

**ENABLING IRAQI EFL UNIVERSITY
STUDENTS TO SPEAK ENGLISH EASILY
BY USING VIDEO SUPPORTED TEACHING**

Keywords: Video, Multimodality, Speaking, Listening, Fluency

Asst. Inst. MOHANAD ASSI AMRET

**Department of English Language & Literature
College of Arts - Mustansiriyah University
mndhj_87@yahoo.com**

**تمكين طلبة الجامعات العراقية؛ دراسي اللغة الانجليزية لغة أجنبية
من تحدث الانجليزية بسهولة باستخدام الفيديو الداعم للتعليم**

م.م. مهند عاصي امرط

**قسم اللغة الانكليزية
كلية الآداب – الجامعة المستنصرية**

Abstract

The purpose behind this paper is to investigate the impact of using video supported teaching in developing EFL learners' speaking skills. Learning English could be achieved in many ways. Learners could develop their knowledge in English concerning reading, writing, grammar, spelling, etc. However, they may face difficulties in speaking that they couldn't hold a conversation. The problem might be the lack of practicing speaking English every day. Feeling embarrassed could be the main reason behind these difficulties. Another problem might be attributed to the fruitless attempt not to commit mistakes while speaking English.

The aim of this paper is (1) to investigate the importance of using video supported teaching in developing EFL learners' speaking skills, (2) to find out the difficulties EFL learners face while speaking English, (3) to discover the reasons behind such difficulties and (4) to suggest solutions in order to overcome such difficulties. It is hypothesized that using video supported teaching can (1) help EFL learners develop their speaking skills, (2) make the teaching process quicker, and (3) enable EFL learners to be confident speakers.

المستخلص

تهدف الدراسة الحالية الى استقصاء تأثير استخدام الفيديو الداعم للتعليم في تطوير مهارات التواصل لدى الطلبة العراقيين دارسي اللغة الانجليزية لغة اجنبية. يمكن تعلم اللغة الانجليزية بعدة طرق حيث يمكن للمتعلمين تطوير معلوماتهم في اللغة الانجليزية من ناحية القراءة والكتابة والنحو والاملاء الخ. ومع ذلك، قد يواجهون صعوبات في تحدث اللغة الانجليزية بحيث لا يستطيعون اجراء حوار. ربما تكمن المشكلة في قلة ممارسة اللغة الانجليزية يومياً، وربما يكون الشعور بالخلل السبب الرئيسي لهذه الصعوبات، وقد تكمن المشكلة في المحاولة اليائسة لعدم الوقوع في الازطاء اللغوية اثناء تحدث اللغة الانجليزية.

تهدف الدراسة الى (1) استقصاء اهمية استخدام الفيديو الداعم للتعليم في تطوير مهارات التواصل عند دارسي اللغة الانجليزية لغة اجنبية، (2) اكتشاف الصعوبات التي يواجهها دارسي اللغة الانجليزية لغة اجنبية عند التحدث باللغة الانجليزية، (3) معرفة اسباب تلك الصعوبات، (4) اقتراح حلول لتلك الصعوبات.

بُنيت هذه الدراسة على الفرضيات الآتية:

- 1- ان استخدام الفيديو الداعم للتعليم يساعد دارسي اللغة الانجليزية لغة اجنبية في تطوير مهارات التواصل لديهم.
- 2- ان استخدام الفيديو الداعم للتعليم يجعل عملية التعليم اسرع.
- 3- ان استخدام الفيديو الداعم للتعليم يمكن دارسي اللغة الانجليزية لغة اجنبية من تحدث اللغة الانجليزية بثقة.

ENABLING IRAQI EFL UNIVERSITY STUDENTS TO SPEAK ENGLISH EASILY BY USING VIDEO SUPPORTED TEACHING

Asst. Inst. MOHANAD ASSI AMRET

Department of English Language & Literature

College of Arts - Mustansiriyah University

mndhj_87@yahoo.com

1. Introduction:

Foreign languages are taught in different parts of the world using various methods. Each method has its own positive and negative sides. In teaching English, for instance, four skills are involved. They are reading skills, writing skills, listening skills and speaking skills. In Iraq, most learners are very good in reading skills and writing skills. However, they are weak in listening skills and speaking skills.

