



Peer Feedback and Students' Recorded Videos to Improve Oral Skills: An Action
Research Study

Author: Heinz Javier Zambrano Pilco

Guide: María Rossana Ramírez Ávila

Presented as Partial Fulfillment for the Degree of Magíster en Pedagogía de los Idiomas
Nacionales y Extranjeros con Mención en la Enseñanza de Inglés. CES: RPC-SO-25-N°.416-
2016. Cohort 2017-2019. Guayaquil, September 23rd, 2019.

PEER FEEDBACK AND STUDENTS' RECORDED VIDEOS

Abstract

This research study focused on improving oral skills through the use of peer-feedback and students' recorded videos. Participants of this study were twenty-eight students from a public institution located in a small parish in Guayas province. A first video, a fourth video, the rubrics that learners used to provide the feedback to their peers, and a Likert scale survey were the instruments to collect data in this research. At the end of this journey, the results showed that the learners improved their oral competences in general terms but also in their accuracy, choice of words, and interactive communication. Results indicated that the first video presented a mean of 2.66 but the last one a mean of 5.30. The outcome of the survey displayed positive points of view about the application of the innovation. Consequently, the use of recorded videos was proven to improve students' oral skills. This study can also be a reference for instructors that want to enhance their students' oral performance and update their teaching practices.

Key words: oral skills, peer feedback, students' recorded videos

PEER FEEDBACK AND STUDENTS' RECORDED VIDEOS

Resumen

Esta investigación se enfocó en mejorar las habilidades orales a través de retroalimentación de compañeros y videos grabados por estudiantes. El presente estudio tuvo como participantes a veinte y ocho estudiantes de una institución pública localizada en una pequeña parroquia de la provincia del Guayas. Un primer video, un cuarto video, las rúbricas que los estudiantes usaron para proveer retroalimentación a sus compañeros y una encuesta de Likert fueron los instrumentos de esta investigación. El primer video presentó una media de 2.66 pero el último una media de 5.30. Al final de este estudio, los resultados confirman que los participantes mejoraron sus competencias orales en términos generales, pero también, su precisión, selección de las palabras y comunicación interactiva. El resultado de la encuesta mostró efectos positivos acerca de la aplicación de la innovación. Consecuentemente, se confirma que el uso de videos grabados mejora las destrezas orales de los estudiantes. Este estudio puede también ser un referente para instructores que quieran mejorar el desempeño oral de sus estudiantes al momento que actualicen sus prácticas de enseñanza.

Palabras clave: Destrezas orales, retroalimentación de compañeros, videos grabados por estudiantes

PEER FEEDBACK AND STUDENTS' RECORDED VIDEOS

Peer Feedback and Students' Recorded Videos to Improve the Oral Skills: An Action Research Study

According to the report from the English Proficiency Index (English First, 2018), Ecuador presents a low-level of English competency which places it in the 13th place among seventeen Latin American countries. This low level of English is more noticeable in the speaking skill, and this could be due to the implementation of traditional classes. The goal for Ecuadorian EFL instructors is to improve this reality providing non teacher-focused and meaningful sessions. In teacher-centered classes are teachers and not students who answer most of the questions without learners' participation (Emaliana, 2017). Wang (2014) agreed with this thought remarking that these kinds of lessons which are non-student-centered do not give the learners enough opportunities to use their L2. These classes reduce pupils' motivation and compromises with the process of acquiring the language (Ministerio de Educación, 2010).

Ecuador and other countries are trying to enhance the levels of English and specifically oral skills. For instance, in a research conducted in Ethiopia, Make and Yonas (2018) established that audiovisual materials replace monotonous teaching atmospheres increasing students' interest, participation, and developing their speaking abilities. The oral performance of English as a Foreign Language is linked to the management of vocabulary, the utilization of body language, pronunciation and intonation models, production of pieces of language, the verification of oral production, incentive, and compromise (Sánchez-Narváez & Chavarro-Vargas, 2017). Karimy and Pishkar (2017) expressed that accuracy and fluency are components of oral skills necessary for speaking proficiency. When the instructor teaches about productive skills like speaking and writing, formal accuracy will grow into an urgent issue. Additionally, Brown (2007) mentioned some relevant aspects like redundancy and the

PEER FEEDBACK AND STUDENTS' RECORDED VIDEOS

use of contractions which according to him are relevant factors of pronunciation to deliver a message effectively.

Several research studies have been conducted to target different speaking components. In an action research which took place in Chile, Molina and Briesmaster (2017) expressed that fluency is the tensest point to polish in the speaking skill. A recent study developed in the Ecuadorian Amazon region showed how stimulated learners were when they participated in communicative activities. The reason for this motivation is the sensation of improving their fluency, pronunciation, and performance through the practice of English in a different, real, and entertaining way (Cabrera, Quiñónez, Castillo, González, & Ochoa, 2016). All before-mentioned studies have been developed at higher education levels. This study fills a gap in research as there are no studies based on teaching and or learning EFL in a rural public institution.

In the English as a Foreign Language curriculum of 2016, the Ecuadorian government mentioned that the instruction of oral skills requires a meaningful and communicative context. The Ecuadorian syllabus divided the oral communication thread into three sub-threads: listening skills, spoken production, and spoken interaction. The spoken production centers on the fundamental essence of fluency over accuracy, while the spoken interaction promotes the use of cooperative working, oral and non-oral interaction, and the participation of pupils in formal and informal contexts (Ministerio de Educación, 2016).

The Ecuadorian ministry of education established in 2012 that the English Language Learning Standards (ELLS) determine the student's outcome. Focusing on the oral competencies and according to these standards, by reaching their A2 level students must be able to demonstrate the appropriate use of sentences and phrases in single routine assignments inside the individual, educative, public, and professional domains (Ministerio de Educación, 2012). Nonetheless, the problem was detected after a placement test, it was

PEER FEEDBACK AND STUDENTS' RECORDED VIDEOS

proved that the participants in this study were not in an A2 level where they should be, but they were in an A1 level which was necessary to improve.

Peer feedback and student's recorded videos were implemented in this research to reach the English Language Learning Standards for A1 level for speaking production. Following these criteria, the trainees should be able to: produce slow, hesitant, planned dialogues; for speaking interaction, students will have the capability to interact and participate in brief informal dialogues directly by asking and answering simple questions about the learners' personal background. Lastly, communication is dependent on repetitions at a slower rate of speech, rephrasing, and repair (Ministerio de Educación, 2012).

To reach the previous mentioned standards, peer feedback which effectivity was evident in other studies was also applied in this investigation to enhance the speaking skills. Smith (2017) expressed that instructors that want to enhance the teaching-learning process should bring more feedback to their educative centers. Also, time was one of the obstacles for tutors mainly because of the high number of trainees, peer feedback appears as a valuable tool in classrooms. However, sometimes learners refuse peer-feedback, not just during the oral performance but in writing. For authors like Tsui and Ng (2000), learners preferred the feedback provided by the instructor instead of that from their peers. The authors explained that some students think only the teacher is competent to provide the required feedback. This research was conducted to improve writing.

There are not enough studies about how to enhance oral skills through peer feedback. Fang, Cassim, Hsu, and Chen (2018) stated that through the use of a mobile application a group of learners from a university in Taiwan were able to participate in conversation tasks and deliver feedback. The results from that investigation showed that although the students did not enhance their communication strategy use, the application of mobile-based peer feedback helped them to supervise their spoken production obtaining and delivering adequate

PEER FEEDBACK AND STUDENTS' RECORDED VIDEOS

feedback which improved their oral competence. Similarly, Lee (2017) mentioned that peer feedback influences EFL learner's oral presentation skills positively. This research also developed in a university showed how a group of apprentices increased the quality of their oral presentations after working in small groups and receiving peer feedback, in addition to the feedback their tutor gave them. Something to highlight is that most studies about peer-feedback occur at universities in developed countries and not in high school level in Latin America, which is a gap that is necessary to fill.

This investigation also includes video methods to improve speaking efficiency. Jensen, Mattheis, and Johnson (2012) stated that using videos contributes to diverse opportunities for the apprentices at university level since this establishes more interactive and dynamic sessions. Additionally, the application of videos supplies the learners with affirmative convictions and personal dependence. In this research, different from Jensen, Mattheis and Johnson's study, the students recorded their own videos, and participants were high school students.

