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Abstract

This research paper aimed at improving learners’ oral skills through the use of peer-feedback to student created videos in an English academy in Guayaquil. Eight participants were exposed to different instruments in order to increase their proficiency. A research study which included quantitative and qualitative instruments was conducted. It consisted on the application of a pretest-posttest format, and a Likert survey. During the research process, learners were evaluated by their peers and two facilitators to avoid bias. Results indicated an increase of 53% on their average performance. In an analysis by categories, post results outperformed pre-test data in three categories: Accuracy, pronunciation, and interactive communication. Students also reflected positive perspectives towards the use of peer-feedback. Therefore, the study reflected that peer-feedback to student created videos is an efficient strategy for EFL learners. This study also has benefits for teachers that want to develop learners’ oral skills on constant basis by providing learners opportunities to interact within a real context.
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Resumen

Este trabajo de investigación tuvo como objetivo mejorar las habilidades orales de los alumnos mediante el uso de comentarios de compañeros en videos creados por estudiantes en una academia de inglés en Guayaquil. Ocho participantes fueron expuestos a diferentes instrumentos para aumentar su nivel de inglés. Se realizó una investigación-acción, la cual incluyó instrumentos cuantitativos como cualitativos. Se aplicó un formato de prueba previa y posterior, además, se administró una encuesta Likert. Durante el proceso de investigación, los alumnos fueron evaluados por sus compañeros y dos facilitadores para evitar sesgos. Los resultados indicaron un incremento del 53% en su desempeño promedio. En un análisis por categoría, los resultados del post-test reflejaron mejoría en comparación a los del pre-test en: precisión, pronunciación e interacción. Los alumnos también reportaron perspectivas positivas hacia el uso de retroalimentación. Como consecuencia, el estudio refleja que la retroalimentación de los compañeros a los videos creados por los estudiantes es una estrategia eficiente para los estudiantes de inglés como lengua extranjera. Este estudio también tiene beneficios para los maestros que desean desarrollar las habilidades orales de los alumnos de manera constante al proporcionarles oportunidades para interactuar dentro de un contexto real.

Palabras clave: comentarios de compañeros, habilidades orales, videos creados por los estudiantes, escuela de lengua inglesa, dominio.
Peer-Feedback to Student-Created Videos to Improve Oral Skills

Improving orals skills have been a challenge for EFL students due to the lack of authentic interaction and materials McKay (2012). Therefore, learners did not feel engaged and encouraged into speaking production. This is a general issue in the global education field. As pointed out by McKay, teaching English as an international language is a demanding process that requires both teachers and students to be updated and eager to learn. As a result, materials must represent real-life situations, so students can use their English along with technology to recreate a real context rather than just a textbook (Baltova, 1994).

One of the principal reasons for speaking being a difficult skill to develop is that traditional teaching which is based on drills, repetition and rote learning has not helped students develop their oral skills (Ahmed & Abdallaabdalgane, 2014; Tuluram & Machisella, 2018). Traditional teaching is meant to have learners sitting and listening without having any valuable learning experience in realistic and meaningful situations. Relying only upon this type of teaching will not let students reach their full potential.

Despite the several efforts done by the national government of Ecuador and educators to improve the teaching of EFL, according to English First (2017), Ecuador was placed number 55 out of 80 different countries. Besides the changes and the updating of teachers, this year as remarked by English First (2018) Ecuador is now number 65 out of 80 countries. These statistics reflect that Ecuadorian students have a shallow level of English proficiency. This happens not only for having traditional teaching methods, but the lack of application of technological tools inside the classroom (Cox & Martin, 1989).
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In the national field, some standards need to be fulfilled effectively, such as discussing real-life topics that are relevant to everyday life by and interacting without previous preparation in the target language (Ministerio de Educacion, 2016). This standard clearly states the importance of oral communication.

One option to fulfill this standard can be to give learners opportunities to assess their partners. This process is called peer-feedback. Several studies (Ngar-Fun & Carless, 2006; Patri, 2002; Topping, 2009) agreed that peer-feedback has a practical impact on students. They also stated that feedback should not only come from the educator, but peers can also provide an insight into the progress of their partners. Moreover, it is essential to provide students with feedback since it is a way to make students reflect on their practices. Gielen (2010) showed that peer-feedback provides learners the opportunity to reflect based on their partners’ comments and not only their perception.