It has been argued that speaking skill is the most important skill, simply because people, who are able to speak any language, are always called language speakers. Therefore, EFL learners, when asked about their second language, always expect the burning question "Do you speak English?" rather than "Do you read English?" or "Do you write English?" (Ur, 1996: 120)

2. Literature Review:

Van Leeuwen (2014: 281) defines multimodality as "the term multimodality refers to the integrated use of different semiotic resources (e.g. language, image, sound and music) in texts and communicative events". However, Baldry and Thibault (2006: 21) states that multimodality refers to "the diverse ways in which a number of distinct semiotic resource systems are both code played and co-contextualized in the making of a text-specific meaning". Simpson and Walsh (2010: 37) believe that new methods of teaching should be developed within the new technological developments. Teachers can use new technologies to help EFL learners understand English easier and faster. They argue that now with "interactive, multiple authoring and social networking facilities provided ... new pedagogic possibilities can be utilized in the classroom".

Listening and speaking are the most important skills for EFL learners since they need to achieve their communicative competence in English. Speaking is seldom done in isolation; therefore, speakers are badly in need of listeners to communicate. Krashen (1981: 20f) argues that speaking skill is highly affected by internal and external factors. The former

refers to the fear of committing mistakes by speakers. This fear can build a barrier that hinders their fluency or sometimes prevents them from speaking at all. The latter refers to the problems EFL face while trying to comprehend what they hear, i.e. the input. They have to comprehend the input completely in order to respond properly.

Bardovi-Harlig and Salsbury (2004: 199) stress that:

It is time to make the study of speaking a major source of data. Communicating with someone – especially speaking to someone – is such a basic function of language that it is remarkable that it is not better represented in the interlanguage pragmatics literature.

Van Duzer (1997: 3) defines listening as "an important and active process in selecting and interpreting information from audio and video inputs and it is the process of understanding messages". Nunan (1991: 17) argues that EFL learners must develop their listening skills because these skills supply them with the input they need to analyze in order to comprehend the message. Harmer (2001: 200) states that listening is a "receptive skill where people get ideas through listening and understanding the video".

In this respect, Belasco (1967: 112) adds that:

The key to achieving proficiency in speaking is achieving proficiency in listening comprehension. The day when the average foreign student overhears a conversation between two or more native speakers and has no difficulty in understanding what is being said is the day when he/she will be well on the way to develop linguistic competence. To say it right, one must learn to listen.

However, Redmond & Vrochota (2007: 120) argue that "speakers are at the mercy of listeners". They (ibid: 123) add that the problems of listening are of two types, namely, internal problems and external problems. Internal problems are related to the listener him/herself, e.g., lack of information, lack of vocabulary, being angry, being nervous, being annoyed etc. External problems are related to the source of listening, e.g., the quality of the sound, the quietness of the place etc.

Derrington & Groom (2004: 43f) observe that listening could be classified according to function into five types:

- 1- Informative Listening: this refers to the information which can be memorized by the learner.

- 2- Appreciative Listening: this refers to the style of learners and their feelings.
- 3- Critical Listening: this refers to the analysis of the information listened to.
- 4- Discriminative Listening: this refers to the ability of listeners to realize the emotions or feelings of the speakers through their tone.
- 5- Empathic Listening: this refers to the harmony by the listeners and what they hear.

