



Peer Feedback to Improve Speaking Facilitated with Mobile Devices

Alexandra Karina Carrión Basantes

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: CES: RPC-SE-19-N°. 140-2020. Cohort 2019 - 2021. Author's email: alexandra.carrion@casagrande.edu.ec
Quito, January 18th, 2020.

Proyectos de Investigación

Certifico que ALEXANDRA KARINA CARRIÓN BASANTES ha cumplido satisfactoriamente su investigación acción como pre-requisito de graduación de Magíster en Pedagogía de los Idiomas Nacionales y Extranjeros con Mención en la Enseñanza de Inglés.

Su investigación es parte del proyecto PEER FEEDBACK TO IMPROVE SPEAKING cuyo objetivo general es mejorar la producción oral a través de la evaluación de pares.

En este proyecto, cada participante desarrolla la investigación-acción en un contexto educativo diferente. Las secciones de introducción, literatura y metodología (instrumentos y análisis de datos) son las mismas.

Particular que comunico para los fines consiguientes.

María Rossana Ramírez Avila

Coordinadora de Titulación

Abstract

This study was conducted in a public high school in Quito, Pichincha, Ecuador during the pandemic caused by COVID-19. The sample that took part in this action research was in the second year of baccalaureate. Within this study, the students had the opportunity to improve their speaking skills through peer feedback. The participants worked on online activities that allowed them to gain vocabulary, practice fluency, work in pairs, and use appropriate structures in context. Besides, they created dialogues and recorded themselves in real-life situations with the use of their mobile devices and other technological tools. During the innovation, students took a pre and post-survey as well as a pre and posttest to determine their improvement. The results showed that students improved their speaking skills. They also increased their intrinsic motivation to learn English. *Cohen's d = 0.9* indicated the reliability of this research. This study confirms that peer feedback activities enhance students' oral production. Besides this, once students realized the benefits of speaking English, they started to be more interested in English learning, considered it easier to acquire and use language through dialogues in online environments.

Keywords: speaking, peer feedback, pair work, dialogues, technological tools.

Resumen

Este estudio se realizó en un colegio público de Quito, Pichincha, Ecuador durante la pandemia provocada por el COVID-19. La muestra que participó en esta investigación se encontraba en el segundo año de bachillerato. Dentro de este estudio, los estudiantes tuvieron la oportunidad de mejorar sus habilidades para hablar el idioma inglés por medio de la retroalimentación entre pares. Los participantes trabajaron con actividades en línea que les permitieron adquirir vocabulario, practicar fluidez, trabajar en parejas y usar estructuras gramaticales apropiadas en contexto. Además, los estudiantes crearon diálogos y se grabaron en situaciones de la vida real con el uso de sus dispositivos móviles y otras herramientas tecnológicas. Durante la innovación, los estudiantes realizaron una encuesta previa y posterior, así como una prueba previa y posterior para determinar su mejora. Los resultados mostraron que los estudiantes mejoran sus habilidades para hablar. También aumentaron su motivación intrínseca para aprender inglés. El Cohen $d = 0,9$ confirmó la fiabilidad de esta investigación. Este estudio confirma que las actividades de retroalimentación entre compañeros mejoran la producción oral de los estudiantes. Además de esto, una vez que los estudiantes se dieron cuenta de los beneficios de hablar inglés, comenzaron a estar más interesados en aprender el idioma inglés, ya que consideraron que era más fácil adquirir y usar el idioma mediante diálogos en entornos virtuales.

Palabras claves: hablar, retroalimentación entre pares, trabajo entre compañeros, diálogos, herramientas tecnológicas.

Peer Feedback to Improve Speaking Facilitated with Mobile Devices

The Common European Framework of Reference has divided into two parts the levels of proficiency and they will be applied in the public educational system gradually (Ministerio de Educación de Ecuador, 2012). Ecuadorian English Language Learning Standards (ELLS) are based on CEFR and establish that students who are at the end of the third year baccalaureate should be at the B1 level (Ministerio de Educación, 2002). This proficiency implies that students are independent users of their language competencies. However, participants of this study held an A1 level, according to a proficiency test taken online. They were students of a public high school.

Ecuador has been making changes to improve the English level in the public educational system. It considers the integration of language and content to their own cultural realities and to respect and tolerate everyone (Paredes et al., 2018). Ecuadorian schools still do not reach the required proficiency. Education First (2019) shared that Ecuador in Latin America ranked in position 35 of 70 countries in 2015, but in 2019 it ranked 81 out of 100 countries due to disparities in access to EFL between public and private schools. Considering the ranking of regions, Guayaquil and Pichincha have the highest acquisition of English skills with 50.96.