This research explored the following research questions:

1. To what extent will students improve their oral skills with the implementation of peer feedback and student's recorded videos?
2. What type of feedback will students provide?
3. What are students' perspectives towards the innovation?

Literature Review

This research has as a primary goal to improve learner's oral competences using peer feedback and students' recorded videos. The approach applied was based on Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) principles. For this reason, this section examines concepts about Communicate Language Teaching, oral skills, peer feedback, and educational videos.

Communicative Language Teaching (CLT)

CLT is a group of principles related to the aims of language instruction activities and the role of pupils and instructors inside the classrooms (Richards, 2006). Among the principles of CLT, Nunan (1991) mentioned stress on the apprenticeship to communicate utilizing interplay in the target language, and the use of authentic material into the learning atmosphere, to supply the trainees with opportunities to concentrate on their learning instead of the language. Additionally, an effort to build a connection between the language learning inside and outside the classroom.

Speaking

Cantón and Pérez (2017) defined oral communicative competencies as those that permit speakers of a foreign language to interact correctly with other users. In the same way, Swain (1980) established competences in second language approach as the speaker-hearer's knowledge of his/her language. This author added that competence links to the cognizance of grammar and other aspects of language differing from a performance in real use.

Fattah (2006) defined speaking as a bilateral trial which encompasses real communication, data, and feelings. In this top-down perspective, the author addressed the spoken texts as the teamwork between two or more people in a shared atmosphere and time. Similarly, Luoma (2004) described speaking as an interactive process where the meaning is built and material is generated, received and indicted. In the same way, Farabi, Hassanvand, and Gorjian (2017) considered that speaking is the form that learners use to convey information, show purposes, and expectations. These three authors agreed that during the speaking activity the actors focus is on providing and receiving real messages and interplaying in a full way. Additionally, the material or information is acquired, processed, and transmitted showing the intentions and hopes of their performers. Scarcella and Oxford

PEER FEEDBACK AND STUDENTS' RECORDED VIDEOS

(1994) stated some problems pupils confront when speaking. Even though learners start using the new language in a more reliable way, they will not have an accurate or correct language.

On the other hand, accuracy, fluency, and pronunciation are main components of speaking. As part of oral competences, Srivastava (2014) defined accuracy as the capability that learners own to articulate sentences in a correct grammar form. Besides, this author expressed that accuracy is necessary to succeed at the moment of communicating. Similarly, Pereira, Bermúdez, and Medina (2018) stated that an English learner who is trying to generate accurate L2 will observe automatic assertive outcome when practicing the language due to the relationship between speaking and the nature of the linguistic characteristics.

Brand and Götz (2011) defined speaking fluency as the automaticity and speed of speech production. On the other hand, Crowther, Trofimovich, Isaacs, and Saito (2015) expressed that a person can make a grammar mistake during dialogue, for instance, using in a wrong way the third person singular (she live vs. she lives) but this learner can still speak fluently.

Pronunciation is an essential part of speaking. It is the capability to use the right stress, rhythm, and intonation of a word in a spoken language. It is possible to judge a person by the form they speak. Consequently, someone with a deficient pronunciation can be judged as a person with poor education or without knowledge (Kelly, 2000). Besides, Bilash (2009) stated that pronunciation is fundamental not only at the moment of acquiring a language but also when using it. Although, all the aspects of speaking are important, this study focused on accuracy.

Grammar Structure

Grammar emerges from the natural framework of the language, making it possible for different functions to converge with common rules principally for communication. Erdem and Celik (2011) defined grammar as the area that analyzes the sounds, word kinds and their

PEER FEEDBACK AND STUDENTS' RECORDED VIDEOS

structure, their sequence, and performance in the sentence besides the rules about their conjugation. Similarly, Li and Song (2007) pointed out that grammar helps learners to comprehend the written and spoken language right. If students know grammar, they can edit their output, and it enhances students' communication proficiency.

Muneera and Shameem (2013) expressed that in EFL instruction the knowledge of context, and grammar, especially tenses represent the hardest part for learners to domain. In this innovation, students used the simple present and the present perfect tense. Azar (2002) expressed that the simple present tense shows situations or incidents that always exist, constantly, these actions exist at this moment, existed in the past, and probably will be present in the future. On the other hand, the present perfect tense is formed with the auxiliary verb *have* and the past participle form of another verb. Huddleston and Pullum (2002) mentioned that there are four principal uses of the present perfect which are the continuative, the experiential/existential, the resultative, and the perfect of the recent past.

Feedback

Different authors showed how effective peer feedback is. Hattie and Timperley (2007) introduced feedback as the enlightenment concerning an apprentice's production or comprehension. It can be provided by an instructor, parent, self, text, or peer becoming a result of learner's throughput. In the same way, Scott (2014) presented feedback as the comments or information that tutors provide to their pupils after a task or presentation to improve their future performances. Following this, William (2016) established that feedback is a constant cycle in instruction. He defined it as a process where one person observes another's performance or task, check it, take notes about it, and gives a score or reflection which later will be used to improve performance.

However, Harmandaoğlu, Balçıkanlı, and Cephe (2016) established that learners and instructors have a different judgment about oral error scores or reflection. These authors

PEER FEEDBACK AND STUDENTS' RECORDED VIDEOS

remarked that tutors do not always provide oral correction, while pupils expect it. Also, while instructors deliver non-direct feedback, students prefer a kind of feedback that is straight and clear.

Joo (2016) expressed that in order to achieve the goal and enhance the learners' speaking ability tutors must fulfill some requirements. These terms include adequate instruction, appropriate knowledge of learner's traits, but also concordance with the syllabus. This author concluded that to acquire the required oral competencies it is crucial not to zoom just in the final product, but in the process of having a determinant role during the self and peer- feedback. When the efficiency of self- and peer- assessment is enhanced by peer feedback, instructors can center on improving their pedagogic techniques reducing their amount of work (Patri, 2002).

Similarly, in a study about assessment, Babaii, Taghaddomi, and Pashmforooshet (2015) remarked that to diminish an existing disarrangement between learners' and teachers' assessment during the speaking self- appraisal, it is vital to facilitate the pupils the rating criteria and the complete drill session. Additionally, in another study Prihatini, Prasetyarini and Sutopo (2015) mentioned that the students can comprehend right pronunciation through peer correction and that the use of this strategy is helpful to achieve learners' understanding. Besides, peer correction enhances the input of the apprentices to the speaking class. However, not all the pupils are able to deliver peer-feedback with the appraisalment criteria that a tutor owns (Falchikov, 2005). To succeed, it was necessary to apply qualified peer-feedback and constructive feedback which was based on observation.

Educational Videos to Improve Oral Skills

The use of videos to transfer messages in an audio-visual setting is basic. Secules, Herron, and Tomasello (1992) showed that also from two decades before, research instructors centered on providing their students with real situations during the learning process to

PEER FEEDBACK AND STUDENTS' RECORDED VIDEOS

succeed at the moment of learning a foreign language. Similarly, in other studies, Canning-Wilson (2000) found out that learners preferred to acquire the language through the observation of videos instead of just listening to audios on the radio or taking notes in the classroom. In the same way, Katchen (2002) remarked that native speaker's media (sitcoms, films, and television shows) provide original language entry that learners require. Additionally, Ochoa and Ortíz (2018) focused on the improvement of verbal presentations abilities in a 3D virtual land named Moviestorm machinima, contrasting it with videos made in real life. Thereby, the use of these two sorts of videos tried to develop oral communication skills, particularly verbal presentations in English and improve cooperative work among learners.

Berk (2009) mentioned how positive videos are and highlighted that videos can be motivational if they are combined adequately with exercises like making a selection of core parts and discuss about them with the learners, stop the videos at any part to remark something important or repeat it for practice. Additionally, it establishes a moment to meditate about what the apprentices have observed. On the other hand, to achieve their goals inside the classroom, EFL instructors must know precisely what those aims are at the moment of applying the videos. The crucial and first goal is to ease the growth of the EFL learner's language abilities, paying particular attention to listening and speaking abilities (Bajrami & Ismaili, 2016). Hadijah (2016) agreed with the role of instructors and remarked that they have to face challenges while applying videos in their classrooms; for example: the ability tutors need and the availability of technology tools. This author noticed that teachers must be able to select the appropriate videos to help learners acquire the required language proficiency.

