

The Use of Vlog in Improving Students' Oral Language Production: A Case Study

Teguh Hadi Saputro^{1*}, Ibnu Choirin Tafsirudin, Rafika Rabba Farah

Universitas Muhammadiyah Malang, Indonesia
teguhhadisaputro@umm.ac.id^{1*}

Abstract. *The analysis of using a video blog (Vlog) in language learning has been widely done. However, most of the studies only focus on investigating the students' perception of Vlog. This study attempted to analyze the use of Vlog in improving students' oral language production. In addition, the students' perception after applying Vlog in language learning was also investigated. The complexity, accuracy and fluency (CAF) were the aspects analyzed from students' performance. Further, a mixed-method was applied in this study. This study involved six participants (3 male and 3 female) who were the students of the English Language Education Department of a private university in Malang, Indonesia. A speaking test which was in the forms of vlogs and semi-structured interviews were used as the instruments for the data collection. The quantitative data from the test were calculated by using formulas of CAF and further analyzed by the descriptive statistics, while the qualitative data from the interview were analyzed to explore the benefits and challenges of learning with vlogs. The findings showed the increasing mean of the students' accuracy while their fluency and complexity decreased. There were several factors that might impact the findings. Those were; planning time, pressures, restrictions in terms of time, and task repetition. The benefits and challenges of learning with Vlogs were discussed in this paper.*

Keywords: *language performance, teaching speaking, vlogs*

1. INTRODUCTION

Since the technology was introduced, it has given a great contribution to language learning, and it is inseparable from the language learning process, not to mention in this digital era. The use of technology devices such as smartphones, laptops, and computers among the present generation becomes a necessity and a need for them (Balakrishnan & Puteh, 2014). In addition, today's generation is technology revelers who use those technology devices in their daily life, and hard to leave it behind. Those who are in their school-age are the active user of the technology. In this case, the institutions or schools and the stakeholders should be aware of integrating technology with the materials in the language teaching syllabus to make language

learning more effective and attractive. Further, the use of technology in language learning can reduce teacher's talk time in the teaching and learning process in the classroom (Balakrishnan & Puteh, 2014).

In this globalization era, technology develops rapidly and is always linked to innovation. One of the innovations is video blog (Vlog), a mix of video and blog, which is popular among nowadays generation (Anil, 2016b). It is a personal diary in terms of video and audiovisual shared with the public through an internet network. The purpose of Vlog activity is to express someone's ideas or the information and share them to the public through video and audiovisual. This activity reveals to be one of the interesting ways to learn English, mainly speaking, outside the classroom, and creates an innovative language learning atmosphere (Anil, 2016a).

Vlogs facilitate language learners to practice their speaking skills outside the classroom (Hung, 2011). They can record their speaking activities in a video format and post it on online media such as YouTube, Dropbox, and others. Teachers can monitor the improvement of the learner's speaking skills through the videos. Meanwhile, the public can also give their comment and suggestion to enrich the content and the quality of the Vlogs. This practice can be one of the best ways to improve speaking skills outside the classroom and might be needed to cope with the recent issues of learners' willingness to speak and confidence in their speaking performance. Most of the time, in the classroom context, students have minimal time to practice their speaking as teachers need to struggle with completing the syllabus, which might ignore the speaking practice (Anil, 2016b). Thus, using Vlog can help language learners improve their speaking skills despite the above situations (Anil, 2016b; Shih, 2010).

Most studies have investigated learners' perception about Vlog in speaking class. The results mostly suggest the perceived effectiveness of Vlogs in improving the students' speaking skills (Anil, 2016b; Balakrishnan & Puteh, 2014; Smith & Maté, 2010). However, empirically measurement of the improvement has not yet been done and, thus, it serves as the gap of this present study. It attempts to provide empirical evidence of whether assigning the students to create Vlogs is beneficial to the students' language performance, which in this case is their complexity, accuracy, and fluency (CAF). Another gap in this research is that only a few studies on this topic have explored the Indonesian context. Thus, the present study also aims at providing the perception of the use of Vlogs in the Indonesian teaching context.

2. RESEARCH QUESTIONS

- How is the result of using Vlog on the students' performance in terms of Complexity, Accuracy, and Fluency (CAF)?
- How is the students' perception of Vlog in their learning speaking?

3. LITERATURE REVIEW

3.1 *Language teaching and technology*

Many teaching methods and media have been proposed and applied in the field of second language teaching in order to help teachers and learners in achieving language teaching goals (Kramsch, 2014). Further, since the late 1980s and early 1990s, the cognitive and sociolinguistic approaches have emerged in language teaching and, to a certain extent, suggested the integration of technology (i.e., computer) in the classroom (Tarighat & Khodabakhsh, 2016). These days, language teaching is not limited to whatever happens in the classroom, but also outside the classroom, with several innovations in language teaching to facilitate it. Therefore, several methods and media in language teaching are utilized the advance of the digital era, such as integrating more technology devices (e.g., computer, mobile, and internet) in it (Chun, Smith, & Kern, 2016; Salaberry, 2001; Sung, Chang, & Liu, 2016; Zamari, Adnan, Idris, & Yusof, 2012).

The role of technology in language teaching is crucial. Since the presence of technology in society, it has helped people in doing many things in their life, until some argue that technology assists society (Gonzalez-Acevedo, 2016). In terms of second language teaching, technology has given its significance. Computer-Assisted Language Learning (CALL), for instance, is one of many roles of technology in the language learning process (Gündüz, 2005; Parmaxi, Zaphiris, & Ioannou, 2016; Tarighat & Khodabakhsh, 2016). In addition, Afshari et al. (2013), argue that technology used in language teaching creates a good atmosphere for learning and motivates students to learn and participates in classroom activities. Moreover, Lee (2000, as cited in Azar & Nasiri, 2014) suggests that computer technology used in second language teaching can provide ways for students to practice the language through experimental learning, stimulate students to learn more, increase student accomplishment, enrich reliable materials for learning, encourage greater interaction among stakeholders in language teaching, give emphasis on individual needs, avoid misinformation and broaden global understanding. Eventually, several

researchers agreed that computer technology is a good and perfect tool to enhance students' learning in English (Azar & Nasiri, 2014).