Kouicem (2010: 27f) believes that if EFL learners would like to speak fluently and effectively, they have to take into consideration some features of language such as connected speech, expressive devices, lexis and grammar, and negotiation language. Connected speech refers to the ability to create a chain of sentences in order to express one's feelings, emotions, opinions, etc. Expressive devices refer to the ability to use sound features properly such as intonation, stress, pitch, etc. Lexis and grammar refer to the ability to use many structures of the language so as to convey different messages to the listeners because these structures have many functions. Negotiation language refers to the ability to use many expressions that can help learners to clarify themselves more and more, i.e. to make it clearer for the listeners to understand the message sent by the speakers through different sentences.

Baker & Westrup (2000: 5) believe that speaking skill is the key for EFL learners to develop their writing skill, reading skill and listening skill. Vocabulary and grammar could be learnt by the assistance of speaking skill.

Although speaking skill is the most important skill in the process of learning a new language, some teachers still teach speaking skill through memorizing many dialogues by heart. However, students' communicative skills should be enhanced in order to help those students express themselves in different situations (Susanti, 2007: 7).

Boussiada (2010: 15ff) believes that second language learners usually face many difficulties while they are trying to express themselves in the target language. They are hesitant speakers and their speech is usually rich in pauses and repetition. These difficulties could be resulted from:

- 1- Lack of self-confidence.
- 2- Poor or no listening practice.
- 3- Fear of committing mistakes.
- 4- Lack of vocabulary.
- 5- Being not interested in the subject.

6- The effect of mother-tongue language.

Feeling afraid of committing mistakes or being corrected by their teachers, many second language learners tend to reserve their ideas for themselves. However, Bowman (1989: 116) argues that second language teachers must encourage their students to speak in front of the whole class and help them overcome embarrassment and stress while speaking in the second language. Similarly, Nunan (1991: 61) emphasizes that teachers, who teach speaking skills, must be able to train second language learners to use the language fluently and naturally without any hesitations, i.e. they have to build learners' self-confidence.

Tschirner (2001: 305) argues that multimedia applications, DVDs in particular, provide EFL learners with multimodal representations that may help them "gain broad access to oral communication both visually and auditory". However, Marshall (2002: 7f) believes that people, generally speaking, can usually remember 10% of what they read, 20% of what they hear, 30% of what they see and 50% of what hear and see.

3. The Video

Stempleski (1987: 5) states that "video is a rich and useful source of education". This suggests that using video in classroom helps teachers improve their students' skills easily, because videos give real situations and clear environments. However, Caporali & Trajkovi (2012: 27) believe that "the video is a technology that works to transmit voice and image to language learners".

Using video in teaching has its own impact on learners' skills. Scholars have suggested that using video:

- 1- helps learners assess others' actions (Lander & Burns, 1999: 8).
- 2- supports learners with self-learning materials (Knipe & Lee, 2002: 303).
- 3- helps learners solve the problems they face while studying a foreign language (Comber, et al, 2004: 2).
- 4- helps learners ask questions and discuss topics (Albetra, 2006: 5).
- 5- creates an atmosphere of cooperation among learners (Olsen, 2003: 24).
- 6- makes learners listen to native speakers (Alberta, 2006: 7).
- 7- helps learners build up their confidence in speaking English (Tavani & Losh, 2003: 142).
- 8- urges learners to recognize their own mistakes (Tavani & Losh, 2003: 142).
- 9- opens learners eyes for new ways to develop their language (Liu & Jiang, 2009: 65).

4. The Sample

The sample of the study is second-year students/ Mustansiriya University/ College of Arts/ Department of English Language and Literature/ Morning Studies for the Academic Year 2018 – 2019.

The sample consists of two groups, namely, a controlling group and an experimental group. Each group contains 30 students. They are chosen randomly. Their ages are around 19 – 21. Repeaters are excluded from the sample in order to secure the homogeneity of the group.

The students of the controlling group and experimental group have been subjected to a pre-test in order to check their levels in speaking skills. The researcher himself has taught both the experiment group and the controlling group for three months – October, November and December.

5. The Pre-test:

The students of both groups have been subjected to the pre-test on 2nd October 2018. The results of the pre-test reveal that both groups are homogenous as in the tables below.