In this regard, Derakhshan et al. (2016) pointed out the usefulness of practice, structure, and planning to develop speaking skills. Roeders (1997) mentioned that in order to improve education, active learning techniques should be applied. However, studies report that students have many reasons for not developing speaking skills (Al-Eiadeh et al., 2016; Derakhshan et al., 2016). Some of those are confusion, embarrassment, deficiencies of English learning in prior educational levels, difficulties in pronunciation, limited vocabulary,

fossilization, lack of confidence, anxiety due to inaccurate utterances, misunderstanding questions, the use of incorrect grammar, lack of practice, mixing classes, among others.

This study was applied to the students at public schools during the COVID-19 pandemic, so technology ensured learning continuity. Online learning has accelerated changes in teachers' methodology and schools have been pushed into reacting to the immediate educational challenges to find new ways to address learning (United Nations, 2020). Technological tools and platforms can be used to remedy some of the fallouts from school closures to many educational systems across the world (Onyema et al., 2020).

Modern technology such as multi-media devices, mobile phones, audio/visual effects applications, and social media, has been adopted to optimize English language instruction and equip teachers to connect with classroom language learners in a systematic and advanced way (Alqahtani, 2019, p.169). For this research, the participants understood the importance of getting and giving positive feedback to their partners to improve their speaking skills through mobile devices and also they used a digital platform to upload videos, give and receive feedback from the partners assigned. The next section introduces the literature review that helped to conduct this research.

Literature Review

This section is a review of theories and similar research that has been conducted to explore the meaningful effects of improving students' oral skills through dialogues. Besides, the pedagogical practices included the Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) approach and peer feedback. There are some descriptions of this approach, principles, the role of peer feedback, and the importance of dialogues to build confidence to speak. All those aspects were applied in the innovation.

Communicative Language Teaching

This innovation was based on the principles of Communicative Language Teaching. Jacobs and Farrell (2003) made a list of this approach components and remarked the following:

- Focusing on the role of the learner as a key component in the process. In fact, the teachers' role is to be a facilitator and establish so many situations to stimulate communication. On the other hand, learners took a central role in the progress of their learning.

- Teaching is based on the process rather than the product. The learners think about what and why they are making meaning.

- Connecting the school to the context of the world. Besides, students have the opportunity to communicate using real language in real context for language use.

- Considering individual differences of learners and the importance of the social nature of learning.

- Emphasizing meaning and lifelong process. It means that students could remember things that they are interested in capturing their motivation to learn.

Pair Work

Pair work through real-life and field-related dialogues matches well with the previous components. Oprandy (as cited in Jacobs & Farrel, 2003) highlighted the critical role of teachers in the design of pair work activities. When they plan pair work, they should include meaningful tasks. Moreover, teachers have to tolerate messiness because of the organization of the tasks. At the same time, teachers have to identify students' needs to meet them accordingly.

Authors coincide that pair work enhances learner's autonomy (Harris et al., as cited in Jacobs & Farrel, 2003). They explained that collaboration among peers raises independence from the teacher. They also highlight the role of meaningful tasks to retain more information. In this regard, it is important to consider student's preferences of topics.

Speaking

Speaking involves fluency and accuracy. The first refers to the ability to speak spontaneously and without many pauses. The latter to construct grammatically correct ideas, phrases, or chunks (Derakhshan et al., 2015). For other authors like Bygate, speaking also involves interaction and production. Bygate defined production as the ability to speak without time limitations; and, interaction is produced when pairs negotiate the conversation (as cited in Derakhshan, et al., 2015). Burns and Joyce (as cited in Al-Eiadeh et al., 2016) shared similar points of view. They considered speaking involves interaction to construct meaning. This interaction means not only receiving and processing information but also producing it.

Hence, students require extended, authentic, and meaningful practice (Celce-Murcia, 2001; Jacobs & Farrel, 2003). Celce-Murcia (2001) added that speaking tasks need structure and planning. This author suggested to use short dialogues, and a structure of question-answers to start with. However, students' proficiency level required that the structure and planning were preceded by vocabulary introduction.

