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Abstract

This action research examines the impact that self-video recordings of oral task-based activities have on the development and/or improvement of students’ speaking skills. The study was conducted in an eight-week period during which the participants wrote a script for a cooking TV, videoed their rehearsals in order to receive teacher feedback. Finally they made a final live presentation of the TV show during which a recipe was followed while they explained its steps and gave tips. Data examined by means of videos, structured interviews and students’ reflections showed that students’ oral production was enhanced mostly due to the analysis that the students were able to do of each one of their rehearsals, which also helped the teacher to give more meaningful feedback. This action research intervention resulted in an increase of vocabulary and self-confidence, more fluent performance and better pronunciation.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

We live within a globalized economy, which means that our country’s borders are practically wide open to the constant interchange of products, ideas and some other elements of culture. This process has occurred due to the development of telecommunications which have brought people closer to people from different cultures, forming a global community that requires a means to share knowledge and information as well as trade or conduct business. Thus, it is necessary to use a common language that serves all these purposes. It appears English has become the gateway for them.

Another major aspect that this phenomenon has had an impact on is the development of the tourism industry all over the world. Through the internet it is now possible to know about new, wonderful and remote places in any part of the world, which motivates people to travel and visit them. A survey conducted in 2014 by the business consulting firm Timetric found that northern Europeans are the world’s biggest travelers, with four Nordic countries all in the top five (Traveller, 2014).

Mexico has not been spared the effects of globalization; according to the UNWTO (World Tourism Organization) it had a 1% growth in tourists arrivals and according to the INEGI (Instituto Nacional de Estadística y Geografía) and Banxico (Banco de México) the number of international visitors to our country reached 23.7 million in 2013, the new historical maximum in our country (Datatur, 2013; INEGI, 2015). It must be highlighted, however, that of all the tourists that visit Mexico, 55% are American.

Thus, although tourist services providers have to cater for the needs of domestic tourists, to a large extent; they also have to be prepared to provide services and goods to this growing market of American tourists that are frequent visitors in our country. In this regard, it is not surprising that in Mexico, learning English as a foreign language has become an important asset for these businessmen, travel agents, tour guides, and the like.

In view of the constant growth of international tourism in our country, together with the adoption of English as the universal language for communication around the world, the importance of this language and the reasons for learning it as a foreign language need not be emphasized, especially for those people who work in the tourism industry or that are majoring in tourism related areas, such as gastronomy and tourism industry management.
As a consequence of this, teaching English in public schools but mostly in private schools, mainly in those that offer majors in tourism and gastronomy, has become an essential subject in their curricula. Hence, in this kind of colleges it is necessary to teach English for Specific Purposes. According to Celce-Murcia (2001), English for Specific Purposes is an approach that considers the language needs of the students and also takes into consideration the sociocultural contexts in which these students will be using English.

In view of the fact that tourist service providers and their clients interact mostly orally, it is more important for the students to be competent at communicating this way. Thus, they can assist their customers appropriately by giving them explanations, making suggestions or giving advice and even doing business with them in order to sell or buy services or products such as the dishes of a menu in a restaurant, tickets for a concert or a day trip to an archaeological site.

From this point of view, although developing the four skills is vital for the acquisition of the language, it may make more sense for some of these universities and their students to focus more on one or two skills - speaking and listening - than in the others.

Consequently, it is essential for students who study gastronomy to be able to explain the procedure of a recipe accurately or to have a good command of the vocabulary related to the kitchen and/or food so that they understand the instructions that can be given in this kind of context, to mention a few examples. For this reason, the intention of the present action research is to present a strategy that has an impact on the learners’ oral production and on their vocabulary acquisition.

The present report is organized in five chapters. In Chapter One, some facts about the relationship between learning English and the development of the Tourism industry in Mexico are examined. The area of practice investigated is identified by presenting the context in which the research has been carried out, including the characteristics of the participants and the description of the problem. The aims and purposes of this investigation are set at the end of this section.

In Chapter Two, a discussion about the theory and empirical studies related to the object of study in this research is presented. Concepts such as English for Specific Purposes, Learner-Centered Education and some current teaching approaches are analysed in detail. Finally, information regarding the development of speaking skills and the use of
technology in English Language Teaching is included together with some previous research on the topic.

In Chapter Three, the concept and characteristics of an Action Research are explained. There is also an explanation of the techniques used to collect the data for the initial research (IR) and an account of the outcome emerging from it. Subsequently, the action plan that was designed, based on the result of the IR and characteristics of the problem, is described thoroughly. This segment concludes with the explanation of the implementation of the strategy that may present a solution for the problem that was identified.

Chapter Four presents the outcomes resulted from the videos, the interviews and the students' self-reflections. The results were categorised into three main topics: oral production improvement, vocabulary acquisition, and motivation and self-confidence.

Finally, the conclusions of the research together with the limitations and implications for further research are shown in Chapter Five. Likewise, a deep analysis of this research led to consider some changes next time around in order to improve the action plan that was implemented.
1.1 Context

The present study was carried out in Xalapa, Veracruz at a private university. This university has two B.A programs, Tourism and Gastronomy. English is a very important subject in both degrees and the school administrators are very keen to have a strong English teaching program so that students can really benefit from it.

The objective set up by the head of the school is that English teachers focus on the students’ developing communicative skills rather than any other skills. For the school administration, it is very important that the students be able to hold meaningful conversations with English speaking tourists and that they also be prepared to deal successfully with prospective job interviews so that they can be hired by some of the large companies operating in our country and abroad.

The approach to English teaching at the school can be labeled as English for Specific Purposes. All the resources, activities and materials used in class are related to these two main fields: Tourism and Gastronomy. The students majoring in Tourism have four 50-minute classes per week, whereas students majoring in Gastronomy have three 50-minute classes per week. Most of the classes are large - twenty to thirty students- and students have different levels of English proficiency.

In the university, there is an English academic group which is formed by five English teachers. They are in charge of designing the syllabi and compiling the anthologies for each semester. The students do not work with any specific textbooks. As pointed out above, the majority of the activities focus on developing communicative skills. The teachers’ duties include submitting their semester planning and filing a report every week outlining the activities that they plan to implement with each group during the week.

Although there are specific topics to cover, each teacher has freedom to choose what to teach first, how to teach it and what materials to use, which means that they can organize the contents the way it suits them better and introduce new activities to complement the ones that are part of the anthology.

At the end of every semester, each group is assigned a special project that changes depending on the semester and the BA but it is standardized, which means that all the groups of the same semester and major have to do the same thing. For example, if the English teacher decides that the project for the eighth semester students of the BA in Gas-
tronomy will be “a job fair”, all the groups in the eighth semester of that BA will have to do the same thing.

It is important to mention that English is not a subject included in the curriculum for the BA in Gastronomy. Theoretically, it is not mandatory for the students to study English. Thus, some students are reluctant to take this class. This means that teachers have to make a big effort to motivate them and almost make them attend the English class. Fortunately, the new generations are more conscious of the importance of learning this language and most of them are more willing to take the class.

1.1.1 Participants

The research participants in this investigation were fifty-eight students of the second semester of gastronomy: 27 males and 31 females. The students were distributed in three different groups (two of nineteen students and one of twenty). Almost all the students come from middle-class families and only 39% of all of them are from Xalapa. In most cases, their parents are making a considerable effort to support them, pay for tuition, books, housing and so forth. Their ages range from eighteen to twenty-two years old.

Most of the students can be considered beginners, that is, most of them may be at the A1 or A2 level according to the Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR). Nevertheless, there was a disparity regarding the level of language proficiency of these students. While about 20% of all the students seemed to have a higher level of English (most likely a B1 or B2 level), about 15% of them did not have any knowledge of English at all.

The attitude of the students towards English is of acceptance, which means that the students are aware of the importance of leaning English, especially for their major as it increases the possibility of getting better job opportunities; however, most of them think it is quite difficult and some others simply do not enjoy learning this language. However, the majority do not make any effort to study the language at home nor are they exposed to it (music, videos, or TV shows) after class.
All the students received instruction, from a different teacher, using an English for Specific Purposes (ESP) syllabus for about sixty hours during the first semester of their major.

As English is compulsory in middle and high school in the basic education system in our country, all of students took at least 6 years of English before they enrolled in the BA in Gastronomy. However, it is well known that these courses account for little if any practical knowledge of the language. Only two of them have a certification in English (PET) and about 10 students have taken English courses in private language institutions. It goes without saying that it is these students who have a better command of the language. This does not automatically translate into higher grades, as these students are also the ones who tend to procrastinate, do their assignments at the last minute, miss homework, and have an attitude problem.
1.2 Description of the problem

Since 1993, the Ministry of Public Education (SEP, for its initials in Spanish) in Mexico contemplates English as mandatory for secondary school and High school. The expectation is that, after 6 years of English classes, when students enroll in university, they will have reached at least a B1 level. Nevertheless, according to a study, carried out in 2014 by a non-governmental organization called Mexicanos Primero, entitled Sorry: El Aprendizaje del Inglés en México (Sorry: Learning English in Mexico), it was determined that 8 out of 10 new students of High school do not have any knowledge in English. Apparently, this situation does not change significantly when they join the university.

On the other hand, it is well-known that nowadays, having a good command of English is considered very important for any profession. However, there are some BA programs in which English is imperative, especially because it has become crucial for the development of some kinds of jobs; that is the case of the BA in Gastronomy. Due to the characteristics of the graduate profile of this program, gastronomy students are expected to be in contact with people of different nationalities, assist foreign clients and even work abroad.

For these reasons, being communicatively competent in English is considered one of the main factors for the students’ professional success. However, as it was said above, despite the English instruction received during the secondary and high school period, most of the students have very little knowledge in English. Besides, they are more used to working with grammar exercises rather than with oral activities, which has hindered their communicative skills.

Consequently, the majority of the students cannot communicate fluently because they lack basic vocabulary, not to mention that related to their profession. Furthermore, they are afraid of mispronouncing words and sometimes they do not take risks to speak because they are not sure about the word order in a phrase or a sentence, so there is also a lack of self-confidence.
1.3 Objectives

The main purpose of this project is to determine whether the use of video recording is a useful technique for increasing the oral production of the students of the second semester of Gastronomy. Additionally, this research attempts to identify possible improvement in terms of amount of vocabulary gained, mostly specific vocabulary associated with the kitchen such as kitchen verbs (cook, boil, simmer, bake, etc), utensils, ingredients and measurements. Finally, the implementation of the strategy aims to have a positive impact on the students’ motivation by helping them to develop self-confidence and good feelings toward the learning of English.