Computer technology is one of the valuable instruments in language teaching. Over the past view decades, computer-assisted language learning (CALL) has been widely used in teaching and learning the language. According to Beatty (2003, as cited in Afshari et al., 2013; Oz et al., 2015) CALL is defined as any process that requires learners to use computers in language learning to improve his or her language. In many studies, CALL facilitates language learning and encourages a positive attitude (Grgurović, Chapelle, & Shelley, 2013; Oz et al., 2015) as it helps learners acquire the language. Further, Warschauer (1996, as cited in Afshari et al.) posits that computer technology helps learners in acquiring language in three ways: computer as the instructor (tutoring the learners), computer as impetus (increase syntactic and analytic thinking of learners), and computer as an instrument (e.g., grammar checking, word processing, collaborative writing, and internet). In addition, Hashemi & Aziznezhad (2011) explain that there are two advantages of involving CALL in language teaching and learning: first, it offers a powerful self-access facility; it helps generate autonomous learners or independent learners who will experience many things whatever they want, in learning a language. Autonomous learners use computers to practice their language with compatible software. Other advantages of CALL is to give a new role to teaching materials. Generally, learners feel motivated when they are exposed with innovative and attractive teaching media e.g., using computer. In addition, many language skill learning can be facilitated by software (Gündüz, 2005). Gündüz (2005), believes that CALL helps the language learning when teachers know how to optimize the use of it.

As time goes by, computer technology has somehow been replaced or possibly advanced by mobile technology that offers high practicality and popularity. Further, the education field has given excellent deal attention to the occurrence of wireless technology and mobile-devices innovation that offer portability, social connectivity, context-sensitivity, and individuality features (Sung, Chang, & Yang, 2015). Sung et al. (2015) state that mobile devices make the learning process handy, real-time, cooperative, and all-in-one, and defines as mobile learning. Researchers define mobile learning techniques that applied in the language learning and teaching process as mobile-assisted language learning (MALL) (Sung et al., 2015). Tarighat & Khodabakhsh (2016), define MALL as a new trend in language learning aid that uses portable

devices (Sung et al., 2016) which leads the learners to access several learning programs in a different context.

3.2 Video Blog (Vlog)

Vlog (video blog or video log) is one of attractive media innovations in this current digital era. This innovation was popular among digital geeks especially youth generation that interested on visual and audiovisual. Watkins & Wilkins (2011), state that Vlog is a personal diary in form of video and audio that shared on online media. Recent study suggests to post the results of Vlog on the several media that connected with internet networks such as YouTube, Dropbox, Whatsapp, email, and Facebook or others (Anil, 2016a). In addition, nowadays, generation is inseparable from those media and the internet network, and it becomes their needs in this era. Furthermore, Vlog aims to express someone's opinion or information to others, personally or socially (Anil, 2016a; DeWitt, Naimie, & Siraj, 2013; Smith & Maté, 2010).

Vlogs have an essential role in improving learners speaking skills. Vlogs can be seen as a trial and error method in learning, in which learners can practice many times before they feel satisfied with their own performance in the video, which later is uploaded into a vlog. Watkins & Wilkins (2011) analyzes three-time Vlogs of Vloggers, and the results show that it helps them practice their speaking in front of the camera and build their confidence. Moreover, the vlogs posted on online media like YouTube can make learners learn many things from the feedbacks, comments, and viewers' suggestions and motivate them to correct and improve the contents of their Vlog. In conclusion, integrating vlogs in language learning is one of the best ways to facilitate learners to improve their speaking skills and build their confidence to speak up while exploring digital experiences in this technology era.

3.3 Complexity, Accuracy, and Fluency (CAF)

Complexity is the highest level of language use. It emphasizes the language organization and elaborates on the variety of syntax in language. The complexity in speaking is the difficult one, where the learners have to develop their ideas orally while reconstructing as more intricate language subsystems with the strong willingness to take a risk and experiment the language (Foster & Skehan, 1996). Crookes (1989), states that the greater complexity of language is the greater quantity of clauses in every C-unit. In addition, Brock (1986) defines C-unit as

autonomous utterance providing referential or pragmatic meaning. C-unit is either a simple independent finite clause or a dependent finite or nonfinite clause (Foster & Skehan, 1996).

To know the quality of complexity in a conversation, some experts measure the clauses and words per utterance. The more clauses in a talk per utterance, the more complex the conversation is. Moreover, in the study of Foster & Skehan (1996), it gives the way to measure complexity in speaking by adapting general measurement of Robinson et al. (1995) and Crookes (1989) that calculate the number of subordinate clauses (dependent clause) per utterance and per T-unit. In addition, Young and Milanovic (1992, as cited in Foster, Tonkyn, & Wigglesworth, 2000) define T-unit for oral data as ‘an independent clause and any associated dependent clauses’. Therefore, the complexity is counted by calculating the number of dependent clauses per utterance or how many dependent clauses that attach on independent clause. Finally, this measurement is applied with several experts to know the complexity of speaking.