Vocabulary

Wasik and Campbell (2012) suggested developing purposeful, strategic conversations that focus on the explicit development of vocabulary words and help [students] construct the meaning of words through multiple activities and experiences. They also need to communicate effectively and convey meaning (Wanpen et al., 2013). Mahraj (2018) classified vocabulary into two main categories. The first refers to the ones found in academic texts. The second refers to the lexicon that is associated with specific areas of study.

To the previous classification, Wanpen et al., (2013) added that sometimes the meaning of words varies or they can be unique if they are used in specific areas. Learning vocabulary through multiple, meaningful exposures to words, nested within meaningful and integrative contexts, supported by high-quality definitions, and embedded within rich linguistic

interactions to create conversations that support the use of unfamiliar words (Wasik & Campbell, 2012)

Dialogues

This study proposed dialogues after a topic has been introduced. Dialogues improved speaking, enhanced their interaction, familiarized with other cultures, gained new knowledge, and increased their communicative competence. When recording the dialogues, students may demonstrate difficulties like one of the pair trying to dominate the conversation, speaking very low and not clearly, ignoring the pair, or making constant interruptions (Backlund, 1990 as cited in Al-Eiadeh et al., 2016).

Peer Feedback

Collaboration is a feature of peer-feedback is. Talking about the collaboration, Spies and Xu (2018) highlighted that it aids in real communication. For Sardareh (2018), it enhances students' oral production, it provides useful information that students need which results in knowledge acquisition. When students apply peer feedback their work becomes more objective, gain ideas to improve in subsequent practices. Authors recommend the constant practice, though (Colthorpe, et al., 2014). Smith (2017) added that the teachers' time is limited to provided individual feedback, thus peer feedback may be a solution for that difficulty. Besides, it can improve students' comprehension of any topic.

William (2016) stated that the practice should be constant and in a spiral way. It means students need to observe, revise, take notes, and reflect on their work before sharing their comments. This author sustained that it is not a spontaneous work. To provide meaningful feedback, students should follow a step-by-step procedure. In this same line, Allen et al. (2018) shared a ladder of feedback steps. It is a sequence of pre-requirements to provide significant feedback among peers. It involves: asking to clarify ideas, starting with the positive comments of the task, continue with what needs to be improved, and it finishes

with the suggesting comments. It is important to notice that teachers should devote the required time to guide, scaffold, and monitor students' work. Lantolf et al. (2015) mentioned that if teachers train students by observing what they can do and what they will do next it is very likely that students will become autonomous learners.

Scaffolding

Scaffolding refers to the different ways teachers facilitate learning, starting from an initial mental structure to a complicated content or skill by organizing learners' new knowledge (Reiser & Tabak, 2014). Providing an organization while teaching content will allow learners to better understand and apply this new knowledge. Teachers will have the opportunity to provide the support that gradually will be removed when learners master their skills. Learners can feel free to ask questions, collaborate with peers, form associations between prior knowledge and the new information, and build concepts through a comfortable learning environment.

Technology

Technology is updating and changing human's lives constantly. It has become a tool for development and provided many benefits. In education, it has contributed to a change of paradigms. It motivates students to participate and become autonomous. Students are learning to deal with self-directed activities. Technology provides opportunities to share information, interact with others, and establish environments to make learning more efficient. Thus, it can also serve as a tool to provide feedback (Bahadorfar & Omidvar, 2014). Richards (2006) stated that the practice students carry out using technology makes tasks authentic.

Having identified students' poor oral participation in classes due to several reasons, this study implemented the use of dialogues where students had to plan and organize their ideas before interacting. After this literature review, this study explored the following research questions:

1. To what extent does peer feedback improve speaking?
2. What are students' perspectives towards this innovation?

Innovation

During this process, the participants were studying the first unit about “The story behind the photo”, where they are from, and family vocabulary. The participants worked in pairs and created their dialogs which were focused on a famous person that they liked. One student was the interviewee, a celebrity, and the other one was the interviewer. They used previous vocabulary, common expressions, and something remarkable about him or her.

Besides this, the researcher trained and practiced with students how to give meaningful peer feedback using dialogues and recognizing their structure by applying a rubric. For example, students could identify the celebrity and welcome him/her. They should ask and answer, thank her or him for accepting the interview, and say goodbye. The participants learned how to give effective comments to their peers which helped them to improve their learning process. What is more, the students felt identified with the content used in this innovation, and they realized the importance of feedback to learn how to speak a new language.

