

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 352 857

FL 800 555

AUTHOR O'Malley, Sharon
TITLE Video Tapestry: An Adult ESL Mini-Research Project.
PUB DATE 5 Mar 92
NOTE 16p.; Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada, March 5, 1992).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement; *Adult Literacy; Audiovisual Aids; Comparative Analysis; Educational Television; *English (Second Language); Language Research; Language Teachers; Teaching Methods; *Videotape Recordings
IDENTIFIERS Video Technology

ABSTRACT

A 3-year statewide English-as-a-Second Language (ESL) video learning mini-research project focused on three main areas of televised and video-based instruction in Texas: literacy, adult general education, and ESL. The project described in this paper is a subset of the statewide study and concentrates on the impact of video-based learning when used for language input on language learning and student performance. The affective goal was to explore teacher and student attitudes toward video utilization in the classroom. A total of 175 students from varied adult education programs participated in the study, which used the program "In English" over a 12-week period. The following observations were made: students who received video instruction scored better on post-tests than those who did not; the more time spent on instruction, the better the students performed; student level at the onset made no difference; and "In English" is easy to use and integrates well into a classroom setting. Limitations of the research include the absence of randomly selected students and no control over the amount of time spent. Tests, forms, and checklists are appended. (LB) (Adjunct ERIC Clearinghouse on Literacy Education)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED352857

Video Tapestry: An adult ESL mini-research Project

Presented by: Sharon O'Malley
ESL Adult Education Specialist
Region IV Education Service Center
7145 West Tidwell
Houston, TX 77092
713-744-8120

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sharon
O'malley

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

FL 800555
TEACHERS OF ENGLISH TO SPEAKERS OF OTHER LANGUAGES
CONFERENCE
VANCOUVER, MARCH 5, 1992

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality

☐ Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official
OERI position or policy

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Introduction

During the 1990 school year an ESL video learning mini-research project was conducted with the cooperation of the Texas Education Agency, Pasadena I.S.D., Video Language Products and the Region IV Education Service Center. This study came about as a result of a previous investigation conducted during a statewide project at Region IV ESC. The Adult Education Programs Division of the Texas Education Agency implemented a three year research study entitled "Applications of Television Instruction to Adult Education." This study focused on three main areas of televised and video-based instruction: literacy, adult general education and ESL.

Reason For The Study

Recent years have seen an increasing volume of literature about video utilization and language teaching, but there has been little research into the suitability and effectiveness of the medium for this purpose. The need to explore the impact of video based learning when used for language input, specifically aural and visual, on language learning and student performance provided the impetus for this field based research. Affectively, we desired to explore teacher and student attitudes toward video utilization in the classroom. Because the project is a subset of the three year statewide study, this facilitated our reasons.

Design

A modified experimental/control group was used as the basis of the study. The experimental group used the video based instruction, and lessons from the video based curriculum, "In English". The control group used the workbook that accompanies the video materials, however they did not use the video at all.

A Pre and post test was developed by the author, Richard Bourell for the purpose of measuring progress. The test was a listening comprehension and speaking test administered to one student at a time. The teacher asked the question when the videotape froze. They were awarded one point for demonstration of understanding and one for complete sentences. There were a total of twenty eight questions with the highest possible score being 56. (See Appendix A)

The teachers who participated in the study also were pre and post tested regarding their attitudes toward video utilization to measure any possible effect it may have had. (See Appendix B)

A two hour inservice on the use of the series was provided to all teachers participating in the project by the author on April 9 and 10, 1990. The inservice was videotaped for those teachers who wished to participate but were unable to attend.

There were 11 experimental sites in which 15 teachers and 145 students participated. There were 3 control group sites in which 3 teachers and 30 students participated. Teachers did not use the video as their sole means of instruction, but used the video and its accompanying materials for a period of approximately 45 minutes. The materials were used from April 15 to June 15, 1990. During this time classroom observations were made by Sharon O'Malley, Dr. Mitchell Hall and Linda Blount. A checklist was used to record observations made and there was also an additional section to record comments. (See Appendix C)

Implementation

The inservice training was provided to 35 teachers. The pre test was administered to all 175 students. The students came from varied adult education programs in the state of Texas, ranging from institutions such as the Texas State Department of Corrections to adult education programs in community colleges and adult learning centers. The range of adult ESL students who participated in this mini-project are just as varied in their backgrounds and levels of English proficiency. The post test was administered 12 weeks later. Data was collected and analyzed.

Results

TABLE 1

Tabulation of Pre/Post for Student Average Scores

<u>Experimental Sites</u>	<u># of Students</u>	<u>Pre</u>	<u>Post</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Ferguson Unit (TDC)	27	15.7	37.1	+ 21.4
Wynne Unit (TDC)	20	9.7	26.1	+ 16.4
Stafford Day	53	30.5	37.0	+ 6.5
Brazosport College	25	17.52	26.6	+ 9.12
George Memorial Library	7	15.14	22.14	+ 7.00
Pasadena Independent	13	6.8	21.92	+15.12
<u>Control Sites</u>				
Lamar High School	12	18.58	26.25	+ 7.67
Stafford Night	6	29.42	35.0	+ 5.58

TABLE 2

Attitudinal Teacher Survey (Appendix B)

Item No.	Difference
1	+.14
2	+.2
3	+.2
4	+.17
5	+.31
6	+.17
7	+.2
8	+.2
9	+.2
10	+.2

Conclusions

Although no statistical information can be established, some observational and descriptive information are apparent:

- (1) Those who received video instruction scored better than those who did not receive video.
- (2) The more time spent on instruction, the better they did.
- (3) In English is easy to use and integrates well into a classroom setting.
- (4) Student level at the beginning made no difference.
- (5) Video learning impacts the environment.