Accuracy is one of important aspects of speaking that is dealing with the grammatical and language form. Moradi & Talebi (2014) state that, accuracy is the understanding of language form and structures with the accurate implementation of them in language use. Moreover, Davies (1980) argues that accuracy is included the grammatical and syntactical structure of the target language. In addition, other researchers claim that accuracy is freedom from the error in every language used (Foster & Skehan, 1996). Furthermore, accuracy is much needed when it is used in formal and some non-formal speaking condition to keep the real intention of the speakers, because it is used to determine the real intention of the speakers in their talks or communications. Basically, the information could be misunderstood between speakers and interlocutors when the information is lack of accuracy. Thus, to avoid that issue, the speakers have to know the language form or structure, pronunciation, and the correct vocabularies.

Foster & Skehan (1996), inform the way to measure accuracy in speaking is by calculating error-free clauses in the utterance. Besides, error-free clauses are a clause that there is no error in syntax, morphology, or word order (Foster & Skehan, 1996). This measurement aims to know and compare the quality of speaking in oral language activities. The higher amount of error-free in clauses, the better accuracy of speaking. Moreover, Foster & Skehan (1996) state that under planned conditions, the learners can have greater accuracy with a higher

amount of error-free in clauses. Hence, the measurement is needed to know how many errors that occur in the clauses of speaking.

In addition, being a fluent speaker is as important as being an accurate and complex one. In fact, it should be the first priority when it comes to learning a second language in the early stage. Fillmore (1979, as cited in Moradi & Talebi, 2014), elaborates and conceptualizes fluency in several ways. First, fluency is the capability to speak up at length with little pauses, by filling the time with talk. Second, fluency is the expression of message in a coherent way. Third, a fluent person knows what to say in appropriate contexts. Fourth, fluent speakers are creative and imaginative when they used the language. In addition, Davies (1980) points out fluency as the ability to express oneself adequately without undue hesitation in a given situation, whether in speech or in writing.

Previous studies divide fluency into two categories, the first category is fluency in the narrow sense, which is claimed as the speed and smoothness of speech delivering without (filled) pauses repetition and repair in it. Second, fluency describes overall speaking proficiency, which is a vital component of the speaking proficiency evaluation (De Jong et al. 2015). Thus, fluency in speaking deals with speed, smooth at length without pauses, repetition, and repair or filling it by other talks. Further, the study of Ortega (1999) points out the measurement of fluency by counting the number of syllables per minute without including syllables of reformulation, false starts, hesitations, and repetitions (Ortega, 1999). This measurement is used by several experts to know how fluent the speakers deliver their speech in a speaking activity.

4. METHODOLOGY

This current research employed mixed methods design, quantitative and qualitative to gain the result of both data in this research. The quantitative method was used to obtain the answer to the first research question which investigated the participants' CAF. Meanwhile, the qualitative method was applied to explore the participants' perception after using Vlog in their speaking class by conducting a semi-structured interview.

4.1 Participants

The participants were six students of the English Language Education Department at a private university in Malang, Indonesia. They were three female and three male students with the age range of 18-20. Generally, they had learnt English since junior high school, or they had learnt English for around six years. Furthermore, in the university, they had passed Basic Speaking, Pre-Intermediate Speaking, and Intermediate Speaking prior to the course as they participated in the study.

4.2 Data collection

The data were obtained utilizing giving tasks to the participants to make the contents of vlogs with several instructions which were on the same topic. The topic was related to language teaching issues. The vlog task was given in every two weeks, which resulted in six vlogs. The vlog task was given in the second, fourth, sixth, eighth, tenth, and twelfth weeks from the total of 14 class meetings. The vlog task was the follow-up of the classroom tasks. For example, in the second meeting, the students discussed the importance of grammar in learning English. The students involved mainly in group work. To reinforce their understanding and practice of the topic in the second week, they were assigned to make a 3-minute vlog about the important grammar in learning English. Afterward, they would make a video of themselves talking about the topic, upload the video to YouTube and share the YouTube URL link to the teacher through a learning management system (LMS). By submitting the link to the LMS, it was expected that other students could watch the video and give comments or feedback. The students did the same series of activities to do the second to the sixth vlogs. The sub-topics of the vlogs were (1) the importance of grammar in learning English, (2) how to start writing in English, (3) the difference of learning English and being good at English, (4) how to use technology to support language learning, (5) their opinion about world Englishes and (6) the criteria of a good English teacher. However, for the analysis, only the first and the sixth (last) vlogs were used as the data to check whether or not the participants made progress in terms of their complexity, accuracy and fluency.

As for the participants' perceptions about their vlog tasks, in-depth interviews were carried out with the six participants individually after they completed the 6 vlogs. The interviews were semi-structured with the primary investigation of the benefits and challenges of learning with vlogs. All the interviews were fully audiotaped.

4.3 Data analysis

The two vlogs from the second and twelfth weeks were thoroughly transcribed with the information of the length of pause, repetition, and other details that were relevant to the further analysis. The participants' complexity was calculated by identifying the dependent clauses per utterance (Foster & Skehan, 1996). In other words, the number of dependent clauses determined the score of the complexity. Meanwhile, the accuracy score was obtained by counting the number of error-free clauses (including syntactic, morphological, and word order) to total clauses in percentage (Foster & Skehan, 1996). As for the fluency, Ortega (1999) formulates the way to obtain the score by counting the syllables per minute in speech out of reformulations, false starts, hesitations, and repetition syllables. After the scores of CAF of each individual were obtained, the descriptive statistics were employed to investigate the increase or decrease of CAF from the first vlog to the sixth one. For the interviews, the audio was transcribed. From the transcription, the qualitative analysis was performed to identify and present the benefits and challenges of the vlogs.

5. Findings

5.1 Complexity, Accuracy and Fluency in Vlog

The analysis of the participants' vlog in this current research resulted in some findings. The calculation results are presented in Table 1.