The students had to record themselves and upload their videos on Edmodo. The teacher assigned them randomly to get and give feedback to their peers. The researcher had previously explained to the learners how to work on a rubric in order to be aware of the things they would be evaluating: fluency, accuracy, vocabulary, and interaction (Appendix A).

After that, they had to check the peers' comments, improve their version of the dialog, record themselves again, and upload the final video to be assessed by the teacher. During the innovation process, the students conducted six interviews (Appendix F) in which they

had the opportunity to practice their speaking skills and give their comments about how the innovation was helping them to improve their oral production.

The lesson plan was designed for 6 weeks (Appendix B). The participants had to role-play. They had to interview a famous person, a model, actor, actress, YouTuber, TikTok star, among others (post-test). They wrote down the dialog applying the vocabulary learned during the unit, designed the scenario, and practiced as much as they could. After each practice, they got and provided feedback among themselves. Finally, they submitted the video on the Edmodo platform, and the teacher assessed it by applying the same rubric used for the pre-test.

Methodology

This was action research. It is described by Ravid (2015) as a cycle that starts with the identification of problems that need to be improved, searches for research-based practices, implements them, and report the results. This action research included qualitative and quantitative instruments to answer the research questions. Data were collected at the beginning (pre-survey), during, and at the end (post-survey) of the innovation for six weeks.

Participants Description

This action research was based on survey responses from sixteen students at a public school in Quito, Pichincha province, Ecuador. The participants were 7 males and 9 females. Their ages ranged from 15 to 17 years old. The average age was 16. They were in the second year of baccalaureate and belonged to different classes. All the participants had internet access, and electronic devices such as smartphones, laptops, or tablets. Their English proficiency was A1 and it was confirmed using an online test. The best students were chosen to participate in this research. They aimed to increase their speaking skills through technology.

The demographic survey was administered using online forms (Appendix C). It indicated that three students were Venezuelan, one came from Cuba, and the rest of them were Ecuadorian. Five Ecuadorian students could speak Quichua. Two males had acquired a great knowledge of English when they were at private high schools. Three learners were taking English online classes in their free time, and the rest of the students said that they had learned a little English over the past scholar years. All the sample had digital skills and enjoyed technology. They mentioned that they interacted with their classmates through platforms, apps, and social networks.

Instruments

Demographic Survey. The students took an online survey (Appendix C) before the innovation. So, the teacher collected them to describe the participants.

Proficiency Test. The participants took a Cambridge mock test to know their English level and uploaded their score on the Edmodo platform. The teacher analyzed the proficiency of the participants by overchecking the results. Also, the teacher confirmed the students' proficiency by asking them to upload a video answering random questions.

Speaking Survey. This was completed before and after the innovation based on the Likert scale using an online form. These surveys provided information about how the students developed their speaking skills and pair work. As part of their pre-survey (Appendix D), they expressed the activities they liked doing in class, what skills they had, how to pair work was used, and how they felt about the content they were studying within the unit.

At the end of the process, when students finished the innovation and sent the video, they took a post-survey (Appendix E), in which they expressed how peer feedback had helped them to improve their speaking skills, some common problems they had while doing the activity, and how they felt about working with a peer while recording themselves

speaking in English.

Rubric. It was used to grade fluency, accuracy, vocabulary, and interaction.

The rubric was modified with an extra criterion which was “Insufficient” which allowed to grade all the process during the innovation

Pre and Posttest. The first recording was considered as a pre-test to identify the problems they have while speaking in English. As a part of their pretest, the students were asked to record talking about themselves, their family members, their city where they live, and things they like to do during a normal day at home.

The last video was considered as the post-test. This video was graded with the rubric. The students had the opportunity to create all the dialogues using any apps or tools that they were familiar with and use their creativity to develop them.

Interview. The interview had some open-ended questions which were asked at the end of the innovation and they were recorded by zoom out of the school’s schedule. Using a qualitative technique all the responses were transcribed, interpreted, and analyzed.

Data Analysis

This action research was based on quantitative instruments to carry out the data analysis. The data was collected and analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) program to portray the statistical information like mean, and standard deviation. For data analysis, the effect size was calculated.

The pre and post-survey data were also analyzed using descriptive statistics. Those statistical values were represented in tables that detailed the main items to reflect the impact of the innovation on the participants.

The pre and posttest data were graded using a rubric that focused on fluency, accuracy, vocabulary, and interaction. The interview table presented the most important

comments that students mentioned during the innovation. Additionally, the extra comments that the students gave were inside the field notes format used for this study.