1.4 Research questions

This research focuses on providing an answer for the following questions:

✦ To what extent can the use of self-video recordings increase the oral production of the students?

✦ To what extent can the use of self-video recordings account for gains in kitchen related vocabulary?

✦ Does this strategy have any impact on the students’ motivation and self-confidence?
Chapter 2

Research into Video Recording Techniques in ELT

Increasing students’ oral production in order to improve their communicative competence should be a great concern for any teacher. This was precisely the main objective of this research project. In view of this, first it was necessary to review some of the literature about English for Specific Purposes and Learner-centred Education in order to analyse the characteristics of the curriculum that the participants of this research are following. In this way, the particular language needs of these learners could be understood.

Additionally, the characteristics of current teaching approaches such as Communicative Language Teaching (CLT), Cooperative learning and Task-based learning (TBL) were examined. Likewise, some concepts related to speaking strategies and the use of technology in ELT are explored as a way to establish an argument for the strategy that was designed.

Finally, some previous research on the topic is cited to become familiar with the application of technology in English Language Teaching (ELT); more specifically, the use of video and audio recordings as a technique to improve the oral production of the students.

2.1 English for specific purposes

English for Specific Purposes (ESP) “is a movement based on the proposition that all language teaching should be tailored to the specific learning and language use needs of identified groups of students - and also sensitive to the sociocultural contexts in which these students will be using English” (Celce-Murcia, 2001, p. 43). According to Hutchinson & Waters (1987), ESP should be defined in terms of what it is not:

a. It is not a special form or variety of English.

b. It is not just about teaching words and grammar for a specific area or field. It is necessary to consider what functions of the language need to be performed by the learners, in order to help them to develop the abilities that are required to do so.

c. It is not different from other language teaching, thus, there is no ESP methodology but methodologies that have been applied in ESP classrooms and that are more or less suitable for it.
In this regard, ESP should not be seen as a methodology but simply as an approach to language teaching, which according to Celce-Murcia (2001) possesses four absolute characteristics:

a. It aims to meet the needs of particular learners, such as gastronomy, tourism or business students.

b. It is related to the content of particular disciplines, occupations or activities.

c. It takes into account the syntax, lexis, discourse and semantics of the activities chosen for a specific curriculum. This means that an ESP program will be centred on the language appropriate for each occupation.

d. It is in contrast to the idea of general English, that is, “what distinguishes ESP from General English is not the existence of a need as such but rather an awareness of the need. If learners, sponsors and teachers know why the learners need English, that awareness will have an influence on what will be acceptable as reasonable content in the language course and … what potential can be exploited” (Hutchinson & Waters, 1987, p. 53).

The ESP movement can be categorised in two main groups: English for Academic Purposes (EAP) and English for Occupational Purposes (EOP) which includes English for Professional Purposes (EPP) and Vocational ESL (VESL).

### 2.2 Learner-centred Education

So far, the importance of considering the needs of the learners as a major issue for the development of an ESP curriculum has been established. However, the kind of needs that have to be taken into account has not been determined yet in this paper.

According to Hutchinson & Waters (1987), it is necessary to identify what the learner needs to do in a target situation and it is convenient to analyse those situations in terms of necessities (what the learner has to know in order to perform effectively in the target situation), lacks (what the learner knows and does not know) and wants (the learner’s view or perception of his/her own needs).

Bearing in mind the importance of the learner’s needs, the reason for considering ESP as learner-centred approach is understandable. According to Nunan (1988), a learner-
centred approach needs a collaborative effort to create a curriculum, meaning that it should be planned between teachers and learners, allowing learners to be part of the decision-making process regarding the content and how it should be taught. In addition, Brown (2007, p. 52) points out that “a Learner-centred instruction includes techniques that:

A. Focus on or account for learners’ needs, styles and goals; that is, learners’ needs and styles may vary according to their reasons for learning English and their abilities, respectively. Once they are known by the teacher, the activities can be planned considering the interests of the pupils, not only regarding the topic but also the kind of skill, and their learning style, in order for classes to be motivating enough to foster learning.

On the other hand, it is important that the students set their own learning goals because “an absence of goals can lead to aimlessness and a lack of any sense of direction. Some people will tend to look for “quick-fix” immediate solutions to problems without thinking through the possible long-term consequences” (Williams & Burden, 1997, p. 74). It seems that the goals should be set individually by each learner according to their own capabilities, and in this way the possibilities of achieving them may increase.

B. Give some control to the students and allow creativity and innovation.

Brown (1997) argues that some teachers may be reluctant to give control to the students, especially when these students are beginners because they do not know the language; nevertheless, this should be understood as a way to help the students to be independent and become more effective learners. This is also supported by Cullen, Harris and Hill (2012, p. 18-19) who state that

Sharing power with students is a key factor in learner-centered practices as well as in developing creativity. Giving students opportunities to choose fosters engagement with content and helps ensure that they find activities relevant. The same is true in regard to creativity. Amabile’s extensive study of creativity (1996) outlined the factors that affect creativity in learning environments. Most important is openness, both physically in terms of classroom configuration and metaphorically in terms of a sense of freedom and safety.

From this point of view, it can be concluded that creativity and innovation can be promoted by giving the students freedom to decide about their learning choices.

C. Enhance a student’s sense of competence and self-worth.
A learner-centred curriculum should take into account the development of a sense of competence in the students. William and Burden (1997) consider that teachers should make them feel capable of learning the language by creating a positive self-image of themselves. Apparently, developing a sense of competence in the students leads to a better performance in the acquisition of a language. One of the reasons may be because students are not afraid to express themselves in English or to make mistakes.

This is pinpointed by Cullen et al. (2012), who argue that students’ beliefs about their ability or self-efficacy have a strong impact on their learning. “Students with high self-efficacy are more persistent … in the face of difficulties. They interpret failure not as a personal failing but as a single poor performance that can be overcome…” (Cullen et al., 2012, p. 16)

2.3 Communicative Language Teaching

There seems to have been a great concern for developing new and better ways to teach English as a foreign language. That is why several methods and approaches have emerged, intending to be the panacea of English teaching.

One of the current methods, which has apparently been quite accepted within the English teachers community, is the Communicative Language Teaching. It is difficult to provide a definition for it; nevertheless what is clear is that it sets as a goal the teaching of communicative competence. According to Richards (2006, p. 3), it includes the following aspects of language knowledge:

A. Knowing how to use language for a range of different purposes and functions
B. Knowing how to vary our use of language according to the setting and the participants (e.g., knowing when to use formal and informal speech or when to use language appropriately for written as opposed to spoken communication)
C. Knowing how to produce and understand different types of texts (e.g., narratives, reports, interviews, conversations)
D. Knowing how to maintain communication despite having limitations in one’s language knowledge (e.g., through using different kinds of communication strategies)
Additionally, Brown (2007, p. 46-47) offers some other characteristics as a description of CLT, such as:

A. The use of language techniques to engage learners in the pragmatic, authentic, functional use of language for meaningful purposes.

B. A focus on students’ flow of comprehension and production and a focus on the formal accuracy of production are seen as complementary principles underlying communicative techniques.

C. Students have to use the language, productively and receptively, in unrehearsed contexts outside the classroom.

D. Students are given opportunities to focus on their own process through raising their awareness of their own styles of learning and through the development of appropriate strategies for production and comprehension.

E. Students in a CLT class are active participants in their own learning process. Learner-centered, cooperative, collaborative learning is emphasized, but not at the expense of appropriate teacher-centered activity.

Moreover, “acquisition studies suggest that classroom communication can foster language acquisition, particularly if learners are given opportunities for productive language use and the negotiation of meaning in small-group work” (Nunan, 1988, p. 87). Opportunities for productive language use can be given through different tasks that serve as genuine practice within the classroom. According to Nunan (1988), some of these activities are considered collaborative communication activities such as: problem-solving tasks, role-plays and simulations.

2.4 Task-based learning

It is said that TBL has its origins in Communicative Language Teaching. According to Brown (2007), it is one of the most prominent perspectives within the CLT framework. However, there is disagreement about it because for some authors TBL is a completely different approach while some others “claim that TBLT is at the very heart of CLT”. (Ellis, 2003, in Brown, 2007, p. 50).

This approach uses tasks as a medium for language teaching. Peter Skehan (1998a, p. 95, in Brown, 2007, p. 50) defines tasks as “an activity in which: meaning is primary; there is some communication problem to solve; there is some sort of relationship to comparable real-world activities; task completion has some priority and the assessment of the task is in terms of outcome”. 
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In other words, a task is an activity performed by a person which, in order to be completed successfully, requires or demands certain knowledge, abilities and attitudes from the learner. In this case, the knowledge and abilities needed are related to the use of a foreign language, bearing in mind the attainment of an objective.

Brown (2007, p. 52) argues that a “Task-based instruction is a perspective within a CLT framework that forces you to carefully consider all the techniques that you use in the classroom in terms of a number of important pedagogical purposes”. This means that, when planning an activity it is important to consider the communicative dimensions of it, that is, be clear about what the learner needs to do with the language or the goal to pursue, what input from the teacher is going to be needed, the role of the teacher and the learner and finally the considerations for assessment.

According to Brown (2007) the main characteristic of TBLT is that, by means of tasks, it is possible to achieve specific communicative goals when students are challenged to fulfill activities from real-world contexts. However, in order to succeed, it is necessary to plan and design in detail every aspect of the tasks so that those goals are not only clear and comprehensible but also interesting enough to catch the students’ attention and their willingness to complete such tasks and so accomplish the communication objectives.

2.5 Cooperative Learning

Up to this point, two of the most embraced approaches in English Language Teaching (ELT) have been addressed; nonetheless, having in mind the characteristics of both approaches, it is difficult to imagine the implementation of communicative activities that do not involve cooperative learning.