Table 1: Descriptive Statistic (Means) of CAF results in Vlog

No	Names	C		A		F		Increase/Decrease		
		V1	V6	V1	V6	V1	V6	C	A	F
1	A	7	9	42.1	67	146	110	+2	+24.9	-36
2	B	31	20	93	83	171	154	-11	-10	-17
3	C	12	23	65	80	167	119	+11	+15	-48
4	D	12	12	56.2	72.4	162	138	0	+16.2	-24
5	E	6	3	79.1	86.3	106.4	157.2	-3	+7.2	+50.8
6	F	14	14	72	64	160.1	135.2	0	-8	-24.9
	Mean	13.67	13.5	67.9	75.45	152.08	135.56	-0.17	+7.55	-
										16.52

*C: Complexity, A: Accuracy, F: Fluency, V1: Vlog 1, V6: Vlog 6

Table 1 showed the results of CAF from the two vlogs of the six participants. For the complexity, the mean of the first vlog was higher (13.67) than the sixth Vlog (13.5). It indicated that in terms of the complexity, the participants' performance decreased by 0.17 points. Even though the complexity of Participant "A" increased by 2 points (from 7 to 9) and Participant "B" showed an increase of his / her complexity by 11 points (from 12 to 23), their performance did not impact the overall mean of the participants' complexity.

Unlike the complexity results, the accuracy of the participants' performance was increased indicated by the increase of the mean by 7.55 points (from 67.9 to 75.45). As seen from the table, most of participants increased their accuracy from Vlog 1 to Vlog 6, but only two did not. They were Participant "B" (from 93 to 83) and Participant F (from 72 to 64).

Similar to the complexity, the participants' fluency relatively showed a decrease. It can be seen from the mean of the first vlog, 152.8, which decreased to 135.56 in the sixth vlog. The decrease point was 16.52. However, only one participant increased his fluency from 106.4 to 157.2 (16.52 points).

5.2 Perception

5.2.1 Benefits

The semi-structured interview was conducted with the six participants in this current research and resulted in several findings. In this section, the findings of the interview represented the benefits of Vlog and categorized into five points namely as follows: (A) Vlog was efficient, (B) Vlog helped learners in improving speaking skill, (C) Vlog was more fun in learning speaking, (D) Vlog helped the participants in understanding materials outside the classroom, and (E) Vlog motivated the participants to learn more about language.

In the first point, the results of the interview claimed that Vlog was efficient. There were two reasons that underlined this point. First, the learners could access and make the Vlog in every time and everywhere. Second, the Vlog was considered to facilitate the learners to learn several materials in a relatively short time while preparing the content of their Vlog.

"Usually, Vlog is used for entertainment in YouTube, but now it can be used for language learning, I think it is more efficient than ordinary language learning" (SVN, A)

“I think Vlog is efficient, because it can extend the language learning time and give some time to practice in speaking while making the content of it outside the classroom” (KMS, A)

For the second point, the participants stated that Vlog helped them to improve their speaking skill. Vlog facilitated the participants to practice their speaking outside the classroom, and habituated themselves to talk in English. In addition, the participants perceived that they were more fluent in speaking English after applying Vlog in their speaking practice. Especially for those less active learners in the class, Vlog was helpful in increasing their talk time outside the classroom. Furthermore, Vlog helped them in coping with their self-distrust issue when they did the public speaking.

“I think Vlog is very interesting. It is something new in my learning. It helps me and other shy learners to increase our talk time or to be more active in speaking” (KMS, B)

“In my opinion, Vlog is good in familiarizing myself in speaking English or it can be a good medium for speaking practices” (IN, B)

For the third point, the participants claimed that using Vlog in learning speaking was interesting. There were several reasons that made the use of Vlog more exciting than learning speaking in the class. The participants felt that the use of Vlog in learning speaking was more enjoyable because it was something new in their learning. In addition, Vlog facilitated the learners in expressing themselves freely in front of the camera without any pressure from the lecturer supervision.

“Vlog is something new in my learning process which is interesting to use and learning about it” (SVN, C)

“Actually, I like both of learning language approach that using Vlog and language learning in the classroom. It depends on the lecturer creativity in delivering the materials. To date, I prefer to use Vlog in my language learning because it was more fun than traditional language learning in the classroom that can facilitate me in expressing myself freely” (FDS, C)

The fourth point, Vlog helped the participants in understanding the materials that they had learned in the class. In this point, vlog was claimed to facilitate the participants in reviewing the materials that they had learned. In addition, the participants could re-explain the materials using their own language style in Vlog. Furthermore, the participant could evaluate their works

from the Vlog and the feedbacks in their Vlog. Moreover, Vlog helped them in structuring the materials that they want to present in their Vlog. They could plan the idea in speech as well as they can by implementing what they had learned.

“I understood the materials that I have learned in the class precisely after making Vlog because it makes me rethink and relearn what I have discussed in the class. Hence, I can make a good conclusion of it in my Vlog” (IN, D)

“I prefer to use Vlog in my language learning because it can be used as a medium of reviewing and practicing the materials that I have learned. In addition, after using Vlog in my language learning, I could evaluate my works and make the better one in the next Vlog assignment” (KW, D)

The next point was related to the participants' motivation after using Vlog in their speaking class. Vlog provided additional motivation to the participants' language learning. The reason was that it helped the participants to experience a way to improve their oral performance. Also, vlog facilitated them to practice and evaluate their speaking skill progress. In addition, it could support them to improve their progress when the environment around them did not support them. Moreover, vlog helped the participants to create a good habit in learning language by looking for new information and literature to support their Vlog content.