Table (1): Controlling Group Students' Degrees in the Pre-test

Test Name	Group Name	Student Number	Degree
Pre-test	Controlling Group	Student 1	40%
Pre-test	Controlling Group	Student 2	33%
Pre-test	Controlling Group	Student 3	54%
Pre-test	Controlling Group	Student 4	37%
Pre-test	Controlling Group	Student 5	28%
Pre-test	Controlling Group	Student 6	40%
Pre-test	Controlling Group	Student 7	38%
Pre-test	Controlling Group	Student 8	37%
Pre-test	Controlling Group	Student 9	39%
Pre-test	Controlling Group	Student 10	38%
Pre-test	Controlling Group	Student 11	36%
Pre-test	Controlling Group	Student 12	27%
Pre-test	Controlling Group	Student 13	40%
Pre-test	Controlling Group	Student 14	37%
Pre-test	Controlling Group	Student 15	46%
Pre-test	Controlling Group	Student 16	38%
Pre-test	Controlling Group	Student 17	43%
Pre-test	Controlling Group	Student 18	29%
Pre-test	Controlling Group	Student 19	33%
Pre-test	Controlling Group	Student 20	47%
Pre-test	Controlling Group	Student 21	44%
Pre-test	Controlling Group	Student 22	39%
Pre-test	Controlling Group	Student 23	28%
Pre-test	Controlling Group	Student 24	38%
Pre-test	Controlling Group	Student 25	41%

Pre-test	Controlling Group	Student 26	50%
Pre-test	Controlling Group	Student 27	60%
Pre-test	Controlling Group	Student 28	37%
Pre-test	Controlling Group	Student 29	25%
Pre-test	Controlling Group	Student 30	28%
Total			1150

Table (2): Experimental Group Students' Degrees in the Pre-test

Test Name	Group Name	Student Number	Degree
Pre-test	Experimental Group	Student 1	36%
Pre-test	Experimental Group	Student 2	33%
Pre-test	Experimental Group	Student 3	34%
Pre-test	Experimental Group	Student 4	47%
Pre-test	Experimental Group	Student 5	29%
Pre-test	Experimental Group	Student 6	37%
Pre-test	Experimental Group	Student 7	45%
Pre-test	Experimental Group	Student 8	30%
Pre-test	Experimental Group	Student 9	42%
Pre-test	Experimental Group	Student 10	45%
Pre-test	Experimental Group	Student 11	42%
Pre-test	Experimental Group	Student 12	51%
Pre-test	Experimental Group	Student 13	43%
Pre-test	Experimental Group	Student 14	34%
Pre-test	Experimental Group	Student 15	39%
Pre-test	Experimental Group	Student 16	35%
Pre-test	Experimental Group	Student 17	42%
Pre-test	Experimental Group	Student 18	30%
Pre-test	Experimental Group	Student 19	34%
Pre-test	Experimental Group	Student 20	46%
Pre-test	Experimental Group	Student 21	48%
Pre-test	Experimental Group	Student 22	35%
Pre-test	Experimental Group	Student 23	36%
Pre-test	Experimental Group	Student 24	30%
Pre-test	Experimental Group	Student 25	46%
Pre-test	Experimental Group	Student 26	45%
Pre-test	Experimental Group	Student 27	50%
Pre-test	Experimental Group	Student 28	47%
Pre-test	Experimental Group	Student 29	35%
Pre-test	Experimental Group	Student 30	20%
Total			1166

Table (3): The Percentage of the Controlling Group and Experimental Group Students' Degrees in the Pre-test

No.	Test Name	Group Name	Student Number	Percentage
1	Pre-test	Controlling Group	30	38.33%
2	Pre-test	Experimental Group	30	38.86%