Cooperative Learning refers to:

A systematic instructional method in which students work together in small groups to accomplish shared learning goals. The data in a large amount of research shows, compared with competitive and individualistic efforts, cooperation has positive effects on a wider range of outcomes (Johnson & Johnson, 1991; Slavin, 1995; Kagan, 1999). People operating in a cooperative learning activity attain higher achievement level than those who function under competitive and individualistic learning structures. Other findings in cooperative learning research show cooperation has positive effects on relations among students, self-esteem, long-term retention, or depth of understanding of course material, etc. It has been tested as one of the most effective and constructive teaching strategies (Zhang, 2010, para.1)
Brown (2007) states that a curriculum based on cooperative learning has the same characteristics of a learner-centred program. It involves pair and/or teamwork as a way to achieve goals. This can be made possible by sharing information through mutual cooperation among learners. On the other hand, this author points out that sometimes cooperative learning is used as a synonym of collaborative learning; however, “in cooperative learning models, a group learning activity is dependent on the socially structured exchange of information between learners and in collaborative learning, the learner engages with more capable others, who provide assistance and guidance” (Brown, 2010, p.53).

Yan Zhang (2010) argues that this approach has been gaining great acceptance in the language learning classrooms due to its contributions to create opportunities for communication and for improving productivity. Some of the benefits of cooperative language learning are listed as follows:

1. It provides opportunities with comprehensible input and output.
2. It helps to create a good learning environment.
3. It augments the use of a variety of language functions.
4. It promotes learners’ autonomy and responsibility.

2.6 Speaking skills

Speaking is a productive skill, which according to Brown (1994) it is a process where information is produced, exchanged and processed in order to communicate and/or create meaning.

It also may be considered one of the most difficult skills to teach and/or to work with. This statement is based on the complaints of many teachers about how difficult it is to have their students speak English during the class. Although the reasons for this problem can be many, one of them has to do with the fact that “Speaking requires that learners not only know how to produce specific points of language such as grammar, pronunciation, or vocabulary (linguistic competence), but also that they understand when, why, and in what ways to produce language (sociolinguistic competence)” (Cunningham, 1999, para. 3).
In other words, when speaking, the speaker has to take into account several factors in order to address his/her interlocutor correctly. Speakers have to be aware of the fact that “the form and meaning are dependent on the context in which (they) occur, including the participants themselves, their collective experiences, the physical environment, and the purposes for speaking. It is often spontaneous, open-ended, and evolving” (Cunningham, 1999, para. 3).

However, according to Cunningham (1999), it is possible to find or identify patterns in the language, that is, expressions and/or utterances that are recurrent in certain discourse situations, such as taking orders at a restaurant or providing information for a tourist. This language functions can be classified and charted in order to design goal-oriented oral tasks that eventually help the learner to succeed in a given speech task.

According to Byrne (1991, in Peña & Onatra, 2009, para. 7) oral tasks:

Involve the productive skill of speaking and the receptive skill of understanding. It means that learners have to be taught to speak as well as to listen. Both listening and speaking are such common activities in the daily routine that we seem to confuse ourselves as being experts when we are only users. Hence, when learners understand the difference between hearing something and listening attentively to someone, they can then grasp a variety of communication requirements that range from talking to an audience in a meaningful transactional mode, to speaking with each other by building up the discourse as the conversation flows in an interactional task. The conjunction of these relevant elements in the classroom is a contribution to the gradual achievement of communicative competence.

On the other hand, there is an assumption that learners will be able to transfer knowledge and the skills developed within the classrooms to new contexts and situations in the real world. Nevertheless, Nunan (1998, p. 78) considers that:

The transfer of skills from the classroom context to other contexts did not occur as readily as was hoped. The result has been the development of activities which are meant to approximate in the classroom what happens in genuine communication outside….. Thus, in addition to various drills and controlled practice designed to develop accuracy, we have the whole panoply of communicative activities, including games, simulations and role plays which are meant to foster fluency.
In this view, Nunan (1988) has stated that various tasks types have been developed to simulate genuine whole task practice in the classroom. These include information-gap task, language games, simulations and role-play, which are considered collaborative communication activities. He believes that these activities manifest the following characteristics:

A. They provide learners with opportunities to hold conversations.
B. They make learners help each other to construct meaning.
C. They entail the learning of turn-taking rules.
D. They focus on comprehensible and meaningful input and output.
E. They require the participation and deep involvement of the learner.

Additionally, it is important to consider some other concepts related to the development of communicative competence. “There are six terms in second language research and pedagogy regarding speaking skills: Fluency versus accuracy, interlanguage, comprehensible input, pushed output and negotiation of meaning” (Folse, 2006, p. 30).

According to Folse (2006), a speaking activity can focus on fluency or on accuracy. “Fluency here refers to the amount of language produced in the task, while accuracy refers to the linguistic correctness of what is said in the task” (Folse, 2006, p. 30). This author explains that in conversation classes the most important thing is that students talk, thus, fluency activities can be more suitable, especially if these activities not only encourage them to talk but require them to speak.

The interlanguage is “the language that is in between the native language and the target language (English)” (Folse, 2006, p. 33). According to the author, this language is clearly full of errors which are a sign of language development. “Second language learners errors follow a fairly predictable pattern in which these errors are deemed a normal and necessary part of the language acquisition process” (Corder, 1981 in Folse, 1996, p.33).

Thus, well-designed speaking activities should aim to stretch the learners’ interlanguage. This means that students must be encourage to go to their zone of proximal development, which according to Vygotsky is “the layer of skill or knowledge which is just beyond that with which the learner is capable of coping” (Williams & Burden, 1997, p. 40).

The concept of interlanguage is closely related to the concept of comprehensible input. Teachers should attempt to design speaking activities for a proficiency growth, while
making language comprehensible. According to Fosel (2006, p. 35-39), this can be done through the following suggestions:

1. Enunciate more carefully, particularly avoiding assimilation of adjacent sounds and words.
2. Be aware of common ESL student mispronunciations which are often based on interference from either a student’s native language or English spelling.
3. Be aware of grammatical structures that are either confusing or unknown to your learners.
4. Monitor vocabulary and decide what words can be understood by which students at which level.
5. Avoid paraphrasing in your second attempt at explaining something. Wait until a third attempt.

It should be noted that, in addition to comprehensible input, there is a pushed output which is the moment when learners make utterances, rethink them and modify them if necessary. According to Swain and Lapkin (1995), during this process of modifications their interlanguage is impacted and restructured for good.

Finally, negotiation of meaning is a process in which “the speakers attempt to successfully convey information to one another; they reach mutual comprehension through restating, clarifying and confirming information” (Folse, 2006, p. 40). Having the students holding conversations where they have to negotiate meaning is an excellent way to stretch their interlanguage because “the learners’ vocabulary, an especially important part of second language proficiency, is reinforced.”(Folse, 2006, p. 42)

2.7 Technology in ELT

The last twenty years have been characterised by a great and accelerated development of technology, which has had a deep impact on different fields such as education. Currently, there are a lot of applications, multimedia devices (smartphones, cameras, laptops, pads, computers), networks and all kinds of software that serve as learning tools. It seems that “their effectiveness as instruments of learning is not inherent; their power is derived from the teachers and students who use them. Their effectiveness is measured by whether they improve student performance and help students reach full potential” (Jordan and Follman, 1993, p. 66).
The application of technology within the EFL classroom encompasses a wide range of techniques which can be used in various degrees depending on the learning goals. According to Jordan and Follman (1993) information can be presented in several formats (text, video and audio) by means of technology and each of them provides good opportunities for learning. Likewise, using technology as a learning strategy presents many advantages:

Technologies enable teachers to focus their energies on coaching students with their individual growth. Teachers can give special attention to certain individuals without neglecting the progress of others who are successfully guiding their own learning. Students are enabled to work individually or in small groups at their own pace, taking advantage of access to vast sources of information and working with complex connections among varied disciplines. Technologies stimulate students as active learners who control the pace and direction of content, questions, and responses (Jordan & Follman, 1993, p. 66).

There is an interesting teaching and learning technique based on technology which seems to have positive effects on the development of students’ speaking skill. Weyers (1999) pointed out that video recordings are useful not only to improve students’ oral production but also, and especially, their “confidence in speech”. The benefits of using videos are highlighted by Biegel (1998) as well, who states that videos break the rigidity of more traditional techniques. Moreover, as videos allow to document students’ language production, there is more meaningful feedback because, according to McGovern (1983), teachers and students can observe the video as many times as require in order to analyse thoroughly all the different components that take part in communication; thus assessment is more reliable and valid as well.

In addition, Shrosbree (2008) indicates that by self-video recording a performance, students get the opportunity to discover improvement areas in their speech by analysing their presentation. Furthermore, students “can gain a real sense of purpose from the knowledge that they are preparing and practicing an activity for video recording. There is also the interest and satisfaction of seeing oneself in operation, particularly rewarding if the task being performed in L2 was previously beyond one’s known capabilities” (McGovern, 1983, p. 87).
2.8 Previous research

The improvement of oral production in EFL students has been a matter of analysis and research. One of these studies was conducted at a Japanese national university in 2010. Gromik (2012) conducted a case study in which nine participants used the video recording feature on their cell phones to produce weekly video productions. The participants were asked to produce a 30-second video on a teacher-selected topic. After some weeks, the interviews and teacher observations revealed that students increased the number of words they spoke in a monologue.

It seems that an improvement on the participants' fluency was observed as it took the students less time to produce the final video. The results of this research lead to conclude that using technology such as the video recording feature of the cellphone has a positive impact on students' oral production. It is also motivating and is a way to evaluate the learners' speaking skills.

In Colombia, Peña and Onatra (2009) carried out another kind of research to promote oral production through task-based learning. This study was developed along nine months with a sample of students belonging to four groups of seventh grade of the Francisco de Paula Santander School. Students were asked to interact with their peers by holding conversations, formal and informal interviews, and dialogues. They also did individual presentations based on topics suggested by them. The researchers used audio recordings, field notes and proformas for the data collection.

The outcomes of this investigation were that students gained more confidence and reduced anxiety when speaking, and although there were some mistakes in grammar, intonation and pronunciation, they could manage to use strategies to maintain communication. Memorisation favoured fluency but worked against speaking naturally. One of the most relevant tenets was that mistakes represent a good opportunity to learn and that getting learners to speak in the EFL classroom is both rewarding and demanding. It is also important to keep in mind students' awareness of their learning as a process rather than a last stage product.