The inclusion of technology, if available, is an obligation nowadays to give learners a complete and realistic learning experience using videos and audiovisual material (Cakir, 2006). Therefore, this study aimed at helping learners develop their speaking skills using quality peer-feedback, and the support of authentic materials such as videos which are proven to be active and engaging as remarked by Edugains (2010).

Educational videos are also a way to deliver audiovisual information which is related in recent research as one of the main factors that facilitate learning the target language by watching the language being used in real situations as stated by Gutierrez (2015). Furthermore, it gives learners the opportunity of making videos to foster spoken interaction and provide feedback.

It is common for learners to present difficulties at spoken production in an English academy in Guayaquil, in which almost no research has been done, and students even at an A2 level or above are not able to produce spoken interaction continually for passing
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The graduation exam according to the institutions’ records and reports. Around 36% of students are not able to pass the exam due to the speaking section as presented in the internal institutional report. Furthermore, the institution did not have the facilities for the application of a technological innovation until the beginning of last year.

**Literature Review**

This research study involves improving oral skills through the application of peer feedback and educational videos by implementing videos created by students and uploading them to an educational web page created by the researcher, Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) was the central approach in this research. Theories and studies regarding peer feedback and educational videos are going to be discussed in this section.

**Communicative Language Teaching**

Communicative language teaching (CLT) has been proven to be better than behaviorism and cognitivism (Wafaa, 2018). It is directly connected to constructivism, in which learners create and develop their knowledge. Research conducted by Owen and Razali (2018) support that classrooms inside this approach show students have a significant improvement in their integrated skills due to constant interaction in real life scenarios.

**Oral Skills**

One of the most important and challenging skills to develop is speaking. As stated by Hinkel (2017), speaking is a process that includes formal and informal elements for communication and development of oral skills. Additionally, Richards (2002) stated that in speaking the focus was given mainly to direct translation as the root of communication until the late 1960s. However, learners need more than a large amount of information and memorization of structures to fulfill nowadays world realistic interaction and communication as remarked by Gardner (2008). Moreover, Davis (1989) implied that
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creating a positive environment is compulsory in order to foster learners’ spoken interaction without feeling afraid of making mistakes; they can express their ideas, feelings, and opinions because mistakes are taken as opportunities to improve.

The rubric will provide learners the ability to give formative feedback to their peers based on aspects such as accuracy, pronunciation, and interactive communication. Promoting speaking accuracy can be a challenge in EFL learners (Dincer & Yeşilyurt, 2012). By interacting with technological resources such as audiovisual material, this gap can be surpassed according to research conducted by Ebadi and Asakereh (2018).

Learner pronunciation is also taken into account. Several studies regarding pronunciation stated that learners show improvement while interacting with ICT tools like voice recording, and by creating videos (Gonca & Sabahattin, 2016; Sze-Chu & Po-Yi, 2016).

Peer Feedback

Several research studies have agreed that reinforcing oral skills by providing feedback during the speaking production process has a double benefit. Providers are more objective, and the quality of their feedback is increased. Receivers obtain detailed suggestions and advice (Colthorpe, Chen, & Zimbardi, 2014). For Sadler and Good (2006), there is a space for EFL learners to reflect on their partners’ products in a more student-centered classroom that makes learning authentic by having students interacting on their partners’ work. Likewise, Hendry (2013) states that giving after-task feedback facilitates the learning process by having useful improvements and reducing teachers’ loads of work.

The traditional way of giving feedback implies that the facilitator provides feedback to learners (Patri, 2002). However, peer feedback implies that students can review their partners’ work as remarked by Patri.
It is important to highlight that learners need guidance in order to give feedback to their peers as stated by Sadler and Good. So, learners’ need to understand the objectives, their learning aims to address in order to assess their colleagues (Black & Wiliam, 1998).

Learners’ perspectives while conducting research is important to ensure progression and acceptance while implementing a communicative innovation as stated by Walker (2015). Furthermore, overcoming difficulties while speaking and understanding learners’ perspectives in regard of the speaking process may lead to effective interactive communication as shown in Zhengdong (2013).

