English well when I’m nervous. I don’t know why. I was nervous to talk to the audience when filming the videos, and I spoke more fluently thanks to that. Good experience. I know I must speak well. That it’s not funny. It’s important that others understand what I’m trying to say. It is important for me.” (S11)
- “I wasn’t nervous when I was making the videos in English. I know they are my friends, they will help me, I don’t feel ashamed. I think that if I speak a lot with my friends, I will also be able to speak with strangers. I’m not so nervous to talk about these topics after making the videos.” (S10)
- “We were not afraid to speak in English. We made mistakes but we still spoke.” (S11)
- [adds to the comment by S11] “Yes, because there were no other people around you. Just the camera.” (S10)
- “Knowing that we could re-film the video was encouraging.” (S11)
- “After making these videos, I’m not afraid to speak in the English lessons anymore.” (S9)
- “In the 8th grade I spoke very little in the English lessons. I had the grammar, but I couldn’t speak. When we started having the oral communication lessons, I realised that I can, but I’m afraid. And after making the videos I started speaking more. I realised that I can.” (S11)
- “And I think I had great problems with my accent, and I was afraid to speak. I tried to reduce my accent when making the videos with my friends.” (S12)
- “I speak very little in the lessons because everyone else speak. But when we were doing the videos, I simply had to speak.” (S9)

Relying on the main points for a more natural speech:

- “I personally did not prepare much. I just spoke off the top of my head. I had thought of some main points beforehand.” (S1)
- “We wrote a script with full sentences, exactly as we were planning to speak about the topic. During the filming, we spoke more freely.” (S5)
- “We made the topic clear enough for ourselves so that we could talk about it with the sentences we had written down. And when we forgot something, we found a different way of saying it.” (S3)
- “During the last video, we were able to communicate more freely because it was late, we were tired and we just wanted to get it done. So we found easier ways to do it. We wrote a script at first, but we never put it into use. Some sentences immediately start to seem strange if you do it in real life. But we often changed the script while filming the videos.” (S3)
- “We wrote the script using full sentences, read it several times, and afterwards spoke using our own words. When something went wrong, we re-filmed the video. We didn’t learn it by heart. After practising it several times we just remembered it [S9, S10 and S12 agree].” (S11)
- “We understood the topics, we just thought about how to speak about it using our own words. During the first video we just read the text out loud. Afterwards, we realised that it would affect our grade and decided not to read. To do it ourselves.” (S12)
- “We learned the script by heart for the first video, and it was very time-consuming. But it is not real, and from the second video onwards we spoke using our own words.” (S10)
- “It was easier to speak using our own words. You didn’t have to learn the text by heart.” (S9)

- “We have to show our own ability to speak [stresses the word *speak*] as well as we can.” (S11)

Drawbacks of the LGRVs on fluency

Partner’s lack of English:

- “I was the one who spoke. My partner cannot really speak English.” (S1)
- “I had written a text for my partner and the answers he could use. Every time I asked something or spoke, he could choose from a selection of answers to reply. At first, I wrote a script for him so he could read exactly as it was written there, but later I changed it so he could choose his answers.” (S1)

Vocabulary demands for the task:

- “We had to use these new words and phrases, so we had to learn the script by heart and couldn’t speak freely. It could have just been our problem, though.” (S4)
- “We had the worksheet about the current topic open and we wrote the script. Especially with the travelling topic because it contained a lot of adjectives and verbs. So we just pressed them all in the script. That helped. Otherwise, we wouldn’t have been able to make such good videos.” (S3)

Reading:

- “It was difficult for us to talk about the topics, we simply read the script out loud in the video.” (S8)
- “We met before the deadline, wrote the script in full sentences, turned the camera on, and read the text out loud. I then edited it, and sent it to you. I wrote the script, others helped. Or, I mean, they gave me information about the topic, they didn’t help me linguistically. Our process remained the same from video to video, only speeded up.” (S7)

Memorising the prepared script:

- “Me and my partner wrote the script in full sentences and learned it by heart. But I always memorised it so-so. It was difficult for me to learn everything by heart word-by-word, so I kind of learn it and then speak.” (S2)
- “We wrote the script and then we read it through several times. And then we attempted to film it several times. And then we read the script again. When we encountered a more difficult phrase, we wrote it down, but in the end we realised that it was completely pointless. We just couldn’t look for these phrases from the paper while trying to speak. And so we just learned the text by heart and filmed the video. It was easier to learn a little bit at a time, then film it. We divided the video into about three sections and then combined them into one video. About half the time we used the memorised text, and about half the time we improvised, though I think we used the memorised text more.” (S3)
- “It wasn’t just communication.” (S5)
- “We also wrote a full script. Twice, we had read it thoroughly before we met up to film the video so it would go faster. But for the environment video we came together, and only then started working on the text. We memorised a few sentences, filmed the clip, memorised a few more sentences, filmed another clip. Our process remained pretty much the same from

video to video. We did consider communicating more freely, but we remained in our comfort zone. We wrote the text, memorised it and filmed the video because it was the most effective and the fastest approach. To make sure we didn't skip anything, so that there was no confusion whose turn it was to speak. It was all planned." (S4)

- "We were afraid that we would skip something, like an important topic or word. That forced us to follow the script more. And since we were required to use the new vocabulary, we had to follow the script." (S3)

Already fluent on the topics:

- "I had no problems with fluency. I could already talk about these topics fluently before making the videos." (S2)

The effect of difficult topics on fluency:

- "It was difficult to talk about the environment because it was more scientific and contained more numbers. I think I still would be unable to speak about this topic fluently. Yes, I know the vocabulary, and I know what I would like to talk about, but I think I would have difficulties...because this topic has a lot of numbers, a lot of facts." (S3)
- "At least for us, we spoke based on the script, not naturally. We didn't naturally produce sentences, but had to know facts, and that was difficult." (S4)
- "With the travelling topic you could simply talk about liking travelling to Italy. But with the environment topic you have to speak about agriculture. Then you need to know more specific information." (S6)
- "The environment topic is a wide topic, and it is difficult to talk about it." (S10)

General perception of fluency:

- "I would say my fluency has not changed by making the videos." (S2)
- "I cannot say whether my fluency has changed." (S1)
- "I wouldn't say I can speak fluently about a topic if I memorise these two sentences, film a clip, and then forget the sentences, take the next two sentences, memorise them and film another clip." (S4)
- "I think that straight after filming the videos I could have talked about the environment topic fluently, but if I had to speak about it now, I wouldn't know anything. I think I could remember some things, but...I don't remember the facts, but I do remember the vocabulary. At the time it was more about memorising facts to say the sentences we had written down." (S3)

Usefulness of the LGRVs

General perception of the usefulness:

- "I liked everything we did." (S1)
- "Making the video was very fun. I liked that we could make jokes in the video." (S10)
- "There was nothing useless about making the videos." (S12)

New knowledge and being pro-active to find solutions:

- “I liked that we could use different programs for creating the videos. I used programs I had had no previous experience with because I have never edited videos before.” (S1)
- “Using the technology, how to upload the videos into the computer, the technical side of making the videos.” (S6)
- “Getting to know the different programs, for example.” (S4)
- “Finding out different facts.” (S1)
- “When neither of us understood it, we googled it.” (S3)
- “We understood the topics better. In the English lessons we just speak or read texts but when we started making the video, we realised that we must speak to get a good mark. I want to understand the topics better. It is necessary in life.” (S11)
- “I know more about climate change and the environment now, and how travelling affects the environment. I can make connections better.” (S3)
- “I knew something [stresses the word *something*] before making the videos, but I have learned more and can make connections better after making the videos. More or less as before, but more facts.” (S2)

Being involved:

- “I liked that I could devise my own texts and speak more about the topics. In regular lessons we learn the topic, maybe do a test and move on to another topic.” (S2)

Vocabulary and fluency:

- “It summed up the covered material well.” (S3)
- “It helped to revise the vocabulary.” (S6)
- “It helped to remember the new vocabulary of the topic.” (S3)
- “It helped to revise how to write some of the words.” (S2)
- “I found out new words I didn’t know before.” (S1)
- “Learning new words.” (S9)
- “It helped me practice my language skills, and as a result, they improved.” (S10)
- “Doing the videos became more useful over time. Especially regarding practising the new vocabulary.” (S12)

Grammar:

- “I became better at grammar when we wrote the scripts.” (S2)
- “For me it was also the grammar that improved when I wrote the scripts.” (S1)

Novelty:

- “And it was something different. We have never had to create videos like these in any other lesson.” (S4)
- “I liked that we had a practical task that helped us revise instead of simply learning the material, and then never returning to it again. At first, I wondered what the point of the task was because we had never done anything like this before. I liked that the task was oral because with the other English teacher we only learn grammar, and it becomes boring for me. I have never had a chance to speak in English like this.” (S2)

- “I became more enthusiastic about the task over time. Usually it is just doing worksheets, but in the oral communication classes we make videos. I like the process of making them and the fact that the task was so different.” (S1)

Collaboration:

- “And you got to discuss things with your partner. When you didn’t understand something, she could help or correct you. So you eventually understood the topic better. When I didn’t understand a phrase, I could ask my partner.” (S5)
- “I liked that we could do group work.” (S9)
- “The collaboration was useful.” (S6)
- “The collaboration with your partner. When one of us messed up, we tried again and helped each other, so both of us could equally understand the material.” (S4)

Time management:

- “Time management was also useful. That you know when and how you do things.” (S5)
- “We understood later on how long it approximately takes us to create the videos. And we also realised that we don’t need to be together to film the videos. That we can each film the clips at our own places, and then combine the clips later on.” (S3)

Reduced fear:

- “I’m not so afraid to talk to other people now.” (S11)

Disadvantages of the LGRVs

Showing the videos to classmates:

- “I didn’t like the idea of filming because I don’t even like being in pictures or looking at pictures of myself.” (S2)

Time-consuming:

- “It took so much time. That you had to do it during your free time. It was difficult to find the time because it had to be on the weekend. And who likes doing homework on the weekend?! Or it had to be right after school, which was the time for other things. That sucked a bit.” (S3)
- “When we didn’t find the time to do the video together. Sometimes we had to film it separately.” (S10)
- “Maybe the long process...On the other hand, knowing technology is a good thing. But it was a long process. And when you have to transfer the files to the computer...it is not directly related to oral English.” (S3)

Lots of information to memorise:

- “Maybe remembering the text, too. You had to film several times to get the text as expected.” (S7)

Change in the perception of the usefulness over time:

- [As a reply to the question how the task changed over time] “I would say downhill. The task became a bit repetitive. At first, it was interesting, that it was kind of a new thing. But in the end it was already like, “Ah, we have to get together and do it.” You began to concentrate more on why the task doesn’t help you. Obviously, when you start something new, it’s interesting at the beginning, but will become an obligation in the end.” (S3)
- “We didn’t start filming with positive emotions by the end.” (S4)

Already being familiar with the topics:

- “I knew and had researched many of the topics we covered. For example, I have researched a lot about the climate and job interviews in English, so there was little new for me. I already knew the new words we studied when we covered the climate topic.” (S2)
- “Everything was clear to me before we started filming the videos. After filming it, I only knew a few extra details. For example, I could explain one complicated word in English.” (S1)

Not speaking freely:

- “We memorised things, we didn’t communicate freely.” (S5)
- “It is quite useless when you just put all the new vocabulary we have covered on top of each other. I will only remember, like, two words. Maybe it would have been better if we had been able to pick the most important points for each topic ourselves.” (S4)

Usefulness of the revision questions

- “It was useful in my opinion, since I had to think more about what my classmates would get from our dialogue. It helped with using the vocabulary because I knew the vocabulary but hadn’t had many opportunities to use it. I knew what the most important parts of our text were, and what should be the focus.” (S2)
- “I think it was useful because this way my classmates could learn more about this topic. Usually I cannot use the new vocabulary anywhere but here I could.” (S1)
- “You had to use your imagination.” (S9)
- “It helped to understand whether you have done the video correctly, and whether the answers to your questions can actually be found in the video.” (S11)

Disadvantages of the revision questions

- “I personally didn’t notice that making the revision questions helped me find the important information from our text.” (S2)
- “I didn’t like that we had to create the five revision questions because sometimes we forgot them, and then it affected our mark.” (S9)
- “I had already understood the topic while making the video. So I just picked a sentence from the script and rephrased it as a question. Equally, I saw no point in answering them, because although it made me listen to other people’s videos...I listen to them anyway. Perhaps it makes some people listen to the videos more, but I saw no point in the questions [S4, S5 and S6 agree by nodding].” (S3)