“By using vlog in my language learning, I can experience a way to improve my language, like grammar, speaking fluency and how to develop my speaking, and vlog gives me the motivation to learn a lot of other new things” (SVN, E)

“Vlog gives me motivation in expressing my language style and improves my speaking skill. I can practice my speaking skill even though the environment is not supporting me” (IN, E)

4.2.2 Challenges

The most challenges in this study were technical problems and topic development issues. The first technical problem was about video editing. The most participants lacked of video editing skill. Hence, they could not present what they perceived as a good video. Secondly, some participants who made the video for the first time were confused about uploading and manage it into YouTube. In addition, this problem occurred mostly in the first and the second vlog tasks and for the rest they could handle it. Meanwhile, the topic development issues

involved the lack of references and the anxiety of making mistakes. Some of participants found it challenging to develop the topic in their vlog due to their lack of references. Hence, this pushed them to look for some references to support the content of the vlog. The last issue was their anxiety to make mistakes in their speech that caused them to limit their speech as they had planned before in their vlog tasks. Thus, these issues led to the difficulties in developing the topic for their vlogs.

“Vlog was not boring, but I was confused to develop the topic that I will present in the Vlog, so then I find it hard to maximize the content in the Vlog. In addition, I feel troubled to make the vlog more attractive” (KMS, F)

“I feel nervous in front of the camera because of my expectation that make me afraid to make mistakes in my Vlog” (IN, F)

6. DISCUSSIONS

The findings on the participants' CAF results in this showed an increase in accuracy yet decrease in both complexity and fluency. In terms of the complexity, Ahmadian & Tavakoli (2011) have suggested that the repetition on the same task will affect the complexity results. In this study, the vlog treatments seemed to have a negative effect on the complexity results. This fact is not following the Ahmadian & Tavakoli(2011) statement, which argues that task repetition enhances complexity and or fluency. In addition, most of the participants' complexity results decreased in this current study due likely to several reasons such as pressures, restrictions in terms of time, and planning time. In this study, the participants were allowed to present their speech freely without any pressure. In fact, some participants still felt anxious about making mistakes in their speech. It might cause their low score in making complex oral language. Basically, when the students have sufficient time and less-pressure conditions, they are likely to try to make more accurate and complex language (Ahmadian & Tavakoli, 2011; Johnson, 2017).

Although some studies report that time restriction and planning time are considerable evidence that increases language complexity (Crookes, 1989; Foster & Skehan, 1996; Mehnert, 1998; Ortega, 1999), the current study showed different finding. The time restriction in this study was around three up to five minutes in every vlog treatment, with weekly planning time. This time restriction is claimed sufficient to produce good complexity compared to the study of

Ahmadian & Tavakoli (2011) and Gass et al.(1999). The results of Gass et al. (1999), about repetition in the same task report the gain lexical complexity and partial accuracy which increase in two up to three days planning time. Meanwhile, Ahmadian & Tavakoli (2011), obtain favorable results on complexity in four up to six minutes of time limitation. Moreover, Mehnert (1998) finds that greater complexity is obtained after ten minutes of planning time which is shorter than planning time in the Gass et al. (1999) and this present study. However, the findings of the current study showed different directions, although the procedures of those studies are more or less similar to the current study. Thus, those factors do not seem to have a positive effect on the complexity of the participants in the study.

The vlog tasks seem to give positive results in terms of accuracy improvement. As this particular task is a form of task repetitions, the participants likely tend to focus on preparing their performance and correcting their either error or mistake several times which might affect their accuracy. In this case, the finding of the current news is in line with the study of Bygate (1999) and Lynch & Maclean (2003), that report the task repetition improves accuracy in language production. This finding is also in tune with the result of Hulstijn & Hulstijn (1984), Ellis (1987) and Ahmadian & Tavakoli (2011). Although those studies have some differences in terms of the accuracy measures, the general concept of the measurement is similar, calculating error-free clauses.

One may suggest that the restriction in terms of time in the Vlog treatment impacts the results of students' accuracy (Yuan & Ellis, 2003). In the study, a week planning time in this current study is likely sufficient to facilitate good accuracy in every vlog tasks. Yuan & Ellis (2003), point out that when the students are allowed to take more time in their performance, they try to produce both more complex and accurate language. On the contrary, when the students perform under time restrictions, they will prioritize meaning over form (Yuan & Ellis, 2003). Other experts suggest that when the students use their time without any restriction in their performance, the production of their word order becomes more accurate (Hulstijn & Hulstijn, 1984). According to the finding of Ahmadian & Tavakoli (2011), learners who have ample time for task completion will produce more accurate language than those who do not.

In this section, four participants have increased accuracy while the rest decreases. Some of the structure the idea before presenting their vlog content, and the others do. Structuring idea in the time completion supports the participant to gain greater accuracy and/or fluency in their

oral language production (Gass et al., 1999; Skehan & Foster, 1997). Therefore, one may claim that the time restriction has a big contribution to the accuracy result in oral language production. When the learners are allowed to take time as they need to present the tasks, they do produce not only accurate language but also complex and fluent language (Ahmadian & Tavakoli, 2011).

As the fluency seems to decrease from Vlog 1 to Vlog 6, several factors might underline this finding, such as lack of preparation time. Mehnert (1998), expounds that fluency is likely to improve when sufficient or even plenty of planning time is provided. Meanwhile, Ortega (1999), explains that advance planning impacts language production positively, particularly on the complexity and fluency. Therefore, it might be the case that the participants find a week planning time is not sufficient, or they might not use it wisely to give them concise time to prepare their performance before the submission.