**Educational Videos**

Different research support that educational videos have a positive impact on learners’ spoken production, the following studies agreed that through the use of student-created videos learners show an increase in their speaking skills (Gromik, 2012; McNulty, 2012; Quigley & Nyquist, 1992). Moreover, instead of having only interaction with the facilitator, this audiovisual material provides learners with a more authentic context (Hayet, 2016). Besides, student-created videos are presented not only in a structural form. Instead, they are used as a tool to provide meaningful learning (Tafferner, 2016). They have an educational purpose and elements that engage learners into a meaningful audiovisual experience (Nova, Onatra, & Zubieta, 2017).

The main points detailed in the introduction and the literature review lead to the following research questions:

1. To what extent will oral skills of students improve with the implementation of peer-feedback?
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2. To what extent will self-made videos influence the development of oral skills?

3. What are students’ perspectives towards this innovation?

The goal is to have students get benefits from this innovation by improving their oral skills by watching educational videos as a model to create their videos and receive feedback from their peers. This has not been implemented in the academy.

Innovation

This innovation aimed at developing and implementing CLT in class for students to improve oral skills. To reach this goal several strategies were tailored such as: designing and implementing constructivist tasks/activities for students to improve their oral skills with the support of educational videos. In addition, peer-feedback was implemented as a pedagogical strategy to enhance the oral production of students.

This innovation took five weeks which contained six periods of classes per week (each period of class was 40 minutes). One unit of the course book was covered while applying this innovation. Learners watched the audiovisual material to create in-class discussions to be uploaded on the webpage and then received comments from their peers.

Seven learners provided objective peer feedback based on a rubric which was introduced in class and explained to the students (see appendix 1). This helped students that receive feedback to reflect on their work. Moreover, feedback provided by the participants was graded by the teacher and other educators to avoid bias from the main teacher or other students by using a rubric (Appendix 2). As a consequence, it was expected that learners provide their partners with better feedback and also improve their speaking skills in the videos created in class. By watching, discussing, and analyzing educational videos learners were able to create videos by themselves.

Throughout the first week of the implementation of the innovation, learners got acquainted with the rubric to give peer feedback to their partners, as mentioned in the
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backwards design plan (see appendix 3). During the rest of the weeks, learners watched educational videos and discussed in pairs and groups to create their videos, they were uploaded in the webpage and received preliminary peer feedback on the videos (see appendix 4) as a pre-test. After that, learners had an in-depth explanation of the rubric with different models to provide quality peer feedback, also other facilitators provided models on how to give peer feedback accurately then, learners developed another video and provided peer feedback again.

Methodology

This research is a mixed design study because it includes both quantitative and qualitative data and instruments to obtain reliable results (McKim, 2017). The type of research that this study applies is action research in which the principal researcher plays a role as an active participant and researcher. This study was implemented in an English academy in Guayaquil.

Participants

The sample of this research consisted of eight students (one dropped out due to payment issues), from the level of adults six (out of 10 levels) with a proficiency level of A2. The English proficiency information of participants was provided by an institutional placement test and the fulfillment of previous levels. These participants’ ages ranged from 17 to 37 years old. Most of the sample was female (70%), and the minority were males (30%). This sample was a convenience sample. Therefore, the researcher did not select the sample; it was assigned according to institutional needs.

Instruments

Pre-test/post-test

The first video created by students the week after the presentation of the rubric was the pre-test along with the preliminary feedback given in those videos. During the
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Last week of the implementation, learners created a new video based on the peer-feedback received. The quality of this feedback on their spoken interaction was taken as the post-test created by the researcher with adapted rubrics.

**Rubrics**

The assessment consisted of two parts. Learners grading the production of their peers’ videos over five points by using an adaptation of the Cambridge A2 level assessment scales (Cambridge English, 2011). This rubric was implemented according to the common European framework of reference for languages (Concil of Europe, 2018). In order to assess the quality of their peer feedback, teachers used a peer-feedback analysis rubric which assesses students over 3 points. This grade is given by teachers only. Therefore, other educators also contributed by helping to grade both the videos created by students and the quality of the peer-feedback with a rubric.

**Surveys**

A Likert scale survey was also part of this research (see appendix 5). It measured one of the aspects that are usually difficult to quantify such as learners’ perspective towards the innovation. This survey has five categories having strongly agreed as for the highest and strongly disagree as for the lowest.

A survey design by the researcher to measure the utility of the innovation and determine which components were the most and the least beneficial to their process was also administrated in order to have an idea on how these elements impacted learners’ development (see appendix 6).