6. The Experiment

The researcher has used the same textbook to teach both groups. The textbook is entitled (**Person to Person/ Book 2/ Communicative Speaking and Listening Skills**) written by Richard, Bycina and Wisniewska. However, the experimental group has been taught using video supported teaching method in addition to the textbook. The researcher has used fifteen videos in this experiment. All the videos are made by native speakers of English. Thus, the students of the experimental group have listened to native speakers of English. Watching these videos enables them to be more familiar with English language and develop their listening skills. As a result, they have been really motivated by these videos and they have tried to speak English like native speakers. The topics of the videos are:

- 1- Develop your vocabulary.
- 2- How to speak English with confidence.
- 3- Connected speech.
- 4- Common expression in English.
- 5- Everyday English.
- 6- Common phrasal verbs in English.
- 7- The secret of speaking English fluently.
- 8- Common idioms in English.
- 9- Speak English like native speakers.
- 10- Common mistakes in English.
- 11- Tips to improve your public speaking.
- 12- How to speak with emotion.
- 13- How to tell a story.
- 14- Practicing asking about people's habits, repeated actions and general facts.
- 15- Asking questions with (Be present + noun) in a business setting.

The researcher has also asked students of the experimental group to record videos individually about different topics. Each student has to record three to five videos. The videos are about:

- 1- Talk about yourself.
- 2- Talk about friendship.
- 3- Talk about your problems in speaking English for a long time.
- 4- Talk about an embarrassing situation you have been in.
- 5- Talk about a country you have visited.

Each student has to send the first video to the researcher. Each video lasts for four to six minutes only in which each student has to produce more than 80 sentences without being interrupted by other interlocutors. After that, the researcher watches the videos, analyses them and tells the students about their weak points. Then, he suggests solutions for these weak points and gives them tips to develop their speaking skills. The students are going to work on these weak points so that the second video is going to be better than the first one, and so on. The students have taken this experiment seriously and they have been really interested in practicing speaking

English in these videos. They believe that, for them, speaking English for five minutes without being interrupted by others is, in fact, a big challenge.

7. The Post-test:

The students of the controlling group and the students of the experimental group have been subjected to the post-test on 7th January 2019 in order to check the development in their speaking level after the experiment. The results of the post-test reveal that both the speaking level of both groups has been developed, but the students of the experimental group have achieved higher marks than the students of the controlling group. The tables below explain the differences between the marks of the students of both groups.

Table (4): Controlling Group Students' Degrees in the Post-test.

Test Name	Group Name	Student Number	Degree
Post-test	Controlling Group	Student 1	61%
Post-test	Controlling Group	Student 2	50%
Post-test	Controlling Group	Student 3	70%
Post-test	Controlling Group	Student 4	60%
Post-test	Controlling Group	Student 5	45%
Post-test	Controlling Group	Student 6	60%
Post-test	Controlling Group	Student 7	60%
Post-test	Controlling Group	Student 8	53%
Post-test	Controlling Group	Student 9	61%
Post-test	Controlling Group	Student 10	70%
Post-test	Controlling Group	Student 11	60%
Post-test	Controlling Group	Student 12	50%
Post-test	Controlling Group	Student 13	54%
Post-test	Controlling Group	Student 14	57%
Post-test	Controlling Group	Student 15	64%
Post-test	Controlling Group	Student 16	55%
Post-test	Controlling Group	Student 17	66%
Post-test	Controlling Group	Student 18	50%
Post-test	Controlling Group	Student 19	52%
Post-test	Controlling Group	Student 20	69%
Post-test	Controlling Group	Student 21	62%
Post-test	Controlling Group	Student 22	56%
Post-test	Controlling Group	Student 23	51%
Post-test	Controlling Group	Student 24	58%
Post-test	Controlling Group	Student 25	61%
Post-test	Controlling Group	Student 26	67%
Post-test	Controlling Group	Student 27	66%
Post-test	Controlling Group	Student 28	65%
Post-test	Controlling Group	Student 29	55%
Post-test	Controlling Group	Student 30	52%
Total			1760

Table (5): Experiment Group Students' Degrees in the Post-test.