Innovation

The innovation that was applied consisted of using educational videos (Appendix 1), students' recorded videos, and peer feedback to enhance accuracy while talking, choosing,

PEER FEEDBACK AND STUDENTS' RECORDED VIDEOS

using words correctly, and providing a coherent message. This process was developed during the regular daily classes and using the student's texts and materials as stated in the backward design plan (Appendix 2). The time assigned was forty-five teaching hours. Before and during this project the learners were provided with the basic vocabulary of the unit, the required rubrics (Appendix 3), and training about how to provide quality and authentic feedback after watching the videos during speaking activities.

Based on the observation of videos and the topic of the unit of the text, the learners performed dialogues in groups of five and six that the teacher previously formed. Students recorded these oral presentations in groups and uploaded them to a private group on a Facebook account. Each member of the group watched the videos and provided individual feedback. They used tools like google translator, physical and online dictionaries, and the assistance of the tutor.

Sometimes, students did not complete their tasks in class and did it as homework, or in a different time using the tutor's computer. Learners had their rubrics at hand. This helped them at the moment of grading each component. The pupils observed each video, they focused on accuracy, and they used the rubric to provide feedback.

Methodological Design

This study enforced quantitative and qualitative approaches at the moment of analyzing data. Action research was applied. Ferrance (2000) defined action research as a cooperative action that coworkers develop trying to find out solutions to the daily problems faced at schools and trying to enhance learners' performance. Rashidi (2014) agreed with the fact that through action research investigators give solutions to issues and added that educators enhance their professional growth.

PEER FEEDBACK AND STUDENTS' RECORDED VIDEOS

Participants

The learners involved in this investigation were students from a public institution located in a Parish in Yaguachi, Ecuador. Their English level was A1. The age of this group of 28 participants was between 15 and 16 years old. The majority of these trainees did not receive English during elementary school, they started to learn the language three years ago.

Instruments

The instruments used during this innovation were the first video where the speaking level of the students was observed (Appendix 5), a fourth video which showed improvement as result of this innovation (Appendix 6). They were both developed in class. Other instruments were, a survey (Appendix 7), and the rubrics that students used to provide feedback to their peers.

Pre and posttest

Two videos were used as a pre and posttest. The first video took place on week one. In groups of five and six people, the pupils developed a topic about a lesson they were working on: "What kind of traveler are you?" The students prepared a video which lasted about two minutes. They talked about the places they have visited and their preferences at the moment of travel.

Video number four was used as the posttest. It took place during week five. In this final video, the learners talked about healthy habits. Also, they worked in groups, and the video lasted about two minutes as the previous ones. They were graded with a rubric and results were compared to determine improvement.

Rubrics

The rubrics were in English and Spanish due to students' proficiency. They were the same to assess the first and last video. They provided the highest score to the most accurate use of basic grammatical structure about the simple present tense, present perfect, and

PEER FEEDBACK AND STUDENTS' RECORDED VIDEOS

sentence pattern; and, the lowest score to the use of basic structure about the simple present and present perfect but making frequent errors. Similarly, these rubrics gave a high score to the use of the taught vocabulary and a low grade to those that used the taught vocabulary making frequent errors. Finally, the top scores were given to those students who produced communication in an interactive way and the lowest punctuation to those who did not produce an interactive communication. This rubric was validated by three reviewers. They checked them and suggested to improve them by adding specific grammar tenses like simple present and present perfect.

Students were trained to use the rubric during the second week. They applied it to provide feedback. The rubrics showed the use of simple present and present perfect tenses, vocabulary, and interactive communication in a band from 2 points to 0.5 points.

Additionally, the instructor had another rubric to establish the quality of peer feedback. This rubric gave the maximum score of three to the feedback that addressed accuracy, vocabulary, and interactive communication in complete form, it gave a score of two if the feedback was somewhat elaborated, a grade of one if the feedback was incomplete and zero if there was an absence of the feedback regarded to each component.

The results obtained from the first and the last video were uploaded to excel and then to the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) program to obtain the descriptive statistics like minimum, maximum, mean, and standard deviation. This information was used to obtain the effect size.

Survey

The learners were asked to fill a survey of Likert scale with five options that were interpreted as “always,” “usually,” “occasionally,” “seldom”, and “never.” They had to select the closest choice to what they think regarding each one of the statements. This survey was applied in week five, it was made of fifteen questions collected through a paper survey.

PEER FEEDBACK AND STUDENTS' RECORDED VIDEOS

Through the use of this survey, the researcher had a better idea regarding the learners' perspectives about the innovation.

In order to analyze this data, the mean was calculated in each item of the survey to notice the tendency of students' answers. It is displayed in a table which highlights the results.

Ethical Standards

During this research project, the data provided by the participants were confidential. Before starting this process, the institution supplied all the facilities to carry it out. Students received the required information about the aspects related to the innovation, its goal, and their roles as a core part of the whole process. Participation in this innovation was free and without any pressure. Additionally, to increase the reliability, and to reduce any feeling of bias during this process, there was another evaluator besides the main researcher.

Results

This section presents the results of this research through tables and graphs. Data show the progress of the learners. Here, it is displayed how students evolved from the first video until the fourth video. This section is organized according to the research questions through the applied methods and instruments.

First Research Question

The first research question was: To what extent will students improve their oral skills with the implementation of peer feedback and student's recorded videos? To establish the effect and identify if the application of peer feedback and videos enhanced learners' oral skills, it was necessary to compare the first and the last video. They were evaluated through the rubrics. The results appear in table 1. The first video had a mean of 2.66 and the last one a mean of 5.30. This means there was an improvement after the innovation.

PEER FEEDBACK AND STUDENTS' RECORDED VIDEOS

Table 1

Pre-post video results

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Standard Deviation
Pre test	28	1.50	5.50	2.66	1.27
Post test	28	3.00	6.00	5.30	0.96

Table 2 shows the results of the research but through the subcategories of the rubric, which are accuracy, vocabulary, and interactive communication. One more time, it is possible to observe how after applying this innovation the oral skills of this group evolved significantly. Based on these results, it is possible to answer the first research question presented in this investigation positively.

Table 2

Results of the research through the subcategories of the rubric.

Components	Mean	Standard Deviation
Accuracy (pre)	0.84	0.39
Accuracy (post)	1.75	0.35
Vocabulary (pre)	0.95	0.52
Vocabulary (post)	1.77	0.32
Int. Com. (pre)	0.88	0.48
Int.Com. (post)	1.79	0.35
Accuracy (pre)	1.75	0.35
Accuracy (post)	1.71	0.35
Vocabulary (pre)	1.77	0.32
Vocabulary (post)	1.79	0.37

Second Research Question

The second research question was: What type of feedback will students provide? During this innovation, students provided both qualitative and quantitative feedback. For

PEER FEEDBACK AND STUDENTS' RECORDED VIDEOS

qualitative feedback pupils tried to be comprehensible and used the appropriate vocabulary employing an online translator, dictionaries, and asking the teacher to clarify any doubt during the first video, but later that necessity of asking for help was minimized. On the other hand, for quantitative feedback, learners assigned grades to their peers. Table 3 shows the grades of the last video compared with those that the instructor provided. Results indicated that both grades were similar. This demonstrated that students improved in the skill of providing feedback.

Table 3

Students' vs teachers' grades

	Mean	N	Std. Deviation
Students	5.18	28	0.85
Teacher	5.30	28	0.96

In table four, it is possible to note how the results also displayed the quality of the peer feedback that the students provided to their peers. One more time, it is observed how the learners in this area also showed a significant evolution.

Table 4

Peer-feedback Analysis Rubric of first and fourth video

Component	Pre test		Post test	
	Mean	Standard D.	Mean	Standard D.
Accuracy	2	0.51	3	0.58
Vocabulary	1	0.68	3	0.58
Interactive Com	1	0.69	3	0.56

The qualitative analysis indicated that this group of learners focused on accuracy and vocabulary. The students emphasized on accuracy at the moment of formulating questions, and the use of most of the learned vocabulary. For instance, some of the learners agreed with

PEER FEEDBACK AND STUDENTS' RECORDED VIDEOS

their partners when they used words like healthy, unhealthy, and sedentary, among others, but also, encouraged them to use more of the previously learned words. Additionally, it was observed that participants enhanced their capacity to provide feedback since the grades they provided were similar to those of the teacher.