Finally, Katchen (1991) published an article which discusses the relevance of using videocameras as a teaching tool in EFL classrooms, based on the opinions of different teachers of EFL college courses in East Asian Countries. Basically, Katchen shows that
teachers agreed that recording students’ activities such as role-plays and dialogues is useful to critique language usage and grammar. Moreover, recording the students while speaking allows them to compare each one of their performances and see their progress; thus, students have the opportunity to become self-critical of their abilities and teachers can also use this material as examples for future classes.
Chapter 3: Methodology

This chapter focuses on the kind of study that has been selected. It describes its characteristics, steps and the rationale for choosing this methodological approach. It also addresses the problem being investigated, the action plan that was designed and the strategy that might provide a possible solution to the problem. The data collection techniques that were used to gather information to determine the impact of the strategy that was implemented, are also described.

3.1 Research Design

Action research presents teachers with an effective and practical way to study everyday learning and teaching problems that all professors face in their classrooms. It gives them the opportunity to improve specific aspects of their teaching practice by exploring a situation that is hindering learning, in order to have a deep understanding of it. In other words, “carrying out action research is all about developing the act of knowing through observation, listening, analysing, questioning and being involved in constructing one’s own knowledge” (Koshy, 2005. p. XIV).

According to Burns (1999, in Burns, 2010, p. 5), Action Research (AR) is defined as:

A self-reflective, systematic and critical approach to enquiry by participants who are at the same time members of the research community. The aim is to identify problematic situations or issues considered by the participants to be worthy of investigation in order to bring about critically informed changes in practice. Action research is underpinned by democratic principles in that ownership of change is invested in those who conduct the research.

One of the major advantages of Action Research is that it is a powerful and useful model for practitioner research (Koshy, 2005, p. 21) because:

- Research can be set within a specific context.
- Researchers can be participants.
- Continuous evaluations and modifications can be made as the project progresses.
• New theories can emerge.
• The study can lead to open-ended outcomes

The reason for choosing this kind of study is that it gives the researcher the possibility to become involved in a self-reflective process so as to analyse his teaching practice and thus address a problematic situation within the classroom through the implementation of certain strategies. On the other hand, due to the characteristics of A.R., it is possible to determine the effectiveness of the strategies in a relatively short period of time, giving the researcher the chance to complete several different cycles to achieve the goal that was previously set and finally solve the problem. Under this perspective, this can be a very self-rewarding process because it provides the researcher with a sense of achievement and improvement.

In AR, it is very important that the researcher carry out a process of observation and reflection in order to design and implement a strategy that solves the problem that has been detected. Burns (2010) claims that the process of carrying out Action Research involves the follow-up of some steps, which can become a repetitive cycle depending on the intention of the researcher. The general steps that were followed in this investigation were:

1) The planning: in this first stage the problem was identified and a plan of action was developed to bring about improvement in the students’ speaking skills. Additionally, an initial research was carried out to be sure about the problematic situation. This was done through the observation of the students’ performance in a task and through a questionnaire.

2) The action: this was the second stage and it involved the implementation of some deliberate intervention. The intervention included writing a script for the cooking TV show and the video recording of each rehearsal.

3) Observation: this third stage, implied the analysis of the effects of the intervention and documenting the perceptions of the people involved in the research.

4) The reflection: this last stage was the moment when the researcher evaluated and judged the result emerging from the data collected in order to determine
the real effectiveness of the strategy that was implemented. The researcher may decide to do further cycles\(^1\).

\[\text{Figure 1. Cyclical AR model based on Kemmis and McTaggart (1988, in Burns, 2010, p. 9)}\]

3.2 Identifying and understanding the problem

As pointed out above, at the school where this research was carried out, administrators and teachers privilege developing the speaking skill due to the fact that it is very important for the students majoring in gastronomy to communicate orally so that they can fulfill the requirements of their future jobs once they are employed in a touristic venture. Under this perspective, it is necessary that they focus on oral production by acquiring the structures and the vocabulary that is common in their area of practice. Nevertheless, having the students acquire these skills is easier said than done.

On the other hand, the results of their first semester final oral exam indicate that most of the students have trouble to explain the procedure of a recipe because they do not know enough vocabulary related to this genre (verbs used in the kitchen, utensils, ingredients and measurements). Besides, they do not know how to build clear sentences and/or how to connect them in order to sound natural when explaining the. Additionally, the major-

\(^1\)For the purposes of this research, only one cycle was carried out.
ty of the students have a problem with pronunciation, making it difficult to convey a clear message.

For these reasons, an intervention plan was designed where video recordings were used as a way to tackle all these problems with the aim of increasing the participants' opportunities for oral production and meaningful communication with their teacher and peers. It was also necessary to come up with a set of data collection instruments to gather information that could be helpful in assessing the effectiveness of the intervention.

### 3.2.1 Data collection techniques and verification of data

There is a variety of data collection methods that can be used in research and the decision about what kind of methods is the most suitable depends especially on the kind of study that is being carried out. That is why “action researchers should also be aware of the two categories of data – quantitative and qualitative – and consider their usefulness within the context of their work” (Burns, 2005, p. 86).

According to Burns (2005) the instruments for data collection are questionnaires, interviews, documentary evidence, field diaries and notes and systematic observation. The present investigation is based specially on a qualitative approach; nevertheless some quantitative instruments were applied. Questionnaires were used for the initial research.

#### 3.2.1.1 Questionnaires

As a way to support the previous observations, a structured questionnaire consisting of seventeen questions was designed. Some of the questions were closed multiple choice and other were open in order to know the students’ opinions and feelings about the language.

This instrument seemed to be the best option because as it was anonymous, it gave the students the opportunity to express themselves freely and also because as there were three groups with an average of 19 students in each one (fifty-eight in total, as previously said) this instrument offered the advantage of collecting the information over a shorter period of time.
“The use of questionnaires at the start of a project can often be very useful because it helps you to collect a range of information with relative ease, which can then be followed up as necessary” (Burns, 2005, p. 87). Some of the advantages, according to Burns (2005, p. 89), are that they:

- Enable you to collect background and baseline information quite easily;
- Can help you to gather a reasonable amount of data in a short time;
- Provide information which can be followed up;
- Provide a format making it easy to represent information;
- Are suitable for collecting initial information on attitudes and perceptions.

### 3.2.2. Outcomes of initial research

According to the results of the questionnaire, it can be concluded that:

a. The majority of the students are studying the language because of necessity and only half of them really like it. Nevertheless, it seems that they are aware of the importance of speaking English for their professional development.

b. Students ranked the speaking and listening skill as the most difficult to learn or develop.

c. 42% of the students said that they are moderately capable of speaking in English and 37% of them pointed out that their proficiency is very low. The most repeated reason of this was because they lack vocabulary and have difficulties in the pronunciation which makes them feel ashamed.

d. The variety of activities they do after class to practice English is very narrow. They mentioned that they like listening to songs and watching movies as a way to acquire new vocabulary although the English class is also a very good means for this purpose.

e. The preferred topic to learn English is gastronomy as it was to be expected due to their major and they want their teacher to help them to improve their current English level.

f. Fortunately, it seems that there is a good environment in the classroom so that learning takes place because the students said that they felt comfortable among them, with the class and with the teacher.
g. Also, most of the students think that they have to practice after school and review the vocabulary in order to improve their current level of English, which means that they need longer exposure to the language.

h. Finally, 52% of them consider themselves as regular students because they find it difficult to understand the language.

The information that was obtained is relevant to confirm the identified problem and it provided the researcher with enough basis to design the following action plan.

3.3 Action Plan

According to the context and to the information gathered in the initial research, the proposal for further action focuses on improving the oral production and vocabulary acquisition of the students, which means that the strategy of the intervention was concentrated in making the students produce the most words associated to the gastronomy in order to convey a clear message, such as giving instructions to make a recipe.

The main point of the strategy was to video record, several times, the students’ performance when producing a cooking TV show, so that after each video some feedback could be given to help the students to improve their oral production and at the same time to internalise the vocabulary. The intention is that after rehearsing and doing various videos, the students can be capable of performing the cooking TV show live and preparing in real time the recipe that was rehearsed. Thus, the strategy would have taken into consideration not only the final product but also the whole process.

The stages and general steps that constitute the strategy that was implemented are presented in the following diagram:
Action Plan:

- Revising Vocabulary
- Practicing pronunciation
- Writing the script for the Video

Oral production:
- Rehearsing and video recording the presentation of the recipe.

Teacher provides Feedback about the students' performance and students reflect about it to work on their mistakes and correct them for the next video recording.

Final presentation:
- Live Recipe TV Show

Data Analysis

Conclusions and recommendations

Pre-Video Clip strategy

While-Video Clip strategy
- Instrument: Video tape

Post-Video Clip strategy
- Instruments to apply: Teacher Observations, Video Tape

Instruments to apply:
- Video tape
- Interview

This cycle is repeated at least 3 times

Figure 2. Flow diagram of the action plan (own source)
3.3.1. Rationale

The action plan that was designed took into consideration two major factors: the first one is the approach of the school administrators toward English teaching, who consider that productive skills must be privileged (speaking and listening) over the other skills (reading and writing) due to the characteristics and needs of both B. A. programs (Tourism and Gastronomy). The second one was the evident fact that these students have a low performance when speaking, which was confirmed by the teacher’s observation and the students’ opinions obtained in the initial research.

Thus, under these conditions and considering the results of other previous research, it was decided to use video recordings to help the students to improve and increase their oral production. The aim of the strategy was to provide the students with more opportunities for practicing the language since they commented that there were few things that they did outside the classroom to improve their oral performance.

On the other hand, the intention was that after each rehearsal it would be easier for the students to remember the vocabulary. The assumption is that when someone says something out loud and it is done at the same time, this vocabulary can be internalised to be used in the future. Additionally, it was assumed that there would be an enhancement of the pronunciation due to word repetition, which eventually could have a positive effect on their self-confidence and motivation.

3.3.2. Implementation

To carry out the action plan successfully, it was necessary to implement the intervention in three stages. The implementation took eight weeks starting on the 5th of May and concluding on the 26th of June. The steps that were followed in each stage are explained as follows:

1. Pre - Video recording strategy

   In this stage, the students were exposed to the target vocabulary, mainly through the use of different kind of recipes. The students made a word list divided into different sections: ingredients, utensils and kitchen verbs. They practiced the pronunciation by doing presentations, repetition and peer work.
The students took a vocabulary pre-test to check how many words they could remember and some of them even prepared flashcards of the unknown words, so that they could memorise them.

The students improvised the presentation of a recipe individually to test the quality of their oral production and to assess the number of words they knew.