Ethical Considerations

The institution authorized this innovation through a consent letter. It gave all the facilities to conduct the study. All the participants were informed about the purpose of the research and the whole process during the weeks of study.

The students who participated in this research were minors so their parents signed a permission letter to let them be part of this study. The students' names and personal information were not mentioned in the research to keep confidentiality among participants.

Results

The data in this innovation were collected to describe the impact that peer feedback had on improving speaking skills. The results obtained during the innovation are organized according to the two research questions.

To what extent does peer feedback improve speaking?

Table 1

Rubric

| | N | Pre-test | | Post-test | | Effect size |
|-------------|----|----------|-------|-----------|-------|-------------|
| | | Mean | SD | Mean | SD | |
| Fluency | 16 | 1.88 | 0.719 | 4.00 | 0.816 | 0.974 |
| Accuracy | 16 | 1.62 | 0.719 | 3.44 | 0.814 | 0.953 |
| Vocabulary | 16 | 2.13 | 0.885 | 4.19 | 0.655 | 0.969 |
| Interaction | 16 | 2.06 | 0.680 | 4.44 | 0.629 | 0.995 |

Table 1 shows the pre and post results of tests according to the rubric components such as interaction, fluency, vocabulary, and accuracy. Participants interacted more among themselves during the posttest (Mean = 4.44) than they did during the pretest (Mean = 2.06). Besides, the dialogue flowed spontaneously, the vocabulary was appropriate for the context,

and there were minor grammar mistakes. The effect sizes were high (0.995) for all the components of the rubric. In sum, participants have increased their interaction, fluency, vocabulary, and accuracy significantly and they could communicate in English in a better way.

What are students' perspectives towards this innovation?

Table 2

Pre-survey and Post-survey

| | Pre-survey | Post-survey |
|---|------------|-------------|
| Fill in space with correct grammar | 1.75 | 3.38 |
| Practice specific vocabulary orally of an activity | 2.25 | 3.63 |
| Oral practice with the vocabulary of personal interests | 2.00 | 3.94 |
| Oral pair work activities in the classroom | 2.00 | 4.00 |
| Pair work in general outside the classroom | 2.06 | 3.63 |
| You have created a short speech | 2.31 | 3.75 |
| You have made an oral presentation | 1.69 | 4.06 |
| You have commented on a general topic | 2.00 | 3.69 |
| You have created dialogues to practice with peers | 1.88 | 3.88 |
| You have practice a dialogue about general ideas | 1.81 | 3.81 |
| Pair work is useful to practice speaking | 2.00 | 3.81 |

The post and pre-survey evidenced that there was a change in students' perspectives towards the items, mainly in their oral presentation with a mean of 4.06, oral pair work activities where the mean was 4.00, and oral practice with vocabulary the mean was 3.94. During the pre-survey, participants have made an oral presentation (Mean = 1.69), but after the innovation according to students' perspectives, they improved their speaking skills so the implementation of peer feedback had a positive impact on students' perspectives.

Table 3*The pre-survey and post-survey results*

| | Pre-survey | Post-survey |
|--|------------|-------------|
| Feel confused about the topic | 3.31 | 1.56 |
| Feel confused for not knowing what to say | 3.19 | 1.87 |
| Feel anxious trying to look for words to respond correctly | 3.44 | 1.69 |
| Feel afraid of making mistakes in pronunciation | 3.69 | 1.69 |
| Cannot structure a sentence | 3.44 | 1.56 |
| Cannot continue the conversation because of the lack of vocabulary | 3.56 | 1.75 |
| Feel embarrassed of making mistakes | 3.38 | 1.81 |
| Can interact with the interlocutor | 1.81 | 3.75 |

Table 3 shows the aspects of the second survey that students had to take. There was a clear improvement comparing the pre and post-survey. The most representative means were 3.75 for interaction with interlocutor, 1.69 for pronunciation mistakes, and 1.75 for lack of vocabulary. These mean values showed in other words that participants significantly increased their self-esteem, they overcame their fear of making mistakes in pronunciation and pausing due to a lack of vocabulary.