From the findings, it can also be learned that the trade-off in terms of the complexity, accuracy and fluency is noted. Some previous studies report their findings which are related to this trade-off effect. For instance, Foster & Skehan(1996) suggest that the trade-off effect occurs between complexity and accuracy. Nevertheless, Wendel (1997, as cited in Ahmadian & Tavakoli, 2011) supported by Yuan & Ellis (2003) states that the trade-off includes accuracy and fluency in which accuracy increases by the online planning and fluency increases by pre-task planning. As for this current study, those trade-off effects occur randomly among the participants in their vlogs. As seen in the finding, two participants, “A” and “C”, experience a trade-off between complexity and accuracy, while Participant “E” shows a trade-off between accuracy and fluency. Meanwhile, other participants seem to show a general or suggested patterns of a trade-off as the scholars argue. In general, from the means of CAF, it shows that only the accuracy shows the increase as compared to the complexity and fluency.

In addition to the CAF results, this study also explores the participants’ perception in terms of the benefits and challenges of the vlog tasks. The benefits involve five points presented in the finding section, while the challenges are mostly related to the technical problems and topic development issues.

Further, the first benefit in this current study is the efficiency of vlog in language learning. The participants feel that they can plan and make their vlog almost in any time and

place they like. Besides, they can also practice and monitor their performance during the vlog making in an efficient way. In this case, Hung (2011) has stated that vlog is efficient in enhancing speaking skills verbally and non-verbally as it can be one of practicing and monitoring media. In addition, Vlog facilitates the students to experience and relearn the materials while making the content of it (Combe, 2014). Some students comprehend the materials that they have learned in the classroom after making the vlog assignment. Hence, one may suggest that vlog facilitates the students to experience new knowledge in a relatively short time (Sung et al., 2015).

The results of semi-structured interviews also present that vlog has a major role in improving the speaking skill. In this respect, the role of vlog involves several aspects such as facilitating the students to practice their speaking outside classroom (James, 1996). Moreover, Demouy & Hulme (2010) suggest that vlog making use of mobile devices can adequately support the practice of listening and speaking. Practicing is one of the important ways to improve and master the English speaking (Ortega, 2009). Further, Vlog helps the students to habituate themselves in speaking English. When the students practice their English on a regular basis, it improves their fluency and confidence at the same time (Ellis, 1987; Ortega, 1999; Rossiter et al. 2010). Furthermore, vlog facilitates some less active students to top-up their talk time outside the classroom (Anil, 2016b). In fact, these students, in the study, vlogs are their way to express themselves as they are too anxious to talk during the face to face class.

The use of Vlog in language learning is also claimed to be fun as compared to traditional classroom language learning. Although technology (e.g., CALL, MALL and blog) has been integrated with language learning in a long time ago (Azar & Nasiri, 2014; Combe, 2016; DeWitt et al., 2013; Stickler & Shi, 2016; Tal & Yelenevskaya, 2012), the use of vlog in language learning is relatively new compared to the previous one i.e., Blog. In this respect, most of the students expound that learning language using Vlog is more interesting than the traditional classroom. In addition, a technology that involved in language learning (i.e., vlog) supports students centered approach (Thomson, 2010).

Some of the participants point out that vlog motivates them to practice their speaking. When the students are creating vlog, they experience a lot of new things that they do not find in the traditional classroom—for example, new linguistics knowledge, video recording and video editing. Ahluwalia et al. (2010), suggest that novelty media (i.e., vlog) with the internet

connection are motivating tools for language learning. Even though some students might face some issues in creating a good vlog in the first and second tasks, they get better on the next tasks. Further, as vlogs allow both teacher and peer feedback, it affects their motivation and learning. Shih (2010), argues that feedback in online learning can increase the students' motivation.

The challenges that are found in this current study are mostly about technical problems and topic development issues. After conducting a semi-structured interview, some participants explained that they have trouble presenting good video due to lack of experience in video making. Most of the students are lack skills in video recording and editing. Indeed, there are several skills and experiences needed to create an attractive and useful video, especially in operating camera and editing applications such as window movie maker (Anil, 2016b). Moreover, some aspects have to be included in creating a good video such as video itself, sound, picture, text, and emotions that support the video to deliver the information (Watkins & Wilkins, 2011). The other technical problem is related to the process of uploading the video to YouTube. There are some regulations and technical issues that might be complicated for first-time users of YouTube to share their videos.

The other challenge is about topic development. Most of the participants acknowledge that they find it hard to get relevant references for their talk in the video. However, they feel that they are getting better after doing the next tasks of the vlog. Moreover, it is likely that the participants do not use the planning time effectively although, the preparation time in this study is claimed to be sufficient by several studies (Mackey, 2007; Mehnert, 1998; Moradi & Talebi, 2014; Révész, 2011; Skehan, 2003). However, in this study, the participants have a different opinion. They wish that they can have a longer time for the preparation.

7. CONCLUSIONS

This study was primarily an attempt to investigate the effects of Vlog on complexity, accuracy and fluency of students' oral language production and the students' perception about Vlog in their language learning. The use of Vlog in this current study positively affected the participants' accuracy while negatively affected their complexity and fluency. In addition, several factors might be responsible to the findings, such as planning time, pressures, task repetition, and time restriction. Further, the factors that decreased the participants' complexity

in this study were the pressures of their anxiety in making mistakes and the restrictions in terms of time. Meanwhile, the planning time and task repetition increased the participants' accuracy in this study. Those two factors gave significant contributions toward their accuracy, as pointed out by several previous studies. In addition, this study found that planning time and under pressured performance were the main factors that decreased the students' fluency. Further, the participants' perception about vlog was obtained from semi structured interviews. Those perceptions were categorized into benefits and challenges. From the findings, there are five benefits categories and two challenges in using the vlog for learning English. Combining the calculation of CAF and the perception of the participants in the study, it is likely that vlogs give an excellent effect on the learning and even might even provide a better learning opportunity. However, large-scale studies are needed to strengthen the claim of this small-scale study.