Then those students were asked to watch TV shows at home that had a cooking section, in order to analyse the format of the program, the way to welcome the viewers, the kind of comments that are mentioned and the interaction generated between the host and the special guests.

After doing this and analysing the information in class, the students had to write, in pairs, a script for their own TV show, using the recipe (Chocolate brownies) that was given by the teacher.

2. **While - Video recording strategy**

In this stage, the students had to study and learn the script by heart. Afterwards, they did a rehearsal of the recipe.

After each rehearsal they video recorded their performance at home and brought the video to the teacher for feedback. Some videos were recorded by the teacher in the classroom.

3. **Post - Video recording strategy**

The teacher analysed each video and took notes about the students' performance

The teacher prepared a report.

The students were given feedback through the teacher's report.

The students produced a new video considering the corrections.

The chart below shows the timetable, the objectives to pursue in each stage and the activities that were intended to be developed in order to achieve the goals of the intervention.
Table 1. Schedule of activities for the action plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week 1</th>
<th>May 5 - May 8</th>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✦ Food Vocabulary pre-test (Tuesday).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✦ Revising vocabulary through word lists and recipes (Thursday).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✦ Individual presentation of a recipe.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✦ Watching recipe videos to brainstorm ideas for the Recipe video script (Friday).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week 2</th>
<th>May 12 - May 14</th>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✦ Introduction of new kitchen verbs and utensils (Tuesday).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✦ Addition of new ingredients to the previous list (Tuesday).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✦ Reviewing the script for the Recipe Video (Tuesday).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✦ Rehearsal of the First Recipe (Friday).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week 3</th>
<th>May 19</th>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✦ Production of the first recipe video (video recording, homemade and delivered on Tuesday).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week 4</th>
<th>May 26 - May 29</th>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✦ Feedback and analysis of the first video (Tuesday).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✦ Production of the second video (homemade and delivered on Tuesday).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✦ Feedback and analysis of the second video (Thursday).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✦ Rehearsal in the classroom (Friday).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week 5</th>
<th>June 2 - June 5</th>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✦ Production of the third video (homemade and delivered on Tuesday).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✦ Feedback and analysis of the third video (Thursday).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week 6</th>
<th>June 9 - June 12</th>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✦ Production of the fourth video.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✦ Feedback and analysis of the fourth recipe video (Tuesday).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✦ Rehearsal in the classroom.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week 7</th>
<th>June 16 - June 19</th>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✦ Production of the fifth video</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✦ Feedback and analysis of the fifth recipe video (Tuesday)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✦ Rehearsal in the classroom</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week 8</th>
<th>June 23 - June 26</th>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✦ Final Presentations: Production of the recipes live and direct.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✦ Final video recording</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NB: it is worth mentioning that due to different circumstances it was not possible to follow the timetable to the letter, that is, as it was planned, so at the end the students were able to produce just three videos.
3.4 Sample selection

Initially, there were fifty-eight students participating in this research. At the beginning, all of them received instruction and did the activities planned in the first stage of the strategy. Nevertheless, due to different circumstances, the number of participants was reduced to fifteen.

There were two main reasons for this. In first place, the students' commitment or lack of it; the strategy required a lot of dedication from them because they had to work on it after classes so that the second part of the strategy could be carried out. Many of them simply did not study the script nor rehearsed enough nor video recorded all their performances. The second reason was that some of them dropped out of the school. Thus, after a first analysis of the data, it was concluded that a sample needed to be selected in order to carry on with the intervention and present the results of the implementation consistently and coherently.

The criteria used to decide which data from which participants would be used and presented in the research report was entirely dependent on two factors: the students that completed the three stages of the strategy by following all the steps involved in each one of them and those who video-recorded at least two performances, plus the final presentation. Under this perspective, it was found that only fifteen students fulfilled both requirements.
Chapter 4 Findings

This chapter includes important information that provided the researcher with an answer to each of the research questions that were set at the beginning of this project. It also includes a description of the evaluation techniques used along the implementation of the action plan in order to collect the data and an interpretation of the outcomes obtained as a result of such process.

4.1 Evaluation of action

Every action and decision taken in the process of teaching must be evaluated so that their effectiveness and scope can be verified. Evaluation is defined as “the process of examining a program or process to determine what's working, what's not, and why. It determines the value of learning and training programs and acts as blueprints for judgment and improvement” (Rossett & Sheldon, 2001 in Clark, 2005, para. 1). It can be classified in two categories: Formative when it focuses on the process; and Summative when it focuses on the outcome.

Due to the characteristics of the strategy that was implemented, it was considered important to centre the attention on both, the process and the final result; thus, the two types of evaluation were used. The formative evaluation occurred through the two videos that the students recorded during the second stage of the strategy. The students received feedback after each video so that they could make changes for the next video recording. Additionally, the students were continuously assessed through the live rehearsals performed in class. The summative evaluation took place in the final presentation when the students had to cook for real and explain the recipe live, which was also video-recorded to review in detail their performance. Finally, the participants were interviewed and they were asked to write a self-reflection about their perceptions on the whole process.

4.1.1 Data collection techniques

The findings reported during the implementation of this strategy were obtained through three main tools: videos, a structured interview and students’ self-reflections. These instruments were used to measure the progress of the students in terms of pronunciation,
fluency and self-confidence and to know their opinion regarding the usefulness of the strategy. In the following lines, a description of each instrument and the reasons for choosing them are shown.

4.1.1.1 Video-recording

The use of technology as a way to gather information for further analysis can be very helpful. In qualitative research, video-recording seems to have excellent benefits because through the videos the researcher can observe and analyse in great detail certain phenomenon which, otherwise, would be very difficult to capture. Several researchers have pointed out that “the proper use of the moving image, coupled with the audio, allows capturing aspects that may go unnoticed when other resources are used” (Honoroto et al. 2006; Sadalla; Larocca, 2004; Carvalho, 2004; Pinheiro; Kakehashi, Angelo, 2005, Leonard et al. 1999; Silva, 2007, in Garcez, Duarte and Eisenberg, 2011, para.7).

One of the major advantages is that the researcher can examine the material thoroughly to extract useful data. According to Garcez et al. (2011, para. 16), there are many researchers who mention other benefits of using video recording, such as:

- Noting contradictions between the discourse and behavior (Pinheiro; Kakehashi, Angelo, 2005);
- minimizing the intervention of the researcher, although it will never be eliminated, because there is always the view of the shooter (Honorato et al., 2006);
- revisiting the field several times and at different times, through the multiple readings of what was experienced by viewing the recorded material (Leonardos et al., 1999);
- and even allowing other interpretations of empirical data by other researchers (Sadalla; Larocca, 2004);
- emotional detachment for reflective analysis of the material (handwritten records of the observation bring the emotional charge that accompanies the situation recorded, which can make a less biased and more fruitful perception more difficult to achieve); different possibilities of viewing the recorded material, speeding, skipping parts, pausing, freezing the image, rewinding, fast forwarding, viewing it as many times as necessary for the proper understanding and interpretation of the material (Sadalla; Larocca, 2004).

The videos provided the researcher with the opportunity to record the performance of the students to determine whether there had been an improvement in the students’ oral production or not. On the other hand, using them as a means to evaluate the students’ progress seemed to be a suitable instrument which would be not only useful for formative evaluation purposes but also for self-assessment. Through the videos, the participants became aware of their mistakes and corrected them in a more conscious way. Nevertheless,
it is important to mention that the use of videos was not the only tool to evaluate the students, that is, it was necessary to accompany them with observation sheets (see appendix 3) in which the information obtained from the videos could be organised to be analysed and so come to a conclusion.

The observation sheets have three sections to organise the information. One was for common mistakes. Another one was to write the score of the different aspects that were considered in the rubric which was designed for the research purposes. The last one was used to write a general description of what was happening in the video that could explain the score given to each aspect of the rubric. The elements that are considered in the rubric (appendix 4) are: pronunciation, fluency, tone and intonation, coherence and interaction and body language.

4.1.1.2 Interviews

This instrument is one of the most used in qualitative research as a source of data according to Thomas, Nelson and Silverman (2015). “The main purpose of conducting interviews is to gather responses which are richer and more informative than questionnaire data. In some cases, adults and children give more honest responses in a one-to-one situation” (Burns, 2005, p. 92). The main reason for choosing this instrument was that the interviews allow to explore the students’ experiences, beliefs, perceptions and motivations in depth.

All the participants were interviewed at the end of the implementation of the strategy. These structured interviews were audio-recorded (appendix 5). There was a list of key questions prepared in advance to determine the students’ perceptions about the use of video recording as a way to improve their oral production.

4.1.1.3 Self-reflections

At the end of the implementation of the action plan, the participants were asked to write a personal reflection about the convenience of using video recording to improve their oral production. They had to analyse if there had been any changes and, if so, what kind of
changes they had noticed. Many of the students also wrote about their feelings toward the activity and how they were motivated to do the task successfully.

4.1.2 Verification of data

I used triangulation to ensure the reliability of the findings. It is suggested that “once a proposition has been confirmed by two or more independent measurement processes, the uncertainty of its interpretation is greatly reduced. The most persuasive evidence comes through a triangulation of measurement processes” (Webb, Campbell, Schwartz and Sechrest, 1966, p. 3). The results obtained in each instrument are presented through charts and graphs. The first charts show the most relevant information regarding the analysis of the videos in a summarised way. Then the graphs reflect the results of the interviews and finally there is a chart with some extracts of the students’ reflections.

4.2 Findings & Analysis

The intervention followed three stages. The first stage, called Pre-video strategy, lasted two weeks. The main goal was to provide students with enough input to prepare them for the oral task (cooking TV show). In this stage, the students took two pre-tests; one to check how much vocabulary related to the kitchen they remembered and the other one was the presentation of a recipe to check their pronunciation and language management. Then the participants revised more vocabulary and some kitchen expressions through cooking videos. Finally, the students wrote the script for their TV show and memorised it.

The second stage was the While-video strategy. It lasted five weeks without taking into account the last week in which the participants made the final presentation. The goal to pursue in the second stage was to make the participants put into practice what they had learned in the first stage by making them speak and video record their performances. Finally, in the third stage, named Post-video Strategy, the teacher analysed each one of the videos and prepared a report in order to give feedback to the students. The result of this analysis together with the results of the interviews and the students’ personal reflections were used to determine whether the video recordings worked as a useful tool to increase and improve the students’ oral production in English.
The following sections present such results according to each of the instruments used to collect the data. As it was mentioned above, the information is summarised in charts and graphs so as to facilitate their comprehension.