Third Research Question

The third research question was: What are students' perspectives towards the innovation? For this answer, a Likert survey that contained 15 questions was applied. In table number 5, the highlighted areas show the answers the learners provided. There was a positive perspective from pupils toward the innovation.

Table 5

Survey

Questions	Always (5)	Usually (4)	Occasionally (3)	Seldom (2)	Never (1)
1. Have you used peer feedback in previous courses?					
2. Do you consider peer feedback as a valuable part in the speaking process?					
3. Was it difficult for you to provide feedback to your peers?					
4. Was it difficult for you to understand the feedback provided by your peers?					
5. Was it difficult for you to apply the feedback provided by your peers?					
6. Do you feel the interaction with your peers was convenient?					
7. Did peer-feedback help you to enhance your accuracy?					
8. Was the use of rubrics easy to understand?					
9. Were The videos used by the instructor engaging?					
10. Did you feel comfortable being your presentations judged and scored by your peers?					
11. Would you recommend instructors to use peer feedback to improve other skills?					
12. After receiving peer feedback do you consider that just the instructor has the capacity to provide feedback?					
13. Would you like to continue working in groups to keep enhancing your oral skills?					

PEER FEEDBACK AND STUDENTS' RECORDED VIDEOS

14. Do you still feel nervous when you speak in English to your peers or instructors?					
15. Did you perceive your partners had problems to apply the provided feedback?					

Discussion

After analyzing the positive results obtained from this investigation, these results aligned with previous research and theories. For instance, it is clearly stated how helpful it is for learners the application of peer feedback which can come from different members of the educative environment like instructors, peers, self, and texts, among others (Hattie & Timperley, 2007). Emaliana (2017) mentioned that in teacher-centered classes, the learners have a role of just spectators, which changed with the implementation of peer feedback and students' recorded videos. Similarly, Smith (2017) expressed that if instructors want to enhance the learners' speaking skills, they must increase the use of peer feedback in the classroom and diminish the idea that just the instructor can assess. This was observed during this investigation, where learners enhanced their oral competencies through the use of feedback obtained from their peers.

Nunan (1991) stated one of the principles of CLT, which focusses on the benefits of providing the students with opportunities to concentrate on their learning and not just on the language. Through the use of peer feedback, it was possible to reach this principle since the learners focused not just on their apprenticeship but also on what their peers learned trying to take the best of them for their own benefit. In the same way, the learners took advantage from each comment to enhance their performance, evolving significantly from the first video until the fourth one, this fact concords with the definition of feedback which is a comment or information that someone provides learners after a task to enhance future performances (Scott, 2014). For instance, learners applied their peers' suggestions at the moment of asking a question using the correct word order and adding the right emphasis.

PEER FEEDBACK AND STUDENTS' RECORDED VIDEOS

Harmandaoğlu et al. (2016) remarked that students and instructors have different judgement about oral correction, but the fact that in this study learners and instructors had similar grades expressed that if apprentices receive adequate instruction about peer feedback and supervision from the instructor the scores, the feedback they provide can be similar to those the tutor gives. On the other hand, Tsui and Ng (2000) expressed that students think the feedback their peers provide is not reliable; nevertheless, the survey the learners took in this study showed that apprentices agreed with the feedback from their peers not just that from the teacher. Additionally, through this study, it is possible to observe how the perspectives of the apprentices change if they, instead of receiving teacher-centered instruction take collective participation of the class. This is a principle of CLT that demands interactive involvement of students in the learning process.

During this process, students practiced a different ways of learning the language. This group of students observed videos and recorded their own videos. This is aligned with previous studies like Canning-Wilson (2000), which mentioned that learners prefer the observation of videos to acquire the language instead of just listening to the radio and fill in the texts. Similarly, Cabrera et al. (2016) highlighted the importance of practicing the language in a new, real, and entertaining form to improve it, which happened during this study where the learners improve their oral competences by practicing it in a different form. The final product of this research reinforced this idea since being a teacher's primary goal the development of speaking abilities in learners; it was observed that students evolved in their listening, reading, and writing. Thereby, previous research supported this project.

Conclusion

At the end of this study and after observing the results of this innovation, it was observed how beneficial peer feedback and students' recorded videos have been for high school learners to improve their oral competencies like accuracy, vocabulary, and interactive communication.

PEER FEEDBACK AND STUDENTS' RECORDED VIDEOS

It is necessary, to highlight that at the end of this research, learners did not just increase their oral competencies, but also other skills like writing and reading. Consequently, the use of peer feedback and recorded videos involve students in their learning process making them participate actively. This innovation assisted students in reducing the gap to meet the required standards from the Ecuadorian government. They should be in A2 but their English level at the beginning of this innovation was A1.

The present study also demonstrated that the students can provide peer feedback despite the limitations they present regarding the language. This research showed that with the appropriate practice, instruction, monitoring, and adequate supervision from tutors, the apprentices can deliver positive feedback. Because of their low level of English at the beginning, the learners depended on the instructor, dictionaries and google translator, but later that necessity of using those resources was minimum. This involvement that the students practiced through the application of this innovation changed their perspective about English. Even though this group of learners had no previous practice on peer feedback and a low level of the language at the end of this process, their perspective changed.

Limitations

The primary limitations emerged from the lack of technology resources and the lack of expertise learners had about providing feedback to their peers. The students answered fifteen questions through a paper survey because not all of them had access to the internet. For that reason, they went to internet cafes or used the teacher's laptop. Many times the computers from the laboratory of their high school did not work.

Kruger and Dunning (1999) remarked that beginners and learners with limited production many times undervalue their standards of growth and do not own the required skills to evaluate and monitor. This happened in this research becoming also a limitation. However, this low knowledge about how to provide feedback was improved considerably

PEER FEEDBACK AND STUDENTS' RECORDED VIDEOS

since the tutor provided the students with clear rules, understandable rubrics, and constant training about how to use them in the correct form. Additionally, it is necessary to mention that this group of learners did not have good study habits which also became a limitation. Many times, it was not possible to work in the high school, students were required to upload their videos and provide feedback from their homes, but many of them did not do it on the required date, which delayed the progression of the innovation.

Recommendations

Among the recommendations, it is important to explain more profoundly the learners what peer feedback is, analyze the rubrics and think about an alternative to the spaces where the innovation will take place. Many instructors do not use peer feedback in classes, for this reason, learners did not have idea about how to handle it, so it is highly recommendable explaining students everything about what it is and the advantages of peer feedback.

It is necessary to check these rubrics for future improvement. During this innovation, sometimes the apprentices had doubts about grading accuracy and vocabulary but mainly about the meaning of interactive communication, so it is recommendable to explain the rubrics more deeply and that this kind of communication tries to be mutual where both students give and take information in a fluid way. Finding alternatives spaces where to develop the innovation is recommendable. At the moment of recording the videos, the nearby classrooms made too much noise and it was not possible to record the videos properly, so it is necessary to have in mind an additional area to work.