**Data Collection**

**SPSS IBM software.** It is a software that compiles information and represents it quantitatively. Thus, the whole data was imported to the software. After conducting, gathering, compiling data and exploratory analysis, results were presented by using
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frequency and descriptive statistics, along with a chart that reflected the level of reliability and also explained correlations, especially from the Likert survey. After that, graphs were analyzed in both a quantitative and a qualitative way in order to provide information as accurate as possible. Besides, a demographic information table was filled in by students to have an idea of their economic status, their access, and confidence while using technology and any other special needs that learners may present (see appendix 7).

Ethical considerations

While conducting research that includes education, and its main skills, bias is a factor that must be avoided. It is for that reason that not only the principal researcher, but other educators assessed the students in order to provide objectivity to the research process. Ross (2006) stated that objectivity creates a sense of reliability and validity in a research study.

Privacy was given to students by keeping their names anonymous and any other given information such as emails and phone numbers. Instead, learners were given a code number while tabulating the information and presenting the results. Also, a permission letter was sent to the academy to keep and protect any personal information for further use (see appendix 8). Data were kept confidential and used for research purposes.

Results

In this section, there is an analysis of participants’ progress. Data are presented in figures to show how learners’ improved between the pre-test and the post-test. Moreover, the perspective of students towards the innovation is described with the statistical results of the Likert survey that was administrated at end of the innovation.

Participants’ Progress
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The research objectives of this paper were to determine the effect of peer feedback on student-created videos to improve oral skills. In this section, two figures detail the progress of students throughout the innovation. Therefore, a conclusion can be made after analyzing the collected data. Figure 1 represents the overall scores and comparison of the pre-test and post-test while figure 2 represents the overall scores and comparisons but divided into subcategories these being: Accuracy, pronunciation and interactive communication, the results were the following.

Figure 1. Overall Pre-Post Test Results

![Overall Pre-Post test Results](image)

Figure 1 represents the overall score of the pre-test (green) and the post-test (orange). Being the maximum overall score of the pre-test 2.9 out of 5 points and the maximum overall score of the post-test 4.4 out of 5 points showing that there was a 53% as result of the innovation. These results answer the first research question displayed in this paper; it is: To what extent will oral skills of students improve with the implementation of peer-feedback as a pedagogical strategy to enhance learning. As presented in the illustration a 53% increase is a positive result taking into account that n=7. The innovation had a positive effect on learners' oral skills by the implementation of peer feedback.
Figure 2 illustrates the overall results of the pre-test and the post-test divided into three categories: Accuracy, pronunciation, and interactive communication. In the pre-test, the scores were 2.4 in accuracy, 3 in pronunciation and 3.1 in interactive communication. After the implementation of this innovation within the weeks and through the creation of videos after receiving peer feedback, figure 2 clearly displays improvement in these three categories. This is the outcome for the second research question which is the following: To what extent will self-made videos influence the development of oral skills. In the post-test, the results were 4.1 for accuracy (71% of improvement), 4.3% for pronunciation (43% of improvement) and 4.7 for interactive communication (52% of improvement). Therefore, there is a difference between learners creating videos before receiving feedback and after. Since there is a statistical improvement in every single category. As a result, the second inquiry was answered positively.

Participants’ Perspectives
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In order to answer the third research question of this paper: What are students' perspectives towards this innovation? To answer this inquiry, two Likert surveys were administrated to the participants the first survey having 15 items in which the overall score was that 88% of students strongly agree with the implementation of this innovation and having a positive reaction towards it. Besides, a second Likert survey was administrated regarding the utility of the innovation and having 93% of students agreed that peer feedback was the most useful element and 91.5% of the participants also concluded that self-created videos were the cause of their improvement.

Discussion

Regarding the results, this action research determined that peer feedback to student-created videos could help learners improve their proficiency level in order to pass their upcoming graduation exam, several research such as (Ngar-Fun & Carless, 2006; Patri, 2002; Topping, 2009) back up the outcome of this research by having similar results. Using peer-feedback to improve oral skills and interaction improved students’ oral skills. Stating that by having only feedback from the facilitator, learners’ improvement can be limited. Furthermore, Colthorpe, Chen, and Zimbardi (2014) confirmed the benefits of peer-feedback by claiming that both the person providing and the person receiving the feedback become more objective and conscious of their progress as represented on this research.