4.2.1 The video production

As it was pointed out before, the production of the videos was part of the second stage of the intervention strategy. The intention was to enable the students to record themselves as many times as possible so that they had several opportunities to practice and, this way, they could feel more confident in the final presentation. However, due to time constraints, most of the participants were able to video record only two performances and the final one, which does not necessarily mean that the students did not rehearse enough.

4.2.1.1 Video 1

After writing the script in pairs, and in some cases in trios, the students had to practice their dialogues at home and then record their first video. The students were asked to rehearse their lines while acting the steps of the recipe so that it was easier for them to acquire the vocabulary and understand what they were saying; nevertheless, only one pair of students carried out the task taking this aspect into consideration.

In this regard, the expectations were that from the very first video the students would show a great understanding of the vocabulary and in general of the expressions that were in their scripts by acting their lines without reading and by being congruent with what they were explaining and the actions that they were performing. Nevertheless, it did not happen that way; most of the students did not memorise their lines and it was evident that they were reading. Besides, they used Spanish to continue with the dialogue and almost all of them did not act the steps of the recipe, that is, they just sat in a chair or stayed in the kitchen reading everything without the appropriate intonation and without moving or performing the recipe. What is more, it seems that most of them in fact did not know what they were saying in spite of having reviewed the vocabulary before video recording. This was concluded due to their continuous pausing in the wrong places and because they sometimes did something different from what they were explaining.
Likewise, it was expected that the students would make many mistakes in pronunciation as the majority of them are beginners and they are not so used to speaking in English; nonetheless, there were not only mispronunciations but also mistakes in syntax. At this point, I did not expect to see self-correction because the students were not aware of their mistakes yet. Taking all this into account, the students’ performances were graded according to the rubric already mentioned. Most of the participants failed and only a pair of students who worked as a team got a passing grade. Table 2 sums up what has been described.

Table 2. First video recording

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Common Mistakes</th>
<th>General Observations</th>
<th>General Assessment (see rubric in appendix 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Use of mother tongue</td>
<td>Reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberto</td>
<td>Mispronunciation</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karla</td>
<td>Mispronunciation and syntax</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>José</td>
<td>Mispronunciation</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efraín</td>
<td>Mispronunciation</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorenzo</td>
<td>Mispronunciation and syntax</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlos</td>
<td>Mispronunciation and syntax</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amelia</td>
<td>Mispronunciation</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aida</td>
<td>Mispronunciation</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fabiola</td>
<td>Mispronunciation and syntax</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florencia</td>
<td>Mispronunciation and syntax</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irma</td>
<td>Mispronunciation and syntax</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fabián</td>
<td>Mispronunciation and syntax</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armando</td>
<td>Mispronunciation and syntax</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arturo</td>
<td>Mispronunciation and syntax</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>Mispronunciation and syntax</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.2.1.2 Video 2

After the first video, the students received feedback from the teacher who showed them their video and pointed out their mistakes. Then, the students rehearsed in class to correct their mistakes and they were asked to produce a new video. When the students produced the second video there were many significant changes in the quality of their performance such as:

✦ A reduction in the use of mother tongue. Only four participants out of fifteen used Spanish to continue with the dialogue.

✦ A reduction in the use of visual aids to say their dialogues. In comparison with the first video, there were five participants who did not read at all, four that read half of the time and six who still read all the time.

✦ An improvement in coherence. This time, the majority of the students acted what they were saying; only four of them remained saying the dialogues without performing the actions. Additionally, it was clear that they had a better idea of what they were expressing, their intonation improved and this time no one did something different from what they were saying.

✦ The appearance of self-correction was an unexpected outcome which showed that the students' awareness of their pronunciation and, in second place, of their intonation, had risen; now they also knew where to pause.

✦ The number of students with passing grades increased. The progress achieved was easier to notice through the scores that they got. This time, most of the students gained a passing grade and although some of them got a failing note again, their improvement was remarkable mostly in terms of comprehension, that is, they produced clearer and more comprehensible utterances, which did not happen in the first video.

✦ The emerging of improvisation was another unexpected outcome. Four students took the risk and tried to say things out of their lines in order to complete the message. Three of them accomplished it successfully.

✦ Regarding the mistakes in pronunciation and syntax, there were fewer mistakes in syntax rather than in pronunciation. It seems that the students could remember their lines and were less likely to make mistakes in syntax. In relation to pronunciation, there was
also some progress, although the participants continued mispronouncing many words, they were able to correct their pronunciation of several words and thus reduce the amount of mistakes. In table 3 there is a summary of the aspects described in this section. Table 3 sums up what has been described.

### Table 3. Second video recording

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Common Mistakes</th>
<th>Use of mother tongue</th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Recipe steps Performance</th>
<th>self-correction</th>
<th>General Assessment (see rubric in appendix 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alberto</td>
<td>Mispronunciation and syntax</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>more or less</td>
<td>always</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karla</td>
<td>Mispronunciation</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>more or less</td>
<td>always</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>José</td>
<td>Mispronunciation and syntax</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>always</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efrain</td>
<td>Mispronunciation and syntax</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>more or less</td>
<td>always</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorenzo</td>
<td>Mispronunciation</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>always</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlos</td>
<td>Mispronunciation</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>always</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amelia</td>
<td>Mispronunciation</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>always</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aida</td>
<td>Mispronunciation</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>always</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fabiola</td>
<td>Mispronunciation</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>always</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florencia</td>
<td>Mispronunciation</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>never</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irma</td>
<td>Mispronunciation and syntax</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>never</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fabián</td>
<td>Mispronunciation</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>more or less</td>
<td>always</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armandeo</td>
<td>Mispronunciation and syntax</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>always</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arturo</td>
<td>Mispronunciation and syntax</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>never</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>Mispronunciation and syntax</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>never</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.2.1.3 Final presentation

The final video was recorded in the school kitchen during the last week of the intervention strategy. It corresponded to the final presentation of the course, which also served as the final exam. For this presentation, the students had to bring all the ingredients and the utensils to cook live the chocolate brownies recipe. By this time, the students were expected to perform their cooking TV Show as if they were in a real television program. The results obtained are the following:

✦ Practically all of the students avoided the use of Spanish, except for one participant who used a filler in Spanish. The rest of them did not use their mother tongue at all.

✦ Almost half of the students (six) did not read at all; two of them read a few occasions to remember their lines; five participants had to check their notes almost half of the time and only two were continuously looking at them in order to continue with the dialogue. It seems that the ones who needed to take a look at their notes during the presentation, did it because they were not able to control their nervousness, which made them forget what to say, so they had to glance at them in order to continue, which does not necessarily mean that they were reading. It seems that the stress caused by oral activities has a great impact on the final result. This was concluded due to the students’ comments after their presentations and because one of the students who was reading constantly had a great performance in the last two videos; in fact, this student had got really good grades since the first video but at the end it was as if he had not practiced at all.

✦ In terms of coherence, understood as the congruence between what is said and what is done, all of the students were coherent and they did exactly what they were saying. This shows that at least the vocabulary of this recipe was understood and they had learned how to use it.

✦ The appearance of self-correction was more frequent; seven students out of fifteen rephrased a sentence and/or corrected the pronunciation of some words. This was an important achievement because when students become aware of their mistakes and correct themselves, learning is more likely to have taken place.

✦ The final outcomes in terms of fluency and pronunciation were outstanding in general. In some cases, the level of comprehensibility rose considerably and students
who pronounced poorly and that could not make themselves clear, were able to convey a clearer message. It seems that after the rehearsals and video recordings they gained a lot of confidence which helped them with fluency. Besides, the participants realised that they were able to speak in English. In spite of these results, some students' mistakes seemed to have become fossilised because despite the teacher's feedback they continued making the same mistakes in pronunciation. This time there were fewer mistakes in pronunciation and a few more in syntax in comparison with the previous videos. Nevertheless, these did not prevent them from conveying the message.

- There was again a little improvisation and surprisingly it came from different students in comparison with the ones who had improvised in the previous videos.
- The progress that the students experienced became evident in their final scores. All of the participants had a passing grade, which in this case is a reflection of their improvement. Table 4 sums up what has been described.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4. Final live performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FINAL VIDEO</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>José</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efrain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorenzo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amelia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aida</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### FINAL VIDEO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Common Mistakes</th>
<th>Use of mother tongue</th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Recipe steps Performance</th>
<th>self-correction</th>
<th>General Assessment (see rubric in appendix 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fabiola</td>
<td>Very few errors in pronunciation</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>a little bit</td>
<td>always</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florencia</td>
<td>Syntax</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>more or less</td>
<td>always</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irma</td>
<td>Mispronunciation and syntax</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>more or less</td>
<td>always</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fabián</td>
<td>Mispronunciation and syntax</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>always</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armando</td>
<td>Very few errors in pronunciation</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>always</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arturo</td>
<td>Mispronunciation and syntax</td>
<td>yes (pet word)</td>
<td>more or less</td>
<td>always</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>Mispronunciation and syntax</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>more or less</td>
<td>always</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.2.2 The interviews

The interviews were conducted right after the final presentation so as to capture the emotions and perceptions of the students regarding the usefulness of the strategy that was implemented as a way to improve their oral production in English. The results are the following:

The interview started with the two questions below. It was essential to know the students’ feelings about speaking in English and their perceptions in regard to the difficulty of doing it. The majority of the students said that they do like speaking English (graph 1) and, in some cases, that they have always wanted to learn it because it is important for their degree. However, most of the students find it difficult to speak English (graph 2) mainly because of the pronunciation. Likewise, some of these students agreed that they had not had good teachers that had helped them to do so, which seems to be one of the reasons why it is hard for them to use English in class.

Graph 1. Do you like speaking English?

- No: 7%
- Yes: 93%

Graph 2. How difficult is it for you to speak English?

- Very Difficult: 20%
- Difficult: 60%
- Somewhat difficult: 20%
The following questions were used to know if the students had ever video recorded themselves performing an activity in English and also to know their insights and feelings about doing this activity. All of the students said that they had never video recorded a task in English (graph 3), so for all of them it was a new and challenging experience. Moreover, the students gave different opinions about the activity; what bar graph 4 shows is how frequently an answer was mentioned, for example, for some students the activity was pleasant and interesting and this answer was repeated seven times; other students said that the activity was useful to learn and to correct mistakes, which also appeared seven times. Finally, the characteristics amusing and difficult appeared two and three times respectively. In some cases the same student mentioned two or more of the answers presented.