Assessment on how often LGRVs should be used in L2 classes

- “I think it’s good that we create revision videos in the English lessons. We should do them every period, not after each topic. Then we could create connections between several topics, and study independently even more.” (S2)
- “We should create the videos every period because then we could revise the topics of each period.” (S1)
- “There should be one every period.” (S10 and S11).
- “It depends on the topic. I’m not even sure whether it’s better to use them for easier or more difficult topics. Because when used for easier topics, it would help to improve your fluency. But when used for difficult topics, it would make the topic clearer. But I would say, maybe twice a year.” (S3)
- “Definitely not every period because it is a big project and requires a lot of time.” (S4)

RESÜMEE

TARTU ÜLIKOOL
ANGLISTIKA OSAKOND

Sandra Leeben

The effect of learner-generated revision videos with revision questions on vocabulary acquisition and speaking fluency in an EFL oral communication class

Õppijate loodud kordamisvideote ja -küsimuste mõju sõnavara omandamisele ja suulisele ladususele inglise keele suulise suhtluskursuse raames

Magistritöö

2021

Lehekülgede arv: 81

Annotatsioon:

Uurimuse eesmärk oli välja selgitada, kuidas inglise keele suulise suhtluskursuse raames 9.klassi õpilaste loodud kordamisvideod ja -küsimused mõjutavad nende sõnavara omandamist ning suulist ladusust. Paljud õpilased ei julge võõrkeeletundides rääkida ja suhelda, isegi kui teised osaoskused neile probleeme ei valmista. Seetõttu tuleb leida viise, kuidas vähendada õpilastes kõnelemishirmu ning arendada nende sõnavara ja suulist ladusust. Ka on audio-visuaalsete õppe- ja kordamismaterjalide loomist teismeliste seas vähe uuritud. Töö autor soovis seega teada saada, kas kordamisvideote ja -küsimuste loomine aitab 9.klassi õpilaste arvates omandada uut sõnavara ja arendada suulist ladusust ning kas nad peavad antud võtet kasulikuks.

Õpilased filmisid iga läbitud teema lõpus kokkuvõtva video. Video pidi lõppema viie kordamisküsimusega, mille vastused olid videost leitavad. Kordamistunnis vaadati koos valminud videosid ning vastati kordamisküsimustele. Kokku filmisid õpilased video kolme teema põhjal: reisimine, keskkond ja karjäär. Uurimuses osalejad täitsid küsimustiku enne ja peale video filmimist. Tulemuste põhjal koostas töö autor küsimused poolstruktureeritud intervjuudeks, mis võimaldasid paremini välja selgitada õpilaste arvamusi ning vastata töös püstitatud uurimisküsimustele.

Töö algab sissejuhatusega, kus antakse ülevaade muutunud õpikäsitusest, suuliste suhtluskursuste põhieesmärkidest ning nende kitsaskohtadest võõrkeeleeõppes. Kirjanduse ülevaade keskendub õppijakeskse lähenemise ja koostöise õppimise mõjule akadeemilises edasijõudmises ning ladususe ja sõnavara rollile suulises suhtluses. Seejärel antakse ülevaade eelnevate uuringute tulemustest õppijate loodud audio ning audio-visuaalsetest materjalide, küsimuste ning testide vallas. Töö empiiriline osa koosneb uurimuses osalenute tausta ja eksperimendi kirjeldamisest ning tulemuste analüüsist.

Küsitlustest ning intervjuudest selgub, et õpilaste arvates paranes nende sõnavara tänu kordamisvideote filmimisele. Probleemkohtadena toodi välja kaaslase kehv inglise keele oskus, liiga keeruline või lihtne sõnavara ning uue sõnavara kasutamine kontekstis. Viimast tõstsid esile just tugevamad õpilased, kes nõrgematest õpilastest sagedamini õppisid videos kasutatava teksti pähe, kuna ei soovinud olulist sõnavara kogemata jutust välja jätta. Pikkade tekstide pähe õppimine