Test Name	Group Name	Student Number	Degree
Post-test	Experimental Group	Student 1	76%
Post-test	Experimental Group	Student 2	72%
Post-test	Experimental Group	Student 3	78%
Post-test	Experimental Group	Student 4	90%
Post-test	Experimental Group	Student 5	73%
Post-test	Experimental Group	Student 6	78%
Post-test	Experimental Group	Student 7	90%
Post-test	Experimental Group	Student 8	74%
Post-test	Experimental Group	Student 9	84%
Post-test	Experimental Group	Student 10	88%
Post-test	Experimental Group	Student 11	85%
Post-test	Experimental Group	Student 12	95%
Post-test	Experimental Group	Student 13	85%
Post-test	Experimental Group	Student 14	78%
Post-test	Experimental Group	Student 15	83%
Post-test	Experimental Group	Student 16	78%
Post-test	Experimental Group	Student 17	85%
Post-test	Experimental Group	Student 18	80%
Post-test	Experimental Group	Student 19	77%
Post-test	Experimental Group	Student 20	90%
Post-test	Experimental Group	Student 21	91%
Post-test	Experimental Group	Student 22	79%
Post-test	Experimental Group	Student 23	80%
Post-test	Experimental Group	Student 24	74%
Post-test	Experimental Group	Student 25	90%
Post-test	Experimental Group	Student 26	87%
Post-test	Experimental Group	Student 27	94%
Post-test	Experimental Group	Student 28	89%
Post-test	Experimental Group	Student 29	71%
Post-test	Experimental Group	Student 30	62%
Total			2456

Table (6): The Percentage of the Controlling Group and Experiment Group Students' Degrees in the Post-test.

No.	Test Name	Student Number	Total Degree
1	Controlling Group	30	58.66%
2	Experimental Group	30	81.86%

Table (7): Frequency Distribution of the Controlling Group's Scores in the Post-test.

Score Interval	Frequency	Group Name
90 – more	0	Controlling Group
80 – 89	0	Controlling Group
70 – 79	2	Controlling Group

60 – 69	14	Controlling Group
50 – 59	13	Controlling Group
40 – 49	1	Controlling Group
30 – 39	0	Controlling Group
20 – 29	0	Controlling Group
Less than 20	0	Controlling Group

Table (8): Frequency Distribution of the Experimental Group's Scores in the Post-test.

Score Interval	Frequency	Group Name
90 – more	7	Experimental Group
80 – 89	10	Experimental Group
70 – 79	12	Experimental Group
60 – 69	1	Experimental Group
50 – 59	0	Experimental Group
40 – 49	0	Experimental Group
30 – 39	0	Experimental Group
20 – 29	0	Experimental Group
Less than 20	0	Experimental Group

8. The Results

In regard to the outcomes of the pre-test and the post-test, some results have been achieved. The results are:

- 1- The students of the controlling group have achieved 39% in the pre-test, while the students of the experimental group have achieved 38.7%.
- 2- The students of the controlling group have achieved 60.5% in the post-test, while the students of the experimental group have achieved 81.9%.
- 3- In the pre-test, the lowest mark in the controlling group is 27%, achieved by student no. 12. However, the lowest mark in the experimental group is 20%, achieved by student no. 30.
- 4- In the pre-test, the highest mark in the controlling group is 60%, achieved by student no. 27. But, the highest mark in the experimental group is 51%, achieved by student no. 12.
- 5- In the post test, the lowest mark in the controlling group is 45%, achieved by student no. 5. But, the lowest mark in the experimental group is 62%, achieved by student no. 30.
- 6- In the post-test, the highest mark in the controlling group is 70%, achieved by student no. 3 and student no. 10. Yet, the highest mark in the experimental group is 95%, achieved by student no. 12.
- 7- In the post-test, no student has achieved 90% or more in the controlling group. Yet, 7 students have achieved 90% or more in the experimental group.