Graph 3.
Have you ever video-recorded yourself speaking in English?

Graph 4.
What do you think about the activity?
Apart from knowing the students’ perceptions and feelings regarding this activity; the students were asked to grade the usefulness of video recording as an instrument to improve and increase their oral production in English (graph 5). The majority gave an excellent grade to the strategy, which means that they considered it as a very good technique to foster oral skills. This is supported by the fact that all the students reported improvement in their speaking skill (graph 6) due to the use of video recordings, mostly in terms of pronunciation, fluency, vocabulary and self-confidence (graph 7).
As this strategy required a lot of commitment from the students, it was necessary to know if, by doing all the activities planned for the intervention, the students would feel motivated to give their best to achieve the goal of improving their speaking skill. In this regard, almost all of the students said that they felt motivated to continue studying English (graph 8).

The reason for this was that the students realised how capable they were of speaking English and they had a sense of achievement when doing it. What is more, the students found many advantages in video recording themselves, such as: improving their pronunciation and fluency, gaining self-confidence, losing fear of speaking in public and a desire of learning more (graph 9). Likewise, the topic of pronunciation and fluency improvement continue being mentioned.

NB: The percentages in bar graph 9 represent the number of times that an answer was mentioned; that is, the same student could have named two or three of the options presented.
One important aspect of evaluation is self-assessment and for this reason the students were asked to score their final presentation (graph 10). All of the students graded themselves with a passing grade, the lowest was a 6 and the highest was a 9; half of them graded themselves with an 8 which is an average grade and the main reason for this was that they thought that they had made a big effort; however, due to nervousness they forgot some words but in the end they managed to complete the task.

Additionally, a great percentage of students said that if they had not video recorded all those videos, their final performance would have been bad or even worse (graph 11). The main reason was mostly because they would not have had the opportunity to practice and correct their mistakes; some students mentioned they would not have even tried to participate because they would not have felt able to do it. Only one student said that even without the videos his presentation would have been the same.

Furthermore, the students were asked to grade their pronunciation before and after having used the strategy of the video recordings (graph 12). All the grades that each of the students mentioned were averaged and the results show that the students reported gains in both aspects. In pronunciation there was a difference of 2.7 points and in fluency there was a difference of 2.9 points. It is worth mentioning that the average grade in both areas before using the strategy was a failing grade and after the strategy it became a passing grade.
Finally, graph 13 shows that all the students said that they would use this strategy again in the future because it really helps to lose fear of speaking English. They also said it was a great instrument to raise awareness of the mistakes in pronunciation so that they can be corrected. Besides, according to the students' opinions, it seems that the strategy had a big impact on motivation because it gave them a sense of attainment when they saw themselves speaking English.

Graph 12.
Average Score before and after the video recording according to the students' perception

Graph 13.
Would you like to use again this strategy to improve your oral production in English?

Yes 100%
4.2.3 Students’ Reflections

At the end of the implementation, the students were asked to write a reflection about the process that they went through, so that the teacher could know their insights regarding this strategy. The comments are divided according to the aspects taken into account in the research questions.

4.2.3.1 Oral production improvement

Almost all of the students reported improvement in their oral performance, mostly in terms of pronunciation. It seems that, at the beginning, many of the students felt tongue-tied, that is, it was difficult for them to pronounce words correctly, they could not remember their lines or what they had to say so their fluency was affected. They even said it was difficult for them to understand what they were saying. Aida, José, Fabián y Fernanda (pseudonyms used) agree that, little by little they started to improve all these aspects as can be seen in the following comments:

Al principio sinceramente no me agradó la idea porque no hablo bien inglés y lo vi muy complicado. Conforme fuimos trabajando, si bien no me gustaba la idea, por lo menos fui mejorando en la pronunciación (Aida).²

Más que el cambio en mí, lo noté más en mi compañero pues ya lograba pronunciar mejor unas palabras y conocía el significado de nuevas… (José).³

Este proyecto de inglés de verdad que me ha sido de gran ayuda ya que fuimos aprendiendo muchas cosas como la correcta pronunciación. También me hizo poner en practica el vocabulario, a recordarlo e identificarlo… pude darme cuenta de que por primera vez podía leer algo en inglés y comprenderlo, porque admito que en los primeros ensayos no tenía idea de lo que estaba diciendo pero en los últimos ensayos sabía exactamente lo que decía… (Fabián).⁴

² To be honest, at the beginning I did not like the idea of doing this because I do not speak English very well and I thought it would be complicated. However, as we started working, I noticed that I started to improve my pronunciation…

³ More than a change in myself, I noticed it in my teammate because he was able to pronounce better some words and he knew the meaning of new words

⁴ This project in English was really helpful because we learned many things like the correct pronunciation. It also helped me to put into practice the vocabulary, remember it and identify it. I realised that for the first time I could read something in English and understand it, because I have to admit that in the first rehearsals I had no idea of what I was saying but in the last video I knew exactly what I was saying…
4.2.3.2. Kitchen vocabulary acquisition

Regarding the acquisition of vocabulary it is worth mentioning that, by means of this strategy, the students were able to know and learn new words related to their area of interest (kitchen vocabulary), so the students felt that the activity was beneficial because with new vocabulary it was easier to express themselves. Karla commented:

El ejercicio me benefició en mucho: aprendí vocabulario nuevo que está más relacionado a mi carrera, me abrió la mente y me ayudó a formar oraciones más fácilmente. Perdí el miedo a conversar y hablo un poco más fluido.

It seems that, for some students, learning new vocabulary was also helpful because some students felt that it was easier for them to understand the language when for example watching a video or TV program and they were even able to improvise by adding words. Armando, a student with an intermediate level of English, mentioned:

A través de todo el curso de inglés aprendí mucho. Me di cuenta que sí aprendí porque ahora puedo ver algunos programas en inglés y entenderlos un poco o saber de qué hablan. En el primer video tuve que leer todo y no sabía ni lo que significaba; ya para el segundo vi progreso porque sabía de lo que trataba y pude agregar palabras.

---

5 In the first video it was hard to pronounce many words correctly and I didn’t understand what I was saying. It was very difficult to speak and perform the steps of the recipe at the same time. I noticed a big change between the first video and the last, thanks to my teacher’s support. I didn’t learn the script by heart but I managed to continue with the conversation which I think is the most important.

6 This exercise helped me a lot: I learned new vocabulary related to my profession; it opened my mind and helped me to form sentences more easily; I lost fear of speaking English and now I speak more fluently.

7 During the whole course of English I learned a lot. I realized that I did learn because now I can watch some TV programs in English and I can understand a little bit or at least know what they are talking about. In the first video I had to read and I didn’t know what I was saying but in the second video, I saw the progress because this time I knew what I was saying and I was able to add words.
Finally, the strategy was catalogued as an interesting activity because it helped the students to work with basic vocabulary and it reinforced the previous one. Carlos, a very committed student, commented:

Pues esta actividad me pareció muy interesante ya que me ayudó a trabajar el vocabulario básico y a reforzarlo y con todo esto a recordar conocimientos viejos que ya se me habían olvidado y aprender nuevas cosas que me ayudarán en el futuro.

4.2.3.3 Motivation and self-confidence.

As it is well-known motivation is essential when learning anything and it was very important that the students felt motivated not only to do the activity but also to continue studying English. In this regard, it was rewarding to see that, on the one hand, the students gained motivation and, on the other, they started to overcome their fears when speaking English; thus, they started to feel more confident when speaking in public.

It seems that they also broke some paradigms concerning their ability to learn a language. These aspects were mentioned by many of the students and here some examples are presented:

Lorenzo, a student who seemed to be sceptical at the beginning of the implementation, said:

Fue una buena experiencia, a pesar de que fue la primera vez haciendo esta actividad me gustó mucho, me motiva más a seguir aprendiendo. Gracias a esta actividad estoy superando mis miedos.

Likewise, Arturo, a student who did not like to speak in English in class because as he presented great difficulties to pronounce correctly he felt ashamed, said:

Una vez que inició el proyecto de los videos me daba pena y un poco de miedo al hablar ya que mi pronunciación no es muy buena; sin embargo, esto incrementó la confianza en mí. Al principio no podía pronunciar muchas palabras pero

---

8 Well, I think that this activity was very interesting because it helped me to work with basic vocabulary and to reinforce it. I also could remember old knowledge that I had forgotten. I learned new things that will help me in the future.

9 It was a great experience and although it was the first time that I do something like this, I really liked it. It motivates me to continue learning. Thanks to this activity I am overcoming my fears.
con ayuda de la maestra me fue más sencillo y fluido expresarme. Esta actividad me ayudó a fluir al hablar en inglés. También aprendí y conocí mucho más vocabulario y términos usados comúnmente dentro de la cocina\(^{10}\).

Finally, Daniel, another student with a very poor level of English, who seemed to be demotivated because he finds English difficult to learn, said:

Esta actividad me gustó mucho ya que me sirvió para aprender más vocabulario pero sobre todo para tener más confianza al momento de hablar en público\(^{11}\).

\(^{10}\)Once the project of the videos had begun I was ashamed and scared of speaking English because my pronunciation isn’t good, however, video-recording me increased my confidence and although at the beginning I couldn’t pronounce a lot of words correctly it became easier with my teacher’s help and I could express myself more fluently. This activity helped me to flow when speaking English. I also learned a lot of vocabulary and terms commonly used in a kitchen.

\(^{11}\)I liked this activity a lot because it helped me to learn more vocabulary but mostly to be more confident when speaking in public.
Chapter 5: Discussion and Reflections

This chapter encompasses a general overview of the problem investigated together with a recap of the most relevant findings which served to support the effectiveness of the intervention. Likewise, the implications of those findings for the teacher’s practice as well as for the students’ learning process are presented. On the other hand, during the implementation there were some constraints which made it difficult to carry out the action plan as it was designed initially. Such limitations are described followed by the consideration of the changes next time around that emerged as a result of them.