References

- Azar, B. (2002). *Fundamental of English Grammar*. New York, NY: Pearson Longman
- Babaii, E., Taghaddomi, S., & Pashmforooshet, R. (2015). Speaking self-assessment: Mismatches between learners' and teachers' criteria. *Language Testing, 1*, 1-27. doi: 10.1177/0265532215590847
- Bajrami, L. & Ismaili, M. (2016). The role of video materials in EFL classrooms. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 232*, 502–506. doi:10.1016/j.sbspro.2016.10.068
- Berk, R. (2009). Multimedia teaching with video clips: TV, movies, YouTube, and mtvU in the college classroom. *International Journal of Technology in Teaching and Learning, 5*(1), 1–21. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/228349436_Multimedia_Teaching_with_Video_Clips_TV_Movies_YouTube_and_mtvU_in_the_College_Classroom
- Bilash, O. (2009). *Improving Second Language Education: Pronunciation*. Retrieved from <https://sites.educ.ualberta.ca/staff/olenka.bilash/Best%20of%20Bilash/pronunciation.html>
- Brand, C., & Götz, S. (2011). Fluency versus accuracy in advanced spoken learner language: A multi-method approach. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics, 16*(2), 255-275. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/233579038_Fluency_versus_accuracy_in_advanced_spoken_learner_language_A_multi-method_approach
- Brown, H. D. (2007). *Teaching by Principles: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy*. New York, NY: Pearson Longman
- Cabrera, P., Quiñónez, A., Castillo, L., González, P., & Ochoa, A. (2016). The effect of communicative activities on EFL learners' motivation: A case of students in the

PEER FEEDBACK AND STUDENTS' RECORDED VIDEOS

Amazon region of Ecuador. *Colombian Applied Linguist Journal*, 18, 39-48. doi:

<http://dx.doi.org/10.14483/calj.v18n2.10018>

Canning-Wilson, C. (2000). Practical aspects of using video in the foreign language classroom. Current theory on the use of video as an educational medium of instruction. *The Internet TESL Journal*, 6(11), 1-7. Retrieved from <http://iteslj.org/Articles/Canning-Video>

Cantón, M. & Pérez, B. (2017). Oral communicative competence of primary school students. *Journal of Education and Learning*, 6(4), 57-65. doi:10.5539/jel.v6n4p57

Crowther, D., Trofimovich, P., Isaacs, T., & Saito, K. (2015). Does a speaking task affect second language comprehensibility? *Modern Language Journal*, 99(1), 80-95.

Retrieved from

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/275588808_Does_a_Speaking_Task_Affect_Second_Language_Comprehensibility

English First. (2018). *EF English Proficiency Index*. Retrieved from

<https://www.ef.com/wwen/epi/>

Emaliana, I. (2017). Teacher-center or student-center learning approach to promote learning?

Journal Sosial Umaniora, 10(2), 59-70. Retrieved from

[https://www.researchgate.net/publication/321496091_TEACHER-](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/321496091_TEACHER-CENTERED_OR_STUDENT-CENTERED_LEARNING_APPROACH_TO_PROMOTE_LEARNING)

[CENTERED_OR_STUDENT-](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/321496091_TEACHER-CENTERED_OR_STUDENT-CENTERED_LEARNING_APPROACH_TO_PROMOTE_LEARNING)

[CENTERED_LEARNING_APPROACH_TO_PROMOTE_LEARNING](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/321496091_TEACHER-CENTERED_OR_STUDENT-CENTERED_LEARNING_APPROACH_TO_PROMOTE_LEARNING)

Erdem, I. & Celik, M. (2011). Evaluations on Grammar Teaching Methods. *International*

Periodical For The Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic, 6(1),

1030-1041. Retrieved from

<https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=11&cad=rja&uact=8&ved=2ahUKEwiNtteMyq3hAhVys1kKHc6uB4M4ChAWMAB6BAgBEAE&ur>

PEER FEEDBACK AND STUDENTS' RECORDED VIDEOS

l=https%3A%2F%2Fmafiadoc.com%2Fdil-bilgisi-retim-yntemi-zerine-turkish-studies_5a0510861723dd700236c6a8.html&usg=AOvVaw0_dCnRfjDzexGP9qOtoKH
p

Falchikov, N. (2005). Improving assessment through student involvement. *Practical Solutions for Aiding Learning in Higher and Further Education, 1*, 1-31. Retrieved from <https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=1&ved=2ahUKEwjYz7WT0-vgAhXJq1kKHQtRB7IQFjAAegQICRAC&url=https%3A%2F%2Fcursos.campusvirtualsp.org%2Fmod%2Fresource%2Fview.php%3Fid%3D29889&usg=AOvVaw1YyOKrV7Te92Sjx4mBVqAp>

Fang, W., Cassim, F., Hsu, C., & Chen, N. (2018). Effects of reciprocal peer feedback on EFL learners' communication strategy use and oral communication performance. *Smart Learning Environments Journal, 5*(11), 1-16. Retrieved from <https://slejournal.springeropen.com/articles/10.1186/s40561-018-0061-2>

Farabi, M., Hassanvand, S., & Gorjian, B. (2017). Using guided oral presentation in teaching English language learners' speaking skills. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Language Learning, 3*(1), 17-24. doi: 10.5923/j.jall.20170301.03

Fattah, S. (2006). *The Effectiveness of a Task- Based Instruction program in Developing the English Language Speaking Skills of Secondary Stage Students*. (Doctoral thesis, Ain Shams University Women's college Curricula and Methods of teaching Department, Egypt). Retrieved from <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED52392>

Ferrance, E. (2000). Action Research. *Northeast and Islands Regional Educational Laboratory At Brown University*. Providence, RI: The Education Alliance. Retrieved from <https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=8&ved=2ahU>

PEER FEEDBACK AND STUDENTS' RECORDED VIDEOS

KEwjNjOzolqPgAhVSwVkJHX6rD1QQFjAHegQIChAC&url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.brown.edu%2Facademics%2Feducation-alliance%2Fsites%2Fbrown.edu.academics.education-alliance%2Ffiles%2Fpublications%2Fact_research.pdf&usg=AOvVaw1yjuAWDWkVJMmNxVMdv17L

Hadijah, S. (2016). Teaching by using video: Ways to make it more meaningful in EFL classrooms. *Proceedings of the Fourth International Seminar on English Language and Teaching (ISELT-4)*. Retrieved from <http://ejournal.unp.ac.id/index.php/selt/article/view/6990>

Harmandaoğlu, E., Balçıklı, C., & Cephe, T. (2016). Perceptions of English instructors and learners about corrective feedback. *European Journal of Foreign Language Teaching* 1(1), 54-68. doi: 10.5281/zenodo.166782

Hattie, J. & Timperley, H. (2007). The power of feedback. *Review of Educational Research*, 77(1), 81-112. doi: 10.3102/003465430298487

Huddleston, R., & Pullum, G. (2002). *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Joo, S. (2016). Self- and peer-assessment of speaking. *Working Papers in TESOL & Applied Linguistics*, 16(2), 68-83. Retrieved from <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1176866>

Jensen, M., Mattheis, A., & Johnson, B. (2012). Using student learning and development outcomes to evaluate a first-year undergraduate group video project. *CBE Life Sciences Education*, 11(1), 68-80. doi: <https://dx.doi.org/10.1187%2Fcbe.11-06-0049>

Karimy, S., & Pishkar, K. (2017). A comparison of the effects of teacher's speaking accuracy vs. fluency on EFL learners' oral skill. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Language Research*, 4(1), 304-312. Retrieved from <http://www.jallr.com/index.php/JALLR/article/view/541> Katchen, J.

PEER FEEDBACK AND STUDENTS' RECORDED VIDEOS

Katchen, J. (2002). Video in ELT-Theoretical and Pedagogical Foundations. *Proceedings of the 2002 KATE International Conference*, 256-259. Retrieved

from https://scholar.google.com.ec/scholar?hl=es&as_sdt=0%2C5&as_vis=1&q=Katchen+%282002%29+&btnG=

Kelly, G. (2000). *How to Teach Pronunciation*. England, Pearson Education Limited.

Retrieved from

<https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=1&ved=2ahUKEwiLIOC3->

[PXjAhVlx1kKHQ6fB2EQFjAAegQIBBAC&url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.inpi.edu.ar%2Fwp-content%2Fuploads%2F2017%2F04%2Fnotes-on-sounds.pdf&usg=AOvVaw0KFPv1pQ3ozvcfcy6iE7Qx](http://www.inpi.edu.ar%2Fwp-content%2Fuploads%2F2017%2F04%2Fnotes-on-sounds.pdf&usg=AOvVaw0KFPv1pQ3ozvcfcy6iE7Qx)

Kruger, J., & Dunning, D. (1999). Unskilled and unaware of it: How difficulties in recognizing one's own incompetence lead to inflated self-assessment. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 77(6), 121-1134. Retrieved from

<https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=1&ved=2ahUKEwjR0duH7rfgAhXNxVkkHX->

[WCP0QFjAAegQICRAC&url=https%3A%2F%2Fpdfs.semanticscholar.org%2Ffe320%2F9ca64cbcd9a441e55568797cbd3683cf7f8c.pdf&usg=AOvVaw2YJWCGA1ixCKNxcjiBeA7c](https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org%2Ffe320%2F9ca64cbcd9a441e55568797cbd3683cf7f8c.pdf&usg=AOvVaw2YJWCGA1ixCKNxcjiBeA7c)

Lee, Y. (2017). Sharing peer feedback: How does it affect EFL learners' oral presentation

skills? *Asia-Pacific Journal of Multimedia Services Convergent with Art, Humanities, and Sociology*, 7(12), 307-322. Retrieved from

<http://dx.doi.org/10.14257/ajmahs.2017.12.59>

Li, Z., & Song, M. (2007). The relationship between traditional English grammar teaching and communicative language teaching. *US-China Education Review*, 4(1), 62-65.