Table 4*Interview*

| Questions | Answers |
|--|---|
| 1. What problems did you have with speaking? | Some of the participants claimed that the lack of interest they had to learn English did not let them learn vocabulary to communicate. A few students said that even though they studied their lessons, they could not recognize the words when it was pronounced. One student mentioned that he memorized the vocabulary, but he could not produce it. |
| 2. Did you improve them? To what | All the students said that they improved their speaking skills. Three of the students said that the use of dialogs helped them improve |

| | |
|---|--|
| extent? What helped you improve? | their accuracy and vocabulary. A few students agreed that the use of the technology was fundamental to improve their learning process. Also, two students confirmed that the use of dialogs allowed them to practice and understand more English in the real context. |
| 3. Have you used peer feedback before? What are the advantages of peer feedback? Are there disadvantages? | A few students claimed that they were familiar with peer feedback, but they did not know how to use it effectively. Most of the students told me that they have never work in peer feedback; however, they were agreed that peer feedback helped them improve their speaking during their innovation. Three students said that their classmates only wrote “a good job” and they could not know if it was well. On the other hand, two students claimed that they did not feel comfortable receiving comments from their peers because they felt judged, criticized, or misunderstood. |
| 4. What problems did you have with speaking? | The majority of students agreed that the lack of vocabulary was one of the main problems to communicate in English among them. Two students said that it was very demanding learning how to pronounce some words correctly. One student claimed that the most difficult part was to structure sentences. A few students said that at the beginning, they found it difficult to interact among themselves, but during the process, they took advantage of this technique and it was beneficial. |

Table 4 shows the students' point of view of this innovation. It is clear that this innovation was beneficial for the majority. Participants' interaction improved during this study which provided further evidence that peer feedback had a positive impact on their oral production. There were a few students who took more time to get familiar with accuracy.

Discussion

It is important to mention that the literature review and data obtained allow to answer the two research questions.

Question 1. To what extent does peer feedback improve speaking?

There was a sample of 16 students who took part in this study. They were used to work on the books with minimum interaction among themselves. Peer feedback was rarely used because of the method applied before. This study was conducted when students had to study online due to Covid-19. For this reason, the teacher had the opportunity to change and adapt new activities during the innovation. Oprandy (as cited in Jacobs & Farrel, 2003) highlighted the critical role of teachers in the design of pair work activities. The researcher chose activities that were interesting for the sample. The students not only practiced their speaking skills, they realized the importance of improving them. Students require extended, authentic, and meaningful practice (Celce-Murcia, 2001; Jacobs & Farrel, 2003).

Communicative activities that involve pair work became part of the lesson plans, but there were some problems that students presented at the beginning of the research. The use of dialogs was fundamental for the students to enhance their speaking. When recording the dialogues, students may demonstrate difficulties like one of the pair trying to dominate the conversation, speaking very low and not clearly, ignoring the pair, or making constant interruptions (Backlund, 1990 as cited in Al-Eiadeh et al., 2016). It took some time for the sample to organize themselves and notice that working together would be beneficial for their learning process. Pair work enhances learner's autonomy (Harris et al., as cited in Jacobs & Farrel, 2003).

Technology was essential for this research because all the students around the world were studying online. Through technology, they get opportunities to interact and provide feedback (Bahadorfar & Omidvar, 2014). During classes, students were assigned to work with a peer online, and it was beneficial because all of them felt attracted to work with technology. Also, the participants enjoyed this strategy because, with the use of the internet, they created creative scenarios to use when they had to role-play their dialogs.

Mahraj (2018) classified vocabulary into two main categories. The first refers to the ones found in academic texts. The second refers to the lexicon that is associated with specific areas of study. The content used during this study allowed students to create conversations that support the use of unfamiliar words and the participants acquired as much vocabulary as they could. Jacobs and Farrell (2003) remarked on connecting the school to the context of the world. So, participants used vocabulary not only for class academic purposes, but the content could also be used in real-life situations because they learned a lot of vocabulary related to their interest, shared ideas, and learned new words together.

Question 2. What are students' perspectives towards this innovation?

Through this study, the students had the opportunity to give their comments, and all of them always agreed that they could notice their improvement in their speaking skills because they were able to handle a basic conversation in English during their online sessions with the researcher. In the beginning, the students claimed that it was not easy to record themselves because they were embarrassed to show their pronunciation on the videos. However, the teacher always worked with them and recorded herself to show them how to do it.

Scaffolding refers to the different ways teachers facilitate learning, starting from an initial mental structure to a complicated content or skill by organizing learners' new knowledge (Reiser & Tabak, 2014). The students were active participants and improved their pronunciation, and accuracy due to the teacher's support.