The importance of educational videos and having learners creating their own was an indicator of improvement (Gromik, 2012; McNulty, 2012; Quigley & Nyquist, 1992). The creation of videos may lead to students' developing and improving their oral skills which agree with the findings of this action research. Also, the importance of creating videos and letting students realistically develop their speaking production matches the finding in other recent study (Nova, Onatra, & Zubieta, 2017).
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Different studies support the results. Therefore, it is essential to highlight the benefits of this action research to improve oral communication and give learners’ an opportunity to interact in a non-traditional environment to foster their spoken production by having them create, edit, and develop their own educational videos which were improved by the use of per-feedback.

Conclusion

Despite the different ways for learners to improve oral communication and several studies stated in this paper. The effect of peer feedback to self-made videos is a tool to promote real interaction and communication among learners the effect of this research goes beyond classroom activities since it also affects student’s development and performance outside the classroom. The positive effect of this innovation contributed to EFL learners who wanted to increase their oral proficiency. Moreover, according to the results now they can give peer feedback and reflect on their partners’ performance without depending on their teachers.

Limitations

Some limitations need to be addressed. As previously stated, this research was carried out with a convenience sample of 8 students with one dropping out due to personal issues. As a result, students’ results on the Likert survey may not be the same with a sample of 7 students than with a sample of 20 students. It is important to highlight the limitation of working with a small sample (8 students), this may create bias from the researcher as well.

Moreover, the research only lasted 30 class periods (40 minutes each period). As a result, further research may be needed to report more results regarding this matter. Additionally, working this innovation was a challenge not only for the researcher but also for the students’ because learners rushed in some of the activities due to the limited
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amount of weeks and time presented within the innovation. However, they were properly fulfilled within the time expected. Finally, the institution traditional teaching style that solely relies on the teachers’ book limited some of the performance tasks detailed in the plan. Regardless of these limitations the results were positive and had an impact on learners’ performance.

**Recommendations**

After applying this innovation, despite the positive results it is highly recommended to have a convenience sample of around 16 students at least. This research work was piloted with a group of 21 students and results were different. In addition, it is also suggested that learners are tested with a general diagnostic test before conducting further research. After several research was presented in the institution, they have decided to implement diagnostic tests in every single level from now on. The researcher expects that the results on the diagnostic tests help the learners, teachers, and institution have a better perspective on learners’ progress. For further research, it is also recommended to work at least 60 class periods and with a control group, this will allow future researchers to transform this action research into a quasi-experimental study which may solve the institutional gaps presented in this project.
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**Oral skills rubric**

Assessing Speaking Performance – Level A2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accuracy</th>
<th>Pronunciation</th>
<th>Interactive Communication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • Shows a good degree of control of simple grammatical forms such as basic tenses and structuring.  
• Uses a variety of appropriate vocabulary when talking about everyday situations. | • It is mostly comprehensible, and has some control of sounds and intonation of words. | • Main simple exchanges.  
• Requires very little support. |
| **Performance shares features of Bands 3 and 5.** | | |
| • Shows an acceptable control of simple grammatical forms.  
• Uses appropriate vocabulary when talking about everyday situations. | • It is mostly comprehensible, despite limited control of sounds and intonation of words. | • Maintains simple exchanges, despite some difficulty.  
• Requires some support. |
| **Performance shares features of Bands 1 and 3.** | | |
| • Shows only limited control of a few grammatical forms.  
• Uses a vocabulary of isolated words and phrases. | • Has very limited control of sounds and intonation of words.  
• It is often incomprehensible. | • Has evident difficulty maintaining simple exchanges.  
• Requires additional support. |
| **Performance below Band 1** | | |
# Appendix 2

Peer-feedback Analysis Rubric  
(Teacher use only)

## #1 General Topic: Accuracy

- **Accuracy** – Use of simple grammatical forms correctly (parts of the speech, simple progressive and future tenses) / Uses a range of appropriate vocabulary when talking about everyday situations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Elaborated feedback. Feedback addresses all aspects regarding accuracy. This could be either positive or indicating how to improve.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Feedback is somewhat elaborated. Elaboration probably addresses <strong>Interaction and Communication</strong> but may address only 1 of the specific aspects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Feedback is incomplete - may address <strong>Interaction and Communication</strong> but is not elaborated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Absence of feedback related to <strong>Interaction and Communication</strong>.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## #2 General Topic: Pronunciation