- 8- In the post-test, no student has achieved 80 – 89% in the controlling group. However, 10 students have achieved 80 – 89% in the experimental group.
- 9- In the post-test, 2 students have achieved 70 – 79% in the controlling group, while 12 students have achieved 70 – 79% in the experimental group.
- 10- In the post-test, 14 students have achieved 60 – 69% in the controlling group, while only 1 student has achieved 60 – 69% in the experimental group.
- 11- In the post-test, 13 students have achieved 50 – 59% in the controlling group, while no student has achieved 59% or less in the experimental group.
- 12- In the post-test, only 1 student has achieved 40 – 49% in the controlling group.
- 13- In the post-test, no student has achieved 40% or less in both groups.

9. Discussion of the Results

9.1 Cohesion

According to the outcomes of the pre-test, most students, in both groups, face some difficulties in cohesion. They jump from one idea to another randomly because they fail to arrange these ideas properly due to their lack of vocabulary and poor grammar. Yet, the post-test reveals that they are able to express themselves easily and arrange their ideas properly. However, the students of the experiment group have really developed their speaking skills as they are able to discuss different topics, arrange their ideas and justify their opinions.

9.2 Fluency

Some students, in both groups, face great difficulties in speaking English and, as they try to, they are hesitant speakers. This hesitation is so clear in the pre-test. However, the post-test reveals that the students of the controlling group become less hesitant speakers. Yet, the students of the experiment group have greatly developed themselves in a way that they are able to speak with confidence, make pauses naturally, and speak for a long time easily.

9.3 Repetition

Some students of both groups, when they try to speak English, keep repeating sentences. This is due to their lack of confidence, their embarrassment, their poor grammar, and their poor vocabulary. The pre-test reveals this kind of difficulty. However, the post-test proves that those students have developed themselves that they are less hesitant speakers as they are able to speak easier than before. To be specific, the students of the

experiment group are no longer hesitant speakers. They speak without repetition at all.

9.4 False Start

Some students, in both groups, face some difficulties in the beginning of their speech. They have problems in code-switching. It is difficult to switch from their native language 'Arabic' to English. This problem is discovered in the pre-test. However, the post-test ensures that those students are now able to start speaking English normally without any difficulty.

9.5 Self-Correction

In the pre-test, many students couldn't discover or correct their grammatical or lexical mistakes while speaking English. Their poor grammar, lack of vocabulary or poor knowledge of English may be the main reasons behind this difficulty. However, the post-test proves that some students of the controlling group are now able to correct their mistakes as soon as they commit them naturally; the so-called 'auto correction'. Yet, all students of the experiment group are able to do so in case they commit any.

10. Conclusions

Looking at the responses of the students', the results and the discussion of the results, some conclusions can be achieved.

- 1- Using video supported teaching enables EFL learners to speak English easily. This has validated the first hypothesis.
- 2- Using video supported teaching saves time and speeds up the process of developing EFL learners speaking skills. This has verified the second hypothesis.
- 3- Using video supported teaching helps EFL learners overcome their embarrassment, feeling afraid of committing mistakes and being laughed at by other students.
- 4- Using video supported teaching enables EFL learners to be very confident speakers. This has proved the third hypothesis.
- 5- Using video supported teaching helps EFL learners discover their mistakes and correct these mistakes as soon as they commit them; the so-called 'auto correction'. In this way, these mistakes are no longer considered as mistakes, but they are merely slips of the tongue.

References

- Baker and Westrup (2000). *The English Language Teachers' Handbook*. London: Continuum.
- Baldry, A. and Thibault, P. (2006). *Multimodal Transcription and Text Analysis*. London: Equinox.