PEER FEEDBACK AND STUDENTS' RECORDED VIDEOS

Retrieved from

https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=1&ved=2ahUKEwitrvyxy63hAhXF1FkKHQa2BaEQFjAAegQIAxAC&url=https%3A%2F%2Ffiles.eric.ed.gov%2Ffulltext%2FED497485.pdf&usg=AOvVaw1nf8ReGXNVF_EVadSQAsdp

Luoma, S. (2004). *Assessing Speaking*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Retrieved from http://www.academia.edu/36242047/Sari_Luoma-Assessing_Speaking_Cambridge_Language_Assessment_2004_.pdf

Make, M., & Yonas, A. (2018). Teachers' perception on the use of audiovisual materials to teach English speaking skill: Abba Pascal girls' school in focus. *International Journal of English Language and Literature Studies*, 7(1), 1-6. Retrieved from <https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=1&cad=rja&uact=8&ved=2ahUKEwiOlqTK4qjhAhURhOAKHbs3AaMQFjAAegQIABAB&url=https%3A%2F%2Fideas.repec.org%2Fa%2Fasi%2Fijells%2F2018p1-6.html&usg=AOvVaw1Aou-bOnp9P21Qz2ptF1L2>

Ministerio de Educación. (2010). *English as a Foreign Language for Subnivel Bachillerato*. Retrieved from <https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=1&ved=2ahUKEwiw8q-q5ajgAhWum-AKHbVdAwoQFjAAegQIChAC&url=https%3A%2F%2Feducacion.gob.ec%2Fwp-content%2Fuploads%2Fdownloads%2F2016%2F08%2FEFL-for-Subnivel-BGU-final-ok.pdf&usg=AOvVaw0VhHsUiK8jK5Yzy0E52pqM>

Ministerio de Educación. (2012). *Ecuadorian in-service English Teacher Standards. The English Language Learning Standard*. Retrieved from <https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=1&ved=2ahU>

PEER FEEDBACK AND STUDENTS' RECORDED VIDEOS

KEwiBpPmn16jgAhVsUd8KHe_1D0cQFjAAegQIBxAC&url=https%3A%2F%2Feducacion.gob.ec%2Fwp-content%2Fuploads%2Fdownloads%2F2012%2F09%2Festandares_2012_ingles_opt.pdf&usg=AOvVaw1iwvHjbuF9Lt5f5Uby0xmcontent%2Fuploads%2Fdownloads%2F2016%2F03%2FEFL1.pdf&usg=AOvVaw2DjXfWRuj7ZzYSNPpYRWzp

Ministerio de Educación. (2016). *English as a Foreign Language*. Retrieved from

<https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=1&ved=2ahUKEwjcyL7Su6jgAhXmpVkKHS6ZDU8QFjAAegQIChAC&url=https%3A%2F%2Feducacion.gob.ec%2Fwp->

Molina, M., & Briesmaster, M. (2017). The use of 3/2/1 Technique to Foster Student's Speaking Fluency. *i.e.: Inquiry in Education*, 9 (2), 1-15. Retrieved from:

<https://digitalcommons.nl.edu/ie/vol9/iss2/8>

Muneera, M., & Shameem, R. (2013). Error analysis of present simple tense in the

interlanguage of adult Arab English language learners. *Canadian Center of Science and Education*, 6(2), 146-154. Retrieved from

<https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=1&cad=rja&uact=8&ved=2ahUKEwjT-NKonbXhAhVH11kKHeziB->

[kQFjAAegQIAhAB&url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.researchgate.net%2Fpublication%2F286136812_Error_Analysis_of_Present_Simple_Tense_in_the_Interlanguage_of_Adult_Arab_English_Language_Learners&usg=AOvVaw21-PBTAffIH7wVM1ph8Tld](https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=1&ved=2ahUKEwjT-NKonbXhAhVH11kKHeziB-kQFjAAegQIAhAB&url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.researchgate.net%2Fpublication%2F286136812_Error_Analysis_of_Present_Simple_Tense_in_the_Interlanguage_of_Adult_Arab_English_Language_Learners&usg=AOvVaw21-PBTAffIH7wVM1ph8Tld)

Nunan, D. (1991). *Language Teaching Methodology: A Textbook for Teachers*. London:

Prentice Hall. Retrieved from

https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=1&ved=2ahUKEwib_-

[_h0_DgAhVtUN8KHW6PBN0QFjAAegQIDRAC&url=http%3A%2F%2Flibrary.aceo](https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=1&ved=2ahUKEwib_-h0_DgAhVtUN8KHW6PBN0QFjAAegQIDRAC&url=http%3A%2F%2Flibrary.aceo)

PEER FEEDBACK AND STUDENTS' RECORDED VIDEOS

ndo.net%2Febooks%2FEducation%2FLanguag_Teaching_Methodology.pdf&usg=AO
vVaw3xxm2k68BAvNhFp_59X32f

Ochoa, A. C., & Ortíz, W. G. (2018). Creating machinima (3D) and real-life videos in an ESP classroom. *Profile: Issues in Teachers' Professional Development*, 20(1), 41-56.
doi:org/10.15446/profile.v20n1.59412.

Patri, M. (2002). The influence of peer feedback on self and peer-assessment of oral skills. *Language Testing*, 19(2), 109-131. doi: 10.1191/0265532202lt224oa

Pearson Education. (2005). *Speaking Rubric for Fluency Activities*. World View. Retrieved from
https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=1&ved=2ahUKewj2te_Qp6_gAhUNvIkKHUXjCJgQFjAAegQIBxAC&url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.pearsonlongman.com%2Fae%2Fworldview%2Fwvvideospeakingrubric.pdf&usg=AOvVaw1ELP0rEV413vqNj3iUR4dw

Prihatini, A. N., Prasetyarini, A., & Sutopo, A. (2015). *The Implementation of Peer Assessment on Speaking for the Tenth Grade Students of SMA N 1 Wuryantoro in 2014/2015 Academic Year*. Retrieved from
<https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=1&cad=rja&uact=8&ved=2ahUKEwi2s47a0LfgAhUkwIkKHdJIC3kQFjAAegQICRAB&url=http%3A%2F%2Fprints.ums.ac.id%2F34619%2F&usg=AOvVaw3CrKaiMf5M1ERKsamE8OKE>

Pereira, M., Bermúdez, J., & Medina, L. (2018). Improving L2 oral accuracy and grammatical range through self-assessment of video speech drafts. *Profile: Issues in Teachers' Professional Development*, 20(2), 127-142. doi:org/10.15446/profile.v20n2.61724.