- **Pronunciation** – Mostly comprehensible / some control of sounds and intonation of words.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Elaborated feedback. Feedback addresses all aspects regarding <strong>Pronunciation</strong>. This could be either positive or indicating how to improve.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Feedback is somewhat elaborated. Elaboration probably addresses <strong>Pronunciation</strong> but may address only 1 of the specific aspects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Feedback is incomplete - may address <strong>Pronunciation</strong> but is not elaborated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Absence of feedback related to <strong>Pronunciation</strong>.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## #3 General Topic: Interactive Communication

- **Interactive Communication** – Maintains simple exchanges / Requires very little support.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Elaborated feedback. Feedback addresses all aspects regarding <strong>Interactive Communication</strong>. This could be either positive or indicating how to improve.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Feedback is somewhat elaborated. Elaboration probably addresses <strong>Interactive Communication</strong>, but may address only 1 of the specific aspects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Feedback is incomplete - may address <strong>Interactive Communication</strong> but is not elaborated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Absence of feedback related to <strong>Interactive Communication</strong>.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 3

Backwards design lesson plan

Design from Your Goals

Instructional design of units for transfer of learning to real-life contexts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution:</th>
<th>English Forever</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year of study:</td>
<td>Adults 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student description:</td>
<td>Learners with an A2 level sample of 8 students age range between 17-37 years old</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor:</td>
<td>Gerald Yepez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit title:</td>
<td>Carnivals Around the World</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weeks:</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours:</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Writing your transfer goal and show the standards you used.

I want my students to critically analyze with a rubric, educational videos about carnivals around the world and understand peer-feedback so that, in the long run, and on

---

1This unit design process was adapted from the Guillot Design Process worksheet (2017) Design from Your Goals based on Wiggins-McTighe Backward Design.
their own, they will create their own videos and provide comments to their partners in a webpage to improve oral skills.

| A. If we see & hear them do this, they can transfer this learning: | B. If we see & hear them do this, then they cannot (yet) transfer: | C. What I will commit to doing differently in my classroom to ensure my results look like  
Column A: |
|---|---|---|
| Speaking for a specific audience.  
Connect speaking interaction to real-life situations  
Adapt English videos and give their opinion.  
Selecting relevant information from a rubric to give feedback.  
Have accuracy while developing the different videos  
Participate in class debates, discussions and interactions. | Misunderstanding their partners’ questions while producing spoken interaction.  
Being biased while giving feedback.  
Not being interested in participating nor recording the videos.  
Not having proper organization and pronunciation while producing oral skills.  
Being too broad while giving peer-feedback.  
Not being able to follow a rubric properly.  
Trying to translate words before producing their speech. | Create a safe classroom environment where making mistakes is part of the learning process.  
Offer immediate feedback on the progress of their videos and the feedback they give to their partners.  
Give learners the chance to peer-assess their partners.  
Have them to provide peer feedback on constant basis and not only in the webpage.  
Offer coaching sessions to improve students spoken production. |
Your Summative Assessment Task

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>To give peer-feedback based on educational videos regarding carnivals around the world.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Role</td>
<td>You are a famous national geographic researcher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience</td>
<td>People who watch your weekly program, on the television.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situation</td>
<td>You have selected carnival in the world, and you are the most relevant researcher on the matter; people of the city are anxious for your video about the carnivals around the world. As a researcher, you are posting your video on a webpage, and you are responding to two other videos.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>Review other researchers’ videos after uploading your own one about carnivals around the world.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standards</td>
<td>Your video and review have to meet speaking standards as presented in the A2 rubric a solid feedback must be provided. To peers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What knowledge and skills will your students need to succeed in the assessment you just designed?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What students will need to know</th>
<th>The skills students will need to be able to do</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basic grammar structure and tenses such as the simple present, simple past, and future.</td>
<td>Providing peer feedback by following a rubric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary words for A2 learners</td>
<td>Produce discussions and interact with their partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic pronunciation of words</td>
<td>Understand and analyze educational videos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carnaval</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create a video and upload.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**V. Learning Activities** (Stage 3) Summary of activities for draft 1 (full detailed activities for grade)

**Transfer goal:**

**Abbreviated Performance Task:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Activities (from the student's perspective)</th>
<th>Intention</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>WEEK 1 (6 HOURS)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction of the topic by presenting different pictures about carnivals around the world and having students discussing in pairs</td>
<td>HOOK</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation of the assessment rubric and modeling on how to give peer feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WEEK 2 (6 HOURS)</strong></td>
<td>INITIATING</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students watch a video about the carnival knotting festival and discuss the main ideas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Students create their own video based on their previous discussion and upload it to www.teletrabag.com.