mõjutas seega nende nägemust uue sõnavara kasutamise keerukusest. Teksti päheõppimine oli ka peamine põhjus, miks nad olid kordamisvideote filmimise mõju hindamisel suulisele ladususele kriitilisemad kui nõrgemad õpilased, kes filmimisel suhtlesid loomulikumalt. Keskkonnateema video puhul mõjutas suulist ladusust negatiivselt ka keeruline sõnavara ning vajadus teada detailselt tausta. Samas leidsid õpilased, et videote tegemine aitas vähendada suhtlemishirmu, mis omakorda mõjutas positiivselt suulist ladusust. Üldiselt pidasid kõik uurimuses osalejad kordamisvideote tegemist kasulikuks, kuigi ajapikku õpilaste motivatsioon neid teha langes. Negatiivse aspektina mainiti eelkõige suurt ajakulu ning vähest mõju ladususele. Videote tegemist peeti kasulikuks, kuna need pakkusid tavapärasele õppele vaheldust, olid praktilise väärtusega, võimaldasid õppijatel õppetöös aktiivselt osaleda ning kaaslasega keerulisi aspekte eelnevalt läbi arutada. Samuti toodi positiivse poolena välja, et videote tegemine suunas õpilasi ise informatsiooni juurde otsima, arendas nende sõnavara, õigekirja- ja grammatikateadmisi, õpetas aega paremini planeerima ning vähendas hirmu inglise keeles suhtlemise ees. Kordamisküsimuste tegemist pidasid kasulikuks vaid õpilased, kes pidasid neid oluliseks kordamisvõimaluseks kaasõpilaste seisukohast.

Uuringu tulemuste põhjal saab järeldada, et kordamisvideote loomine inglise keele suhtluskursuse raames on sobilik võtte ka teismeliste õppurite puhul vaatamata nende keeleoskuse tasemele. Siiski tuleb silmas pidada, et õpitav materjal oleks õige raskusastmega, õpilased oleksid motiveeritud ning mõistaksid teksti pähe õppimise ja mahalugemise tagajärgi suulise suhtluse oskusele. Samuti ei tohiks kordamisvideote tegemist liiga tihti rakendada, et vältida õpilastes motivatsiooni vähenemist.

Märksõnad:

Inglise keeles kõnelemine, suhtlemisoskuse arendamine, sõnavara kinnistamine, ladususe arendamine, õpitu kordamine, kordamisvideo, kordamisküsimused, õppijate loodud materjalid.

Lihtlitsents lõputöö reprodutseerimiseks ja lõputöö üldsusele kättesaadavaks tegemiseks

Mina, Sandra Leeben,

1. annan Tartu Ülikoolile tasuta loa (lihtlitsentsi) minu loodud teose

The effect of learner-generated revision videos with revision questions on vocabulary acquisition and speaking fluency in an EFL oral communication class,

mille juhendaja on Natalja Zagura,

reprodutseerimiseks eesmärgiga seda säilitada, sealhulgas lisada digitaalarhiivi DSpace kuni autoriõiguse kehtivuse lõppemiseni.

2. Annan Tartu Ülikoolile loa teha punktis 1 nimetatud teos üldsusele kättesaadavaks Tartu Ülikooli veebikeskkonna, sealhulgas digitaalarhiivi DSpace kaudu Creative Commonsi litsentsiga CC BY NC ND 3.0, mis lubab autorile viidates teost reprodutseerida, levitada ja üldsusele suunata ning keelab luua tuletatud teost ja kasutada teost ärieesmärgil, kuni autoriõiguse kehtivuse lõppemiseni.
3. Olen teadlik, et punktides 1 ja 2 nimetatud õigused jäävad alles ka autorile.
4. Kinnitan, et lihtlitsentsi andmisega ei riku ma teiste isikute intellektuaalomandi ega isikuandmete kaitse õigusaktidest tulenevaid õigusi.

Sandra Leeben

03.05.2021

Autorsuse kinnitus

Kinnitan, et olen koostanud käesoleva magistritöö ise ning toonud korrektselt välja teiste autorite panuse. Töö on koostatud lähtudes Tartu Ülikooli maailma keelte ja kultuuride kolledži anglistika osakonna magistritöö nõuetest ning on kooskõlas heade akadeemiliste tavadega.

Sandra Leeben

03.05.2021

Lõputöö on lubatud kaitsmisele.

Natalja Zagura

03.05.2021