- Bardovi-Harlig, K. & Salsbury, T. (2004). *The Organization of Turns in the Disagreements of L2 Learners: A Longitudinal Perspective*. In: Boxer, D. and Cohen, A.D. (eds.) *Studying Speaking to Inform Language Learning*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 199- 227.
- Belasco, S. (1967). *From Communication to Curriculum*. New York: Penguin Books.
- Boussiada, S. (2010). *Enhancing Students' Oral Proficiency through Cooperative Group Work*. Constantine: Mentouri University.
- Bowman, B., Burkart, G. & Robson, B. (1989). *Teaching English as a Second Language*. USA: Center of Applied Linguistics.
- Caporali, E. & Trajkovik, V. (2012). *Video Conference as a Tool for Higher Education: The Tempus Vices Experience*. Firenze: Firenze University Press.
- Comber, C., Lawson, T., Gage, J., Cullum-Hanshaw, A. & Allen, T. (2004). *Report for School of the Video Conferencing in the Classroom Project*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Derrington, C. & Groom, B. (2004). *Different Types of Listening*. www.paulchapmanpublishing.co.uk/upmdata/9772_036767pg42_45.pdf.
- Fulcher, Glenn and Davidson, Fred (2007). *Language Testing an Assessment: An advanced resource book*. London: Routledge Taylor & Francis Group.
- Harmer, J. (2001). *The Practice of English Language Teaching*. England: Pearson Education Limited.
- Knipe, D. & Lee, M. (2002). *The Quality of Teaching and Learning via Videoconferencing*. British Journal of Educational Technology, 33 (3), 301-311.
- Kouicem, K. (2010). *The Effect of Classroom Interaction on Developing the Learners*. Unpublished Dissertation.
- Krashen, S. (1981). *Second Language Acquisition and Second Language Learning*. Pergamon Press.
- Lander, R. & Burns, J. (1999). *Videoconferencing and Teaching and Learning within De Montfort University*. Leicester: De Montfort University.
- Liu, D. & Jiang, P. (2009). *Using a Corpus-based Lexicogrammatical Approach to Grammar Instruction in EFL and ESL Contexts*. Modern Language Journal, 93 (1).
- Luoma, Sari. (2004). *Assessing Speaking*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Marshal, J.M. (2002). *Learning with Technology: Evidence that teaching can, and does, support learning*. White paper prepared for Cable in the Classroom.
- Numan, D. (1991). *Language Teaching Methodology: A Textbook for Teachers*. New York: Prentice Hall.

- Olsen, F. (2003). *Videoconferencing with some life in it*. The Chronicle of Higher Education, 49 (43).
- Redmond, M.V. & Vrchota, D. (2007). *Everyday Public Speaking*. England: Pearson Education.
- Richards, C. Jack, Bycina, David & Wisniewska, Ingrid. (2005) *Person to Person/ Book 2/ Communicative Speaking and Listening Skills*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Simpson, A. and Walsh, M. (2010). *Multiple Literacies: Implications for Changed Pedagogy*. In F. Christie and A. Simpson (eds.), *Literary and Social Responsibility*. London: Equinox, pp. 24-39.
- Stempleski, S. (1987). *Short Takes: Using Authentic Video in the English Class*.
- Susanti. A. (2007). *Using Role-play in Teaching Speaking Skill*. Jakarta: Unpublished Dissertation.
www.google.dz/search?q=Susanti%2C2007+communicative+circumstance&rlz=1
- Tavani, C.M. & Losh, S.C. (2003). *Motivation, self-confidence, expectations as predictors of the academic performances among our high school students*. Child Study Journal, 33 (3).
- Tschirner, E. (2001) *Language Acquisition in the Classroom: The Role of Digital Video*. Computer Assisted Language Learning, 14(3): 305-319.
- Ur, Penny. (1996). *A Course in Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Van Duzer, C. (1997). *Improving ESL Learners' Listening Skills: At the Workplace and Beyond*.
www.cal.org/caela/esl_resources/digests/LISTENQA.html
- Van Leeuwen, T. (2014) *Critical Discourse Analysis and Multimodality*. In C. Hart, & P. Cap (eds.) *Contemporary Critical Discourse Studies*. Bloomsbury: Bloomsbury Publishing. pp. 281-295.