The participants had the opportunity to create their dialogues with a classmate. In fact, they liked this idea because they learned to be more collaborative with peers, have good relationships with each other, and they hardly ever had occasions to work in groups in their other classes. The exercises created permitted the participants to practice speaking among themselves after classes without being graded. However, the feedback was a part of their learning process. Bygate defined production as the ability to speak without time limitations;

and, interaction is produced when pairs negotiate the conversation (as cited in Derakhshan et al., 2015). Due to this research, the participants realized the importance and benefits of speaking English, so that, they learned to negotiate for creating meaningful learning. In addition, they expressed how peer feedback helped them not to be embarrassed to practice the target language and to accept comments that help them improve this strategy. For William (2016), peer feedback is a constant cycle in instruction. It is a process of observing, revising, taking notes, and reflecting before writing comments.

Conclusions

After this research was conducted, the researcher confirmed that peer feedback was beneficial to enhance speaking skills. At the beginning of this research, the participants felt a lack of confidence in speaking. Nevertheless, they kept working on their oral skills and they were comfortable in giving oral presentations that they were interested in through interactive dialogs using technological apps.

The use of videos and peer feedback combined well because they allowed the participants to improve their vocabulary, fluency, and accuracy due to working together. This study let students handle a basic conversation based on their real-life situations. In fact, they increased their motivation to learn and to improve their speaking skill.

During the innovation, students gained a lot of vocabulary that permitted them to communicate their ideas without making too many pauses. It was also evident the evolution of creating dialogs because students started writing simple sentences and ended producing more complex and structured dialogs. The improvement of accuracy was naturally acquired during this process.

The students interacted better while using technology among themselves because it facilitated meaningful oral production. Besides, the learners made effort to record creative videos paying attention to the pronunciation before uploading them to the platform. They

were also interested in working and creating dialogs with the content used within the innovation.

Limitations

One of the most important limitations was that students sometimes had internet connection issues, especially at peak hours. Sometimes, a few students could not connect early in the mornings. So, they had to take classes in the afternoons. Another limitation was that some students only had one electronic device at home, and they had to share it with other family members that were also studying.

Recommendations

The researcher recommends analyzing the method used in the school before applying this methodology to enhance students' speaking skills. The CLT approach must be part of the curriculum. Another recommendation is when working with teenagers, it is essential to explain to them the objective of the study because they could be worried about the grades and would try to memorize dialogs instead of learning the vocabulary and using it in a real context.

The researcher also recommends that before applying this innovation, investigators must develop exercises using rubrics and make students be part of them. The learners had to be clear that the main objective of this study is to learn English instead of being graded. It is also important to mention that the sample must realize the importance of feedback to improve the target language and be mature to learn through their mistakes.

The last recommendation is that future researchers must be familiarized with the use of the internet and technological apps because adolescents may want to recommend some apps, and the researcher should take time to investigate, analyze them, and decide if they are appropriated to be used in class.

References

- Al-Eiadeh, A., Al.Sobh, M., Al-Zoubi, S., Al-Khasawneh, F. (2016). Improving English language speaking skills of Ajloun National university students. *International Journal of English and Education*, 5(3), 181-195. <https://www.researchgate.net/project/Article-Low-Academic-Achievement-Causes-and-Results>
- Allen, D., Blythe, T., Dichter, A., & Lynch, T. (2018). *Protocols in the Classroom: Tools to help students read, write, think, & collaborate*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Alqahtani, A. (2019). The Use of Technology in English Language Teaching. *Frontiers in Education Technology*, 2(3), 168–180. doi: <https://doi.org/10.22158/fet.v2n3p168>
- Bahadorfar, M., & Omidvar, R. (2014). Technology in teaching speaking skills. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research Review*, 2(4), 9-13. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/315790125_TECHNOLOGY_IN_TEACHING_SPEAKING_SKILL/citations
- Celce-Murcia, M. (2001). *Teaching English as a Second Language or Foreign Language* (2nd. Ed.). New York: Newbury House.
- Colthorpe, K., Chen. X., & Zimbardi, K. (2014). Peer feedback enhances a “Journal Club” for undergraduate science students that develop oral communication and critical evaluation skills. *Journal of Learning Design*, 7(2), 106-119.
- Derakhshan, A., Khalili, A., & Beheshti, F. (2016). Developing an EFL learner’s speaking ability, accuracy, and fluency. *English Language and Literature Studies*, 6(2), 177-186. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/303498787_Developing_EFL_Learner's_Speaking_Ability_Accuracy_and_Fluency