8. REFERENCES

- Afshari, M., Ghavifekr, S., Siraj, S., & Jing, D. (2013). Students' Attitudes towards Computer-assisted Language Learning. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 103, 852–859. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.10.407>
- Ahluwalia, G., Sahib, F., Aggarwal, D., & Sahib, F. (2010). Language Learning With Internet-Based Project : A Student-Centered Approach For Engineering Students. *ESP World*, 9(1), 1–12.
- Ahmadian, M. J., & Tavakoli, M. (2011). The effects of simultaneous use of careful online planning and task repetition on accuracy, complexity, and fluency in EFL learners' oral production. *Language Teaching Research*, 15(1), 35–59. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168810383329>
- Anil, B. (2016a). A study on developing speaking skills through techno-driven tasks. *Brazilian English Language Teaching Journal*, 7(1), 80–93.
- Anil, B. (2016b). Top-Up Students Second Language Talk Time through Vlogs. *Indonesian Journal of EFL and Linguistics*, 1(2), 129–143. <https://doi.org/10.21462/ijefll.v1i2.9>
- Azar, A. S., & Nasiri, H. (2014). Learners' Attitudes toward the Effectiveness of Mobile Assisted Language Learning (MALL) in L2 Listening Comprehension. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 98, 1836–1843. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.03.613>

- Balakrishnan, V. D., & Puteh, F. (2014). Blending Face-to-Face Communication and Video Blogging in Acquiring Public Speaking Skills. *Journal of Creative Practices in Language Learning and Teaching (CPLT)*, 2(1), 64–72.
- Balakrishnan, V., & Gan, C. L. (2016). Students' learning styles and their effects on the use of social media technology for learning. *Telematics and Informatics*, 33(3), 808–821. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tele.2015.12.004>
- Bygate, M. (1999). Task as context for the framing, reframing and unframing of language. *System*, 27(1), 33–48. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0346-251X\(98\)00048-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0346-251X(98)00048-7)
- Celik, C. (2014). Vlogues sur YouTube : un nouveau genre d'interactions multimodales, 265–280. Retrieved from https://impec.sciencesconf.org/conference/impec/pages/Impec2014_Combe_Celik.pdf
- Chun, D., Smith, B., & Kern, R. (2016). Technology in Language Use, Language Teaching, and Language Learning. *Modern Language Journal*, 100, 64–80. <https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12302>
- Churchill, D. (2009). Educational applications of Web 2.0: Using blogs to support teaching and learning: Original Articles. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 40(1), 179–183. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8535.2008.00865.x>
- Combe, C., & Codreanu, T. (2016). Vlogging: a new channel for language learning and intercultural exchanges. In P. Papadima-Sophocleous, L. Bradley, & S. Thousesney (Eds.), *CALL communities and culture - short papers from EUROCALL 2016* (pp. 119–124). <https://doi.org/10.14705/rpnet.2016.EUROCALL2016.9781908416445>
- Crookes, G. (1989). Planning and interlanguage variation. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 11(4), 367–383. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263100008391>
- Davies, N. F. (1980). Language acquisition, language learning and the school curriculum. *System*, 8(2), 97–102. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0346-251X\(80\)90035-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/0346-251X(80)90035-4)
- De Jong, N. H., Groenhout, R., Schoonen, R., & Hulstijn, J. H. (2015). Second language fluency: Speaking style or proficiency? Correcting measures of second language fluency for first language behavior. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 36(2), 223–243.

<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0142716413000210>

Demouy, V., & Hulme, A. K. (2010). Open Learning : The Journal of Open , Distance and e-Learning On the spot : using mobile devices for listening and speaking practice on a French language programme. *Open Learning*, 25(3), 37–41.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/02680513.2010.511955>

DeWitt, D., Naimie, Z., & Siraj, S. (2013). Technology Applications Used by First Year Undergraduates in a Malaysian Public University. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 103, 937–945. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.10.416>

Ellis, R. (1987). Interlanguage variability in narrative discourse: style shifting in the use of the past tense. *St*, 9, 12–20.

Foster, P., & Skehan, P. (1996). The influence of planning and task type on second language performance. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 18(3), 299–323.

<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263100015047>

Foster, P., Tonkyn, A., & Wigglesworth, G. (2000). Measuring spoken language: A unit for all reasons. *Applied Linguistics*, 21(3), 354–375. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/21.3.354>

Gass, S., Mackey, A., Alvarez-Torres, M. J., & Fernández-García, M. (1999). The Effects of Task Repetition on Linguistic Output. *Language Learning*, 49(4), 549–581.

<https://doi.org/10.1111/0023-8333.00102>

Gonzalez-Acevedo, N. (2016). Technology-enhanced-gadgets in the Teaching of English as a Foreign Language to Very Young Learners. Ideas on Implementation. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 232(April), 507–513.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2016.10.070>

Grgurović, M., Chapelle, C. A., & Shelley, M. C. (2013). A meta-analysis of effectiveness studies on computer technology-supported language learning. *ReCALL*, 25(2), 165–198.