5.1 Conclusions

The data showed that the use of video recordings had an important impact on different aspects regarding the speaking skill. According to the students’ opinions and to the teacher’s observations, it seems that most of the participants were able to improve their pronunciation gradually. Although at the end there were still words that were mispronounced, these mistakes did not seem to be a significant percentage of the total amount of words contained in the script, which for a beginner level is quite an achievement. Moreover, all of the participants became more fluent, not accurate though. The students learned meaningful vocabulary related to their profession and changed their perceptions towards their ability of speaking English, that is, they realised that it is not something impossible to achieve, which motivated them and helped them to feel eager to continue studying it.

Thus, it can be concluded that video recording is both; an effective tool to learn a language and an excellent teaching technique. As a learning tool, it helps to identify speaking mistakes in an easier way and so to correct them more consciously; moreover, it aids the students to become more analytic and independent in their learning process. On the other hand, as a teaching technique, it gives the teacher the opportunity to focus individually in the progress of each student so that a more meaningful feedback can be provided. Besides, other important aspects of communication can be analysed such as body language, intonation, grammar and language usage, that eventually will help the students to improve their speaking skills.
Self video recordings of task-based activities also showed to have positive effects on the development of the students’ good self-esteem and on their motivation as well. One of these positive effects is that the students break paradigms regarding their ability to learn and understand English and gain a sense of achievement when observing their capability of speaking English, which has an important impact on their motivation. In this regard, it seems that there is a deeper impact on self-confidence and motivation rather than in an increase of oral production and/or vocabulary acquisition.

5.2 Implications for further research

The strategy implemented showed that video recordings have a very significant impact on the improvement of students’ pronunciation and fluency; however it is necessary to do further research to analyse what other aspects of oral communication, apart from the already mentioned, can be enhanced by means of self-video recordings of task based activities, for example, accuracy, improvisation or body language. Likewise, it would be interesting to determine if this strategy could have any impact on fossilization, that is, if video recordings could help to revert this kind of mistakes/errors that are very difficult to correct.

On the other hand, it would be also interesting to discover how useful this strategy would be for the development of other skills or if there is another way to use video recordings for other teaching purposes. Likewise, it is recommendable to examine whether this strategy is suitable to acquire significant amounts of vocabulary.

Finally, other kind of activities should be considered to assess how convenient or appropriate they would be to work with video recordings, that is, activities that can let the students experience real life situations.

5.3 Limitations.

The main limitation of this research was that the results that were obtained cannot be generalised, that is, it is not possible to assure that other students in other contexts will show the same progress or will have the same achievement; thus, it is unlikely that this strategy may be feasible to use in other contexts such as in rural schools or in a school which does not have the equipment to cook or the things/objects that can contribute to make such experience as real as possible.
Another limitation was that it was not possible to determine the scope of the strategy regarding vocabulary acquisition, that is, although the results showed that the students understood the meaning of the vocabulary that they used, I could not affirm that the students will be able to remember this vocabulary permanently or use it in other situations because some of them might have overused their short-term memory just to perform the activity; thus, I could not even establish the amount of words that the students internalised.

5.4 Changes next time around

✦ Some of the changes that I would suggest are:

1. Give the students a script already written and ask them to adapt it to their recipe because as they had to write it from scratch, this activity took a lot of time of the action plan. This way, it would be possible to save time and use it for the oral rehearsals, which were the main point of the strategy.

2. Video record all the performances in class to optimise time.

3. Let the students choose from a variety of recipes (previously chosen by the teacher) so that the students could learn more vocabulary through their classmates’ rehearsals.

4. If possible, ask the students to rehearse at least three different recipes and give them one randomly at the end for the final live presentation so that, they make a bigger effort to learn more vocabulary.

5. Give the students a demonstration of how to develop the task, that is, perform a live cooking TV show to make them aware of the aspects that they have to take into consideration, so that better results can be obtained since the first video produced.
References


Appendix 1

Justin Gellatly’s chocolate brownie

Photograph: Andy Sewell

I started making this brownie shortly after starting at St John restaurant in 2000, and have been following the recipe ever since. It’s a favourite of many customers and chefs alike.

Makes enough for 16 large brownies
whole blanched almonds 160g
whole blanched hazelnuts 160g
unsalted butter 300g, chopped
Valrhona or other dark chocolate (70%) 500g, broken or chopped into small pieces
eggs 5
caster sugar 500g
plain flour 100g
fine sea salt a pinch

Preheat the oven to 180C/gas mark 4. Line and lightly grease a 36cm x 26cm x 3.5cm baking tray.

Put the almonds and hazelnuts into a roasting tin and roast for about 10–15 minutes, stirring every few minutes until they are golden brown. Leave them to cool, then chop them roughly.

Put the butter and 400g of the chocolate into a heatproof bowl over a pan of lightly simmering water and leave to melt slowly.

While the chocolate is melting, mix the eggs and sugar together in a large bowl, using a wooden spoon and mixing just enough to combine. Once melted, pour the chocolate mix into the egg mix and whisk them together briefly.

Fold in the nuts and the rest of the chocolate, then sift in the flour and salt and fold into the mix.

Pour the mixture into the prepared baking tray and bake for 25 minutes. Take out of the oven and put the tray on a cooling rack for 1 hour (it might look a little under-baked, but as it cools it will firm up).
Serve warm, for a moist brownie, or chill in the fridge overnight, which I prefer. Either way, serve with vanilla ice cream.
Appendix 2
Questionnaire for initial research

1. Why are you studying English?
   a. Because I need it  b. Because I like it  c. Because I have to

2. How much do you like English? Why?
   a. A lot  b. A little  c. Not at all

3. Which of the four abilities is the most difficult for you? Rank them from the most difficult (1) to the least difficult (4)
   a. Listening ( )  b. Reading ( )  c. Writing ( )  d. Speaking ( )

4. In your opinion, How capable are you for communicating in English? Why?
   a. Very capable
   b. Capable
   c. Moderately capable
   d. Little capable
   e. Not capable at all

5. When you speak in English, you find it difficult due to:
   a. Lack of vocabulary
   b. Difficulties in pronunciation
   c. Not knowing what to say
   d. Being ashamed or scared to make mistakes
   e. To prevent being mocked by their classmates
   f. Other: Not knowing how to structure a sentence

6. What do you think are the difficulties that you have to speak English fluently?
   a. Lack of vocabulary
   b. Pronunciation
   c. Not knowing what to say or how to make a sentence
   d. Feeling ashamed when making a mistake
7. How do you learn or have you learned new vocabulary?
8. What kind of activities do you do outside the classroom to practice English?
9. Do you like reading? What kind of books?
10. What kind of topics do you find interesting to learn English?
11. How do you feel in your English Class?
12. How do you feel with your classmates in your English class?
13. How do you feel with your current English teacher?
14. What do you expect of your English teacher and of the English course?
15. What do you think you need, to speak more in English and to improve your current level?
16. How do you think that you have learned English best during the whole time that you have been studying it?
17. In your opinion, What kind of student do you think you are?
   a. Good   b. Regular   c. Bad
## Appendix 3

### Observation Sheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Video 1** | | Scoring according to the rubric:  
  - Pronunciation:  
  - Intonation:  
  - Fluency:  
  - Coherence:  
  - Interaction and BL |
| **Video 2** | | Scoring according to the rubric:  
  - Pronunciation:  
  - Intonation:  
  - Fluency:  
  - Coherence:  
  - Interaction and BL |
| **Final Video** | | Scoring according to the rubric:  
  - Pronunciation:  
  - Intonation:  
  - Fluency:  
  - Coherence:  
  - Interaction and BL: |
# Appendix 4

## Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pronunciation</th>
<th>Intonation</th>
<th>Fluency</th>
<th>Coherence</th>
<th>Interaction and body language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Does not interfere with communication</td>
<td>Student showed excellent use of tone and intonation. Both tone and intonation were appropriate for the context of the activity.</td>
<td>Speech continuous with few pauses or stumbling</td>
<td>What is being said always correspond to what is being done</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Occasionally interferes with communication</td>
<td>Student showed good use of tone and intonation, however, the tone or intonation was inappropriate for the context at times.</td>
<td>Some hesitation but manages to continue and complete thoughts</td>
<td>What is being said usually correspond to what is being done</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Frequently interferes with communication</td>
<td>Student showed little change in tone and intonation. Speech was slightly robotic, showing very little emotion or inflection.</td>
<td>Speech choppy and/or slow with frequent pauses; few or incomplete thoughts</td>
<td>What is being said sometimes correspond to what is being done</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>It interferes with communication a lot</td>
<td>Student lacked tone and intonation completely. Speech was robotic and monotonous, showing no emotion or inflection at all.</td>
<td>Speech halting and uneven with long pauses and/or incomplete thoughts</td>
<td>What is being said rarely correspond to what is being done</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Communication is totally incomprehensible</td>
<td>There wasn't enough speech to check tone and intonation.</td>
<td>Breakdowns in speech make impossible to follow the message.</td>
<td>What is being said never correspond to what is being done</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 5

The interview

1. ¿Te gusta hablar en inglés? Por qué?
2. Del 1 al 10 ¿Qué tan fácil o difícil es hablar en inglés para ti? Por qué?
3. ¿Habías realizado videos en inglés con anterioridad? Describe la actividad
4. ¿Qué te pareció haber grabado videos en inglés? / En escala del 1 al 10, ¿Cómo calificarías la realización de los videos como medio para mejorar tu producción oral?
5. ¿Consideras que grabarte te ayudó a mejorar tu producción oral? Por qué?
6. ¿Qué cambios notaste en tu producción oral tras la realización de cada uno de los videos? / Describe en qué mejoraste o no después de haber realizado los videos.
7. ¿En qué medida el trabajo con tu(s) compañero(s) de equipo ayudó a mejorar tu producción oral?
8. ¿Realizar esta actividad te motivó a seguir estudiando inglés? Por qué?
9. ¿Qué ventajas y/o beneficios encontraste en haberte grabado?
10. ¿Qué desventajas encontraste en haberte grabado?
11. ¿Cómo calificarías tu presentación final? Por qué?
12. De no haber grabado los videos, ¿Cómo crees que habría sido tu desempeño en la presentación final.
13. ¿Qué calificación le darías a tu pronunciación y fluidez antes y después de haber realizado los videos?
14. ¿Volverías a utilizar esta estrategia? Por qué?
15. ¿Qué actividades, realizadas por tu profesor, consideras que te ayudaron a mejorar tu producción oral en general?
16. ¿Cuáles serían tus sugerencias en relación a la realización de esta actividad?