PEER FEEDBACK AND STUDENTS' RECORDED VIDEOS

- Rashidi, Z. (2014). Action research. *Journal of Independent Studies and Research-Management, Social Sciences and Economics*, 305. Retrieved from <http://jisr.szabist.edu.pk/JISR-MSSE/Publication/12/1/6/BookReview>
- Richards, J. C. (2006). *Communicative Language Teaching Today*. Retrieved from https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=1&cad=rja&uact=8&ved=2ahUKEwi42J3H9KDgAhXuqlkKHVCiAEMQFjAAegQIDxAC&url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.professorjackrichards.com%2Fwp-content%2Fuploads%2FRichards-Communicative-Language.pdf&usg=AOvVaw0_dej91Es44_Ujtswr72Sb
- Sánchez-Narváez, N. & Chavarro-Vargas, S. (2017). EFL oral skills behavior when implementing blended learning in a content-subject teachers' professional development course. *Colombian Applied Linguistics Journal*, 19(2),263-276. Retrieved from: <http://www.redalyc.org/articulo.oa?id=305752034008>
- Scarcella, R. C. & Oxford, R. L. (1994). Second language pronunciation: State of the art in instruction. *Elsevier*, 22(2), 221-230. Retrieved from <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/0346251X94900582>
- Scott, S. (2014). Practising what we preach: towards a student-centred definition of feedback. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 19(1), 49-57. Retrieved from <https://tinyurl.com/ybr4rsvy>
- Secules, T., Herron, C., & Tomassello, M. (1992). The effect of video context on foreign language learning. *The modern Language Journal*, 76, 480-490. Retrieved from https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=4&cad=rja&uact=8&ved=2ahUKEwiTiYrSn6DgAhVRj1kKHYYqPCE4QFjADegQICBAB&url=https%3A%2F%2Fonlinelibrary.wiley.com%2Fdoi%2Fabs%2F10.1111%2Fj.1540-4781.1992.tb05396.x&usg=AOvVaw1ne-AW90ffv7XFbNQ_K-D

PEER FEEDBACK AND STUDENTS' RECORDED VIDEOS

- Smith, D. (2017). *Collaborative Peer Feedback*. Paper presented at the International Conference Educational Technologies. Faculty of Science, Yale-NUS College. Retrieved from <https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=1&cad=rja&uact=8&ved=2ahUKEwighJ6j06DgAhVvU98KHQanCowQFjAAegQIBRAB&url=https%3A%2F%2Feric.ed.gov%2F%3Fid%3DED579292&usg=AOvVaw0HwchvIleMFVkkR0yOMrgc>
- Srivastava, S. R. (2014). Accuracy vs fluency in English classroom. *New Man International Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies*, 1(4), 55-58. Retrieved from https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=1&cad=rja&uact=8&ved=2ahUKEwjc69mMo-zgAhUIvFkKHa1eBqoQFjAAegQIBxAC&url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.newmanpublication.com%2Fbr%2F09.pdf&usg=AOvVaw15XAojAeR4bTOzO_q5ibQh
- Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistic*, 1(1), 1-47. doi : 10.1093/applin/I.1.1 · Source: OAI
- Tsui, B. M., & Ng, M. (2000). Do secondary L2 writers benefit from peer comments? *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 9(2), 147-170. doi:org/10.1016/S1060-3743(00)00022-9
- Wang, Z. (2014). Developing accuracy and fluency in spoken English of Chinese EFL learners. *English Language Teaching*, 7(2), 110-118. Retrieved from <https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=2&ved=2ahUKEwiB0tHB2KDgAhUQUt8KHX68DIEQFjABegQICRAC&url=https%3A%2F%2Ffiles.eric.ed.gov%2Ffulltext%2FEJ1075642.pdf&usg=AOvVaw0FKfJbdKG-46oDdEFXtbrB>

PEER FEEDBACK AND STUDENTS' RECORDED VIDEOS

William, D. (2016). The secret of effective feedback. *Educational Leadership*, 73(7), 10-15. Retrieved from <http://www.ascd.org/publications/educational-leadership/apr16/vol73/num07/The-Secret-of-Effective-Feedback.aspx>

Appendix 1



On this video the pupils will observe and learn important issues about some of the most visited cities around the world.

Appendix 2

PLAN BASED ON BACKWARD DESIGN

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

Institution:	Unidad Educativa Eloy Alfaro
Year of study:	First Bachillerato
Student description: (include English Level)	28 students with a beginners English proficiency level of A.1
Professor:	Lcdo. Heinz Javier Zambrano Pilco
Unit title:	Unit 4 Traveling the World
Weeks:	Five weeks
Hours:	45 hours

I. Transfer Goal (Stage 1)

Standards the unit will work with:

English Language Learning Standards: (Level A1)

Speaking Production: Produce slow, hesitant, planned dialogues (i.e., communication still depends on repetition, rephrasing, and repair).

Goal: I want my pupils to enhance their oral accuracy; thus, in the long term and on their own they can be able to provide information about travels and touristic activities.

Break down of transfer goal

A. If we see and hear them do this, they CAN transfer this learning.	B. If we see and 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.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide and ask for directions and information in a polite way. • Learners feel confident when talking. • Ask and answer questions, describe and compare places and activities. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inadequate knowledge about how to give directions and state locations of place. • Learners feel nervous and hesitate when try to maintain a dialogue. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide appropriate models through the use of videos, pair and group practice. • Provide ongoing feedback and encourage learners to use it. • Instruct pupils in how to provide, accept and use quality peer-feedback. • To create the appropriate

PEER FEEDBACK AND STUDENTS' RECORDED VIDEOS

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use correct grammar becoming clear and comprehensible when maintaining a dialogue. • Learners express accurately. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Learners are not able to ask, and answer questions describe, compare places and activities. • Lack of knowledge about grammar structure providing a confusing message. • Pupils express themselves in a non-exact and unclear way. 	<p>environment where learners feel confident at the moment of talk in front of their teachers, peers or a camera.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To considerate the ideas and opinions students bring to improve their speaking skills.
--	--	--

II. Summative Performance Assessment Task (Stage 2)

Goal	To display a correct oral presentation showing the advantages of traveling.
Role	You are the ministry of tourism of your country.
Audience	Students of first Bachillerato of the Unidad Educativa Eloy Alfaro
Situation	Find out and discuss about the benefits that traveling abroad provide to young and people in general.
Performance	This presentation has the primary goal of guiding the learners from first bachillerato on how to provide information about travels and touristic activities. Students will provide information ask and respond to peers questions that travelers frequently ask
Standards	This oral presentation will be assessed using descriptors like accuracy while using the simple present and present perfect tenses.

III. Knowledge and skills the students need to succeed in the assessment. (Stage 1)

What students will need to know	The skills of the transfer goal students will need to be able to do
<p>Accuracy Must be related to how to articulate sentences grammatically correct.</p> <p>Grammar</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Learners must be reflective on their strengths and weaknesses. • use the rubrics in a correct way. • Develop cooperative working with their partners.

PEER FEEDBACK AND STUDENTS' RECORDED VIDEOS

<p>Must be related to the use of tag questions, grammar tenses, much and very, Yes/No questions, and indirect questions.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide and accept appropriate feedback to and from their peers.
--	--

IV. Essential Questions (Stage 1)

<p>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.</p>	
<p>Understanding</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To provide a comprehensible message they must know about basic grammar rules and being accurate while talking. • They must have an acceptable knowledge of the topic to be discussed. • The use of peer feedback is beneficial while trying to enhance pupil's oral skills. 	<p>Essential Questions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is peer feedback and why to use it? • How can I enhance my oral skills through peer feedback? • What are the advantages of using the on-time feedback that my partners deliver? • What benefits do the use of educational videos supply that listening audios do not at the moment of improving oral skills? • How can inexperienced learners provide quality feedback to their peers? • What is the best way to minimize pupils' fear to speak in front of their peers?

V. Learning Activities (Stage 3) For Advance I, include a summary of activities for first unit. For Grado you must include a separate plan for each unit. Identify research related activities under intention.

Abbreviated Performance Task:

Learning Activities (from student's perspective)	Intention	A	M	T
<p>Week 1 – (5 hours) Pre-test</p> <p>Introduction of the topic. The teacher will ask the learners about their favorite place to travel and show a video about different foreign places.</p>	<p>Students need to activate their previous knowledge about the topic.</p> <p>Developing</p>	<p>X</p>	<p>X</p>	