**WEEK 3-4 (12 HOURS)**

- Speaking task pre-test by watching the videos on the web page and providing peer-feedback.
- Learners discuss the importance of carnivals and practice for their upcoming video production.

Students write a summary on the aspects that they can improve in the next video and on how the feedback has impacted them.

**WEEK 6-7-8 (9 HOURS)**

| | DEVELOPING | X |
| Students watch a video on the cultural background of carnivals. |
| Students discuss and produce ideas to preserve their cultural background. |
| Students write a small summary of how carnivals have affected cultural backgrounds. |

**WEEK 5-6 (12 HOURS)**

| Creation of the last videos based on the Peer-feedback received |
| Write comments on their partners improved videos |
| Likert survey |

| FORMATIVE ASSESSMENT |
| REVIEW | x |

| FORMATIVE ASSESSMENT |
| CLOSURE |
| x |
Learning process:  A = Acquisition, M = Meaning Making, T = Transfer

Intention:  Hook, formative assessment, initiating, developing, review, closure, research, other.

Indicate Week 1, 2, etc. and the number of hours.

Essential Questions support the transfer goal, signal inquiry, guide instruction, and can be asked over and over throughout the unit without reaching a final answer.

1. What elements do I need while giving peer-feedback?

2. Why is peer-feedback important when I am analyzing a video to improve my oral skills?

Transfer Goal:

I want my students to critically analyze with a rubric educational video about carnivals around the world and understand peer-feedback so that, in the long run, and on their own, they will create their own videos and provide comments to their partners in a webpage and improve oral skills.

Abbreviated Performance Task: Imagine you are a famous researcher; you are analyzing videos about sharks for national geographic, so viewers are interested in your program.
On-going Self-Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>As I reflect on student learning, what will I do if my plan is not yielding my expected results?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If my plan is not yielding my expected results, interactive videos will be chosen more carefully and implemented in which the primary target will be improving oral skills by giving constant peer-feedback through practical tasks and the use of technology. Fixing any further problem in the ongoing by making sure that they are aware of how to assess their peers, modeling will be a robust strategy to tailor activities for students.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3 thoughts on “VIDEO 1”

Franklin dice:
Leandro always shows fluency, Tessa also, but he lacked a bit of relaxation, a little more naturalness. I liked.

Responder

Giulia dice:
In general, the participants of the video keep a conversation in a fluid way, but Tessa should improve her expressions and movements when she is talking with other person

Responder

Génesis dice:
Tessa your pronunciation was good but you didn’t use the past tense very well

Responder
3 thoughts on “VIDEO 2”

Leandro dice:
The conversation was short but the idea is clear, interaction so flat.

Responder

Franklin dice:
Giuliana’s answer seemed clear and simple, but it can improve. there is a little more security in it.

Responder

Génesis dice:
Guiliana you has good pronunciation but your answer was very short

Responder

2 thoughts on “VIDEO 3”

Franklin dice:
I like it. Yomira understands the question and I feel that she answers it well 4 for Yomira.

Responder

Génesis dice:
Yomira, you must improve your pronunciation and use the past tense correctly

Responder
Giulia dice:

In that case, Leandro has a good vocabulary management for this reason he deserves a 4 in his score, only he just have to improve his expressions to make the conversation more natural.