- Derakhshan, A., Tahery, F., & Mirarab, N. (2015). Helping adults and young learners to communicate in speaking classes with confidence. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Science*, 6(2), 520-525. doi: 10.5901/mjss.2015.v6n2p520
- EF EPI. (2019). *EF English Proficiency Index*.
<https://www.ef.com/~/media/centralefcom/epi/downloads/full-reports/v9/ef-epi-2019-english.pdf>
- Jacobs, G., & Farrell, T. (2003). Understanding and Implementing the CLT (Communicative Language Teaching) Paradigm. *RELC Journal*, 35(5), 5-30. doi:
<https://doi.org/10.1177/003368820303400102>
- Lantolf, J., Thorne, S., & Pohner, M. (2015). Sociocultural theory and second language development. In B. VanPatten & J. Williams (Eds.), *Theories in Second Language Acquisition: An introduction*. New York: Routledge.
- Mahraj, M. (2018). Teaching technical vocabulary through word-formation rules. *ESP International Arab Journal of English for Specific Purposes*, 1(1), 37-44.
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/327449200_Teaching_Technical_Vocabulary_through_Word_Formation_Rules
- Ministerio de Educación. (2002). *Ecuadorian in-service English Teacher Standards*.
https://educacion.gob.ec/wp-content/uploads/downloads/2012/09/estandares_2012_ingles_opt.pdf
- Ministerio de Educación del Ecuador. (2012, September). *National Curriculum Guidelines*.
<https://educacion.gob.ec/wp-content/uploads/downloads/2014/09/01-National-Curriculum-Guidelines-EFL-Agosto-2014.pdf>
- Onyema, E., Eucheria, N., Obafemi, F., Sen, S., Atonye, F., Sharma, A., & Alsayed, A. (2020). Impact of Coronavirus Pandemic on Education. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 11(13), 108–121. doi: <https://doi.org/10.7176/jep/11-13-12>

- Paredes, R., Henríquez, E., Zurita, R., Pinos, V., Apolinario, O., & Campoverde, M. (2018). New Curriculum in Ecuador. *Ulink*, 4–74. <https://www.ulink.us/editorial/wp-content/uploads/2018/06/New-curriculum-ulink.pdf>
- Ravid, R. (2015). *Practical Statistics for Educators*. New York: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Reiser, B., & Tabak, I. (2014). Scaffolding. *The Cambridge Handbook of the Learning Sciences*, 3(29), 44–62. doi:10.1017/cbo9781139519526.005
- Richards, J. (2006). *Communicative language teaching today*. New York: Cambridge.
- Sardareh, S. (2018). *Assessment for learning in Malaysian primary schools: A case study*. Sociolinguistics Symposium: The University of Auckland. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/326148123_Assessment_for_Learning_in_Malaysian_Primary_Schools_A_Case_Study
- Smit, N., van de Grift, W., de Bot, K., & Jansen, E. (2017). A classroom observation tool for scaffolding reading comprehension. *Elsevier*, 65(2), 117–129. doi:10.1016/j.system.2016.12.014
- Spies, T., & Xu, Y. (2018). Scaffolded academic conversations: Access to 21st-Century collaboration and communication skills. *SAGE Journals*, 54(1), 22-30. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.1177/1053451218762478>
- United Nations. (2020, August). *Policy Brief: Education during COVID-19 and beyond*. https://www.un.org/development/desa/dspd/wp-content/uploads/sites/22/2020/08/sg_policy_brief_covid-19_and_education_august_2020.pdf
- Wanpen, S., Sonkoontod, K., & Nonkukhetkhong, K. (2013). Technical vocabulary proficiencies and vocabulary learning strategies of engineering students. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 88, 312-320. <https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/82380139.pdf>

Wasik, B., & Campbell, C. (2012). Developing Vocabulary Through Purposeful, Strategic Conversations. *The Reading Teacher*, 66(2), 321–332.

<https://doi.org/10.1002/trtr.01095>

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](http://www.ascd.org/publications/educational-leadership/apr16/vol73/num07/The-Secret-of-Effective-Feedback.aspx)

Appendix A

Rubric

Available upon request.

Appendix B

Design from Your Goals

Available upon request.

Appendix C

Demographic Survey

Students' Demographics

Available upon request.

Appendix D

Speaking Survey (pre-survey)

Available upon request.

Appendix E

Speaking Survey (post-survey)

Available upon request.

Appendix F

INTERVIEW

Available upon request.

Appendix G

FIELD NOTES

Available upon request.