PEER FEEDBACK AND STUDENTS' RECORDED VIDEOS

<p>city encouraging learners to pay attention to relevant facts missing in the book and taking notes.</p> <p>In Groups of 4-5, the learners will discuss what called their attention from the read article and from the video they watched</p> <p>The learners will be trained to use the rubrics.</p> <p>In groups of 4-5 the learners will develop a short presentation about a foreign place they suggest their peers to visit mentioning all its attractions. This presentation will be recorded by the learners and uploaded to a Facebook account.</p> <p>The learners will provide quality feedback to their peers. The learners will also check the received feedback before their next class. Additionally, they will write a summary of what they need to improve.</p>	<p>Formative assessment</p> <p>Developing</p>			<p>X</p> <p>X</p>
<p>Week 4 (5 hours)</p> <p>Observation of videos and group working</p> <p>In pairs, the learners will tell each other a summary about the last classes. They will also share with the whole class the summary they wrote with the recommendations from their peers.</p> <p>The instructor will provide the learners with common questions and answers to use to communicate when traveling abroad,</p> <p>The instructor will present a short video where travelers use known questions and answers when they travel abroad.</p> <p>The learners will create and perform a short dialogue using questions and answers while they travel abroad.</p> <p>In different groups of 4-5 and trying to apply the previous feedback from their peers learners will create a new oral presentation showing the advantages, attractions, and why they recommend different cities from Ecuador.</p> <p>The instructor will record the new video, and this will be uploaded on a Facebook account. One more</p>	<p>The learners will activate their previous knowledge and will share their last task.</p> <p>Initiating</p> <p>Initiating</p> <p>Developing</p> <p>Formative Assessment</p> <p>Review</p>	<p>X</p> <p>X</p> <p>X</p>	<p>X</p> <p>X</p>	<p>X</p> <p>X</p> <p>X</p> <p>X</p>

PEER FEEDBACK AND STUDENTS' RECORDED VIDEOS

<p>time the pupils will provide peer quality feedback trying to remark how their peers have improved.</p> <p>The learners will observe their videos and will share with the class how much they consider their oral skill has enhanced.</p>				
<p>Week 5 (5 hours)</p> <p>Post-test</p> <p>The performance task will be a post-test which will measure the improvement of the learners.(another video where ss express what places would they like to visit in the future and why)</p> <p>Interviews</p>	<p>Summative Assessment</p> <p>Research</p>			<p>X</p> <p>X</p>

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 number of hours.

VI. On-going Teacher Self-Assessment

<p>As I reflect on student learning, what will I do if my plan is not yielding my expected results?</p>
<p>I will encourage my pupils not to feel disappointed, on the contrary I will stimulate them to continue working hard. I will also call them during the week for more personalized interviews to clarify doubts, practice on their accuracy and grammar rules. Additionally, I would ask for help to my more experienced colleagues about the use of quality peer feedback, so the learners do not feel intimidated or doubtful when provide it.</p>

Appendix 3

Speaking Rubric

Feature	2.0 pts.	1.5 pts.	1.0 pts.	0.5 pts.
Accuracy	Uses grammatical structures about simple present, present perfect and sentences patterns in his/her level .	Uses grammatical structures about simple present, present perfect and sentence patterns in his/her level but makes few errors.	Uses grammatical structures about simple present and present perfect with frequent errors or uses basic structures with some errors.	Uses basic structures about simple present and present perfect but makes frequent errors

Vocabulary	Uses the taught vocabulary according to his/her level making any errors.	Uses the taught vocabulary according to his/her level but makes few errors.	Uses the taught vocabulary according to his/her level with some errors.	Uses the taught vocabulary according to his/her level but makes frequent errors
Interactive communication	Students participate in an interactive way	Students participate in an interactive way in some occasions	Students rarely participate in an interactive way	Students do not participate in an interactive way.

Adapted from Speaking Rubric for Fluency Activities. 2005.Pearson Education: Longman

PEER FEEDBACK AND STUDENTS' RECORDED VIDEOS

Appendix 4

Peer-feedback Analysis Rubric

(Teacher use only)

#1 General Topic: Accuracy – Use of simple grammatical forms correctly when talking about traveling.	
3	Elaborated feedback. Feedback addresses all aspects regarding Accuracy . This could be either positive or indicating how to improve.
2	Feedback is somewhat elaborated. Elaboration probably addresses Accuracy but may address only 1 of the specific aspects.
1	Feedback is incomplete - may address Accuracy but is not elaborated.
0	Absence of feedback related to Accuracy

#1 General Topic: Vocabulary . Use a range of appropriate vocabulary when talking about traveling.	
3	Elaborated feedback. Feedback addresses all aspects regarding Vocabulary . This could be either positive or indicating how to improve.
2	Feedback is somewhat elaborated. Elaboration probably addresses Vocabulary but may address only 1 of the specific aspects.
1	Feedback is incomplete - may address Vocabulary but is not elaborated.
0	Absence of feedback related to Vocabulary .

#3 General Topic: Interactive Communication – Maintains simple exchanges / Requires very little support.	
3	Elaborated feedback. Feedback addresses all aspects regarding Interactive Communication . This could be either positive or indicating how to improve.
2	Feedback is somewhat elaborated. Elaboration probably addresses Interactive Communication but may address only 1 of the specific aspects.
1	Feedback is incomplete - may address Interactive Communication but is not elaborated.
0	Absence of feedback related to Interactive Communication .

PEER FEEDBACK AND STUDENTS' RECORDED VIDEOS

Appendix5

First video. During the pre-test, in groups of four the learners will develop a short dialogue to measure their accuracy while using their L-2.

Anahi: Do you guys like to travel?

Angelica, Barbara and Annel: Yes, we do.

Annel: Angelica what places have you visited?

Angelica: I have visited Manabi and Cotacachi. And you Annel, what places have you visited?

Annel: I have visited Montañita in Santa Elena. And you Barbara?

Barbara: I have visited Quito and Manabi.

Annel: Barbara what places in Ecuador do you recommend visiting?

Barbara: I recommend visiting the entire Ecuador.

Annel: And you Angelica, what places in Ecuador do you recommend visiting and why?

Angelica: I recommend visiting Manabi because of its beaches and food.



PEER FEEDBACK AND STUDENTS' RECORDED VIDEOS

Appendix6

Fourth video. The learners will provide feedback to their partners after watching the recorded videos.



PEER FEEDBACK AND STUDENTS' RECORDED VIDEOS

Appendix 7

Survey

Level of the Students Perspectives

Questions	Always (5)	Usually (4)	Occasionally (3)	Seldom (2)	Never (1)
1. Have you used peer feedback in previous courses?					
2. Do you consider peer feedback as a valuable part in the speaking process?					
3. Was it difficult for you to provide feedback to your peers?					
4. Was it difficult for you to understand the feedback provided by your peers?					
5. Was it difficult for you to apply the feedback provided by your peers?					
6. Do you feel the interaction with your peers was convenient?					
7. Did peer-feedback help you to enhance your accuracy?					
8. Was the use of rubrics easy to understand?					
9. Were The videos used by the instructor engaging?					
10. Did you feel comfortable being your presentations judged and scored by your peers?					
11. Would you recommend instructors to use peer feedback to improve other skills?					
12. After receiving peer feedback do you consider that just the instructor has the capacity to provide feedback?					
13. Would you like to continue working in groups to keep enhancing your oral skills?					
14. Do you still feel nervous when you speak in English to your peers or instructors?					
15. Did you perceive your partners had problems to apply the provided feedback?					

PEER FEEDBACK AND STUDENTS' RECORDED VIDEOS

Encuesta (Spanish version)

Nivel de las perspectivas de los estudiantes

Preguntas	Siempre (5)	Usualmente (4)	Ocasionalmente (3)	Raramente (2)	Nunca (1)
1. ¿Has recibido retroalimentación de tus compañeros de clase en cursos anteriores?					
2. Consideras a la retroalimentación como parte valiosa en el proceso de hablar usando el idioma inglés?					
3. Fue difícil para ti proveer de retroalimentación a tus compañeros?					
4. Fue difícil para ti entender la retroalimentación recibida por tus compañeros?					
5. Fue difícil para ti aplicar la retroalimentación provista por tus compañeros?					
6. Sientes que la interacción con tus compañeros fue conveniente?					
7. Ayudo la retroalimentación por parte de tus compañeros a mejorar tu precisión al hablar?					
8. Fue el uso de las rubricas fácil de entender?					
9. Fueron atractivos los videos empleados por el docente?					
10. Te sentiste cómodo cuando tus presentaciones fueron juzgadas y calificadas por tus compañeros?					
11. Recomendarías a los docentes emplear la retroalimentación de parte de compañeros para mejorar otras destrezas?					
12. Después de recibir retroalimentación de tus compañeros consideras que solo los docentes tienen la capacidad para proveerla?					
13. Te gustaría continuar trabajando en grupos para seguir mejorando tus habilidades orales?					
14. Aun te sientes nervioso cuando hablas a tus compañeros o maestros empleando el idioma inglés?					
15. Percibiste que tus compañeros tuvieron problemas al aplicar la retroalimentación brindada?					