Responder
4 thoughts on “VIDEO 5”

**Franklin** dice:
I liked this video. there is a more natural interaction of both. I can clearly understand the conversation.
4 Responder

**Yomira** dice:
Genesis do it very great. her english is good, she has very control of her vocabulary.
4 Responder

**Yomira** dice:
Genesis does it very great. her english is good, she has very control of her vocabulary.
4 Responder

**Giulia** dice:
In general Genesis can keep a conversation with another person, but needs more vocabulary, that’s why in that aspect I give her a 3 in her score
4 Responder

2 thoughts on “VIDEO 6”

**Franklin** dice:
**Editor**
The next video will be better.
4 Responder

**Genesis** dice:
**Editor**
Franklin, you used the past tense well but your answer was short and repeated twice
4 Responder
Appendix 5

Survey

Level of students’ perspectives

Name:
Date:

Put a check (✔) on the box that best describes your level of satisfaction of each of the statements below.
## Appendix 6

### Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (5)</th>
<th>Agree (4)</th>
<th>Undecided (3)</th>
<th>Disagree (2)</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree (1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The use of educational videos was useful to enhance my oral skills development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The video tasks used in class were helpful for my learning process.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The videos presented by the teacher helped me be aware of correct pronunciation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The videos presented by the teacher helped me be aware of grammatical forms.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The videos presented by the teacher helped me be aware of the correct language used.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Working in groups to participate in discussions was useful for improving my oral skills.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Working in groups to participate in role-plays was useful for improving my oral skills.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Working in groups to participate in debates was useful for improving my oral skills.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Giving peer-feedback helped me improve my speaking skills.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Receiving feedback from my peers enhanced my learning process.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>I felt comfortable using rubrics to evaluate my peers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>I enjoyed evaluating the videos of my peers through a website.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>I feel the use of peer-feedback supported my learning process.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>I need more practice to provide feedback.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>I feel the use of video activities supported my learning process.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The utility of the innovation survey**

Order the items from 1 to 5 to indicate their relevance being number one the least relevant and number 5 the most relevant.

**Name:**

**Date:**
Appendix 7
Institutional consent letter

Guayaquil, 31 de Agosto de 2018

Msc. Karen Villacis
Rectora

Msc. Mariuxi Briones
Vicerrectora

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>SELF MADE VIDEOS</th>
<th>PEER-FEEDBACK</th>
<th>CLASS DISCUSSIONS</th>
<th>INTERACTION WITH YOUR PEERS</th>
<th>RUBRICS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. which of the following elements was the most useful to improve your oral skills.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. which of the following elements was the least useful to improve oral skills.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. which of the following elements made your learning experience more realistic.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. which of the following elements made your learning experience the least realistic.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. which of the following elements do you feel the most confidence with.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Msc.
Mariuxi Briones
Vicerrectora
Copol English Institute (COPEI)

Yo, Gerald Alberto Yépez Jouvin estudiante de la Maestría en Pedagogía de los Idiomas Nacionales y Extranjeros con mención en la Enseñanza de Inglés, Cohorte 2017, por este medio comunico que actualmente me encuentro en el proceso de trabajo de titulación.
El trabajo de titulación que he elegido es la escritura de un artículo que reporta los resultados de una innovación educativa. Por este motivo, solicito a usted muy respetuosamente, me permita realizar la innovación *The effect of peer-feedback and educational videos to improve oral skills*. Esta innovación se enfoca en el desarrollo de la producción oral de los estudiantes de idioma inglés.

El objetivo final de la innovación es mejorar las prácticas de enseñanza en beneficio de los estudiantes. Este trabajo se desarrollará dentro de las horas de clase. Los costos de copias y otros materiales estarán a mi cargo. El periodo de aplicación será durante los meses de agosto a diciembre de 2018.

Estaré atento a contestar cualquier inquietud. Adjunto la propuesta de la innovación.

Atentamente,

Lcdo. Gerald Yépez

CI: 0930955141

---

### Appendix 8

**Demographic information table**

*Research Topic: Peer-feedback and self-made videos to improve oral skills*

**Demographic Information**

**Age:**

[ ]

**Gender:**

Male ( ) Female ( )

**Ethnicity:**

[ ]

**Social-economic class:**

( ) low-income ( ) middle class ( ) high-income

**Language(s) Check all languages that apply to you:**

Spanish ( ) English ( ) Other ( )

**EFL background:**

[ ]

**Special necessities:**

[ ]
Other skills: ______________________________________________________________

Access to computers: Yes ( )  No ( )

Access to a smart phone: Yes ( )  No ( )

Access to technological devices from: Home ( )  School ( )  Municipality ( )  Other ( )

Level of confidence while using technology: Beginners ( )  Intermediate ( )  Advanced user ( )