<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0958344013000013>

Gündüz, N. (2005). Computer Assisted Language Learning. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 1(2), 193–214. <https://doi.org/10.17263/jlls.24391>

Hashemi, M., & Aziznezhad, M. (2011). Computer assisted language learning freedom or

- submission to machines? *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 28, 832–835.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2011.11.152>
- Hulstijn, J. H., & Hulstijn, W. (1984). Grammatical Errors As a Function of Processing Constraints and Explicit Knowledge. *Language Learning*, 34(1), 23–43.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-1770.1984.tb00994.x>
- Hung, S. T. (2011). Pedagogical applications of Vlogs: An investigation into ESP learners perceptions. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 42(5), 736–746.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8535.2010.01086.x>
- James, R. (1996). CALL And The Speaking Skill. *System*, 24(1), 15–21.
[https://doi.org/10.1016/0346-251X\(95\)00050-T](https://doi.org/10.1016/0346-251X(95)00050-T)
- Johnson, M. D. (2017). Cognitive task complexity and L2 written syntactic complexity, accuracy, lexical complexity, and fluency: A research synthesis and meta-analysis. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 37(August 2016), 13–38.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2017.06.001>
- Kramersch, C. (2014). Teaching foreign languages in an era of globalization: Introduction. *Modern Language Journal*, 98(1), 296–311. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2014.12057.x>
- Lynch, T., & Maclean, J. (2003). *Effects of Feedback on Performance: A Study of Advanced Learners on an ESP Speaking Course*. *Edinburgh Working Papers in Applied Linguistics*. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/62227676?accountid=12528> LA - English
- Mackey, A. (2007). Feedback in Child ESL Classrooms. *Tesol Quarterly*, 41(2), 285–312.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1545-7249.2007.tb00060.x>
- Mehnert, U. (1998). The Effects of Different Lengths of Time For Planning On Second Language Performance. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 20(1), 83–108.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263198001041>
- Moradi, Z., & Talebi, S. H. (2014). The Effect of Pre-speaking Strategies Instruction in Strategic Planning on Iranian EFL Students' Awareness as well as Students' Fluency and

- Lexical Resources in Speaking. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 98, 1224–1231. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.03.537>
- Ortega, L. (1999). Planning and Focus on Form in L2 Oral Performance. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 21(01), 109–148. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263199001047>
- Ortega, L. (2009). *Understanding Second Language Acquisition*. London: Hodder.
- Oz, H., Demirezen, M., & Pourfeiz, J. (2015). Digital Device Ownership, Computer Literacy, And Attitudes Toward Foreign And Computer-Assisted Language Learning. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 186, 359–366. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.04.028>
- Parmaxi, A., Zaphiris, P., & Ioannou, A. (2016). Enacting artifact-based activities for social technologies in language learning using a design-based research approach. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 63, 556–567. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2016.05.072>
- Révész, A. (2011). Task Complexity, Focus on L2 Constructions, and Individual Differences: A Classroom-Based Study. *Modern Language Journal*, 95, 162–181. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2011.01241.x>
- Rossiter, M. J., Derwing, T. M., Manimtim, L. G., & Thomson, R. I. (2010). Oral Fluency: The Neglected Component in the Communicative Language Classroom. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 66(4), 583–606. <https://doi.org/10.3138/cmlr.66.4.583>
- Ru-Chu Shih, V. (2010). Blended learning using video-based blogs: Public speaking for English as a second language students. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, 26(6), 883–897. <https://doi.org/10.14742/ajet.1048>
- Said, E. (2014). Covering Islam. *Muscle & Nerve*, 49, iii–iv. <https://doi.org/10.1002/mus.24009>
- Salaberry, M. R. (2001). The use of technology for second language learning and teaching: A retrospective. *Modern Language Journal*, 85(1), 39–56. <https://doi.org/10.1111/0026-7902.00096>
- Skehan, P. (2003). Review article Task-based instruction. *Language And Technology*, 36, 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S026144480200188X>

- Skehan, P., & Foster, P. (1997). Task type and task processing conditions as influences on foreign language performance. *Language Teaching Research*, 1(3), 185–211.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/136216889700100302>
- Smith, D., & Maté, N. (2010). Personalizing the abstract with online video watching a documentar. *Canadian Education Assosiation*, 46(2), 50–52.
- Stickler, U., & Shi, L. (2016). TELL us about CALL: An introduction to the Virtual Special Issue (VSI) on the development of technology enhanced and computer assisted language learning published in the System Journal. *System*, 56, 119–126.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2015.12.004>
- Sung, Y. T., Chang, K. E., & Liu, T. C. (2016). The effects of integrating mobile devices with teaching and learning on students' learning performance: A meta-analysis and research synthesis. *Computers and Education*, 94(11), 252–275.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2015.11.008>
- Sung, Y. T., Chang, K. E., & Yang, J. M. (2015). How effective are mobile devices for language learning? A meta-analysis. *Educational Research Review*, 16, 68–84.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2015.09.001>
- Tal, M., & Yelenevskaya, M. (2012). Computer-assisted Language Learning: Challenges in Teaching Multilingual and Multicultural Student Populations. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 47(Graham 2006), 263–268.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.06.649>
- Tarighat, S., & Khodabakhsh, S. (2016). Mobile-Assisted Language Assessment: Assessing speaking. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 64, 409–413.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2016.07.014>
- Thomson, D. L. (2010). Beyond The Classroom Walls: Teachers' and Students' Perspectives on How Online Learning Can Meet the Needs of Gifted Students. *Journal of Advanced Academics*, 21(4), 662–712.
- Watkins, J., & Wilkins, M. (2011). Using YouTube in the EFL Classroom. *Language Education in Asia*, 2(1), 113–119.
https://doi.org/10.5746/LEiA/11/V2/I1/A09/Watkins_Wilkins

Yuan, F., & Ellis, R. (2003). The Effects of Pre-Task Planning and On-Line Planning on Fluency, Complexity and Accuracy in L2 Monologic Oral Production. *Applied Linguistics*, 24(1), 1–27+372+374. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/24.1.1>

Zamari, Z. M., Adnan, A. H. M., Idris, S. L., & Yusof, J. (2012). Students' Perception of using Online Language Learning Materials. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 67(November 2011), 611–620. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.11.367>