Limitations

- (1) We did not use randomly selected students or teachers: therefore we can not use standard statistical analysis.
- (2) There was no control over the amount of time spent.

Suggestions for Further Research

- (1) Preparation for use/training, does it make a difference?
- (2) Follow up study using better design and control.
- (3) How much preparation time can a person save in comparison to a traditional approach?

LISTENING COMPREHENSION & SPEAKING

PRE & POST TEST INSTRUCTIONS

This test is designed to be administered to one student at a time for the purpose of measuring progress. The running time for the videotape test is 12 minutes.

Ask the questions in order (1-28) when the videotape "freezes". (Disregard any numbers you may see on the screen. They do not correspond to the test question numbers.) Ask each question once, in a natural tone and speed. Do not stop the videotape. There is sufficient time for the student to answer the question.

Ask the student to answer using "complete" sentences. If the student answers the question correctly even with a short answer, put a "1" on the line beneath "Understanding." If not, put a "0" on the line. If the student answers with a "complete" sentence (correct grammar), put a "1" on the line beneath "Complete Sentence." If not, put a "0" on the appropriate line.

Note: If students fail to understand 3 consecutive questions, stop the tape. There is no reason for these students to be put through the entire test.

After the student completes the test, add up the score. Total possible points is 58.

Listening Comprehension & Speaking Pre-Test

Name: _____

Date: _____

	<u>Understanding</u>	<u>Complete Sentence</u>
1. Where is the woman?	_____	_____
2. Where is the car?	_____	_____
3. What is in the center of the garden?	_____	_____
4. Is he a cashier?	_____	_____
5. What is he?	_____	_____
6. Where is the bus?	_____	_____
7. What color are the woman's shoes?	_____	_____
8. Is it a nice day at the Music Center?	_____	_____
9. What is near the Music Center?	_____	_____
10. Does this group play Japanese music?	_____	_____
11. Who has a good time at the festival?	_____	_____
12. What are the people doing next to the fountain?	_____	_____
13. Is she listening to the fountain?	_____	_____
14. What is she doing?	_____	_____
15. What is he eating?	_____	_____
16. What does the man behind the counter do?	_____	_____
17. What is he doing?	_____	_____
18. What does this man do?	_____	_____
19. What is he taking out of the sack?	_____	_____
20. Where does the Western Canyon Road go?	_____	_____
21. Where is Mulholland Drive?	_____	_____
22. When is Mulholland Drive pretty?	_____	_____
23. Can you always see downtown L.A. from Mulholland?	_____	_____

Page Two

	<u>Understanding</u>	<u>Complete Sentence</u>
24. Where can you eat in this area?	_____	_____
25. Why should you explore Westwood on foot?	_____	_____
26. How long has this theater been here?	_____	_____
27. What does "Topanga" mean?	_____	_____
28. Where do the Santa Monica Mountains begin and end?	_____	_____

(Page 2)

Copyright Richard Bourell, 1990

Listening Comprehension & Speaking Post Test

Name: _____
Date: _____

	<u>Understanding</u>	<u>Complete Sentence</u>
1. Where is the girl?	_____	_____
2. Is the car next to a water fountain?	_____	_____
3. Where is the fountain?	_____	_____
4. Is he a student?	_____	_____
5. What is he?	_____	_____
6. Is the bus next to an apartment building?	_____	_____
7. Where is the woman with white shoes?	_____	_____
8. Is it a beautiful day at the Music Center?	_____	_____
9. Are there many old buildings near the Music Center?	_____	_____
10. What kind of music does the group play?	_____	_____
11. Do people have a good time or a bad time at the festival?	_____	_____
12. Are people playing near the fountain?	_____	_____
13. What is she listening to?	_____	_____
14. Who is she talking to?	_____	_____
15. What is he doing?	_____	_____
16. What does he sell?	_____	_____
17. Who is he weighing the meat for?	_____	_____
18. What is this man selling?	_____	_____
19. What is he doing now?	_____	_____
20. How long is the Western Canyon Road?	_____	_____

Page Two

	<u>Understanding</u>	<u>Complete Sentence</u>
21. What is a part of the Santa Monica Mountains?	_____	_____
22. What comes out along Mulholland Drive in the spring?	_____	_____
23. What can you see today from Mulholland?	_____	_____
24. Where can you eat most quickly here?	_____	_____
25. To see Westwood, should you drive or walk through it?	_____	_____
26. Where is the movie theater capital in L.A.?	_____	_____
27. What happens to some of the streams in the Santa Monica Mountains during the summer?	_____	_____
28. How close are the Santa Monica Mountains to L.A.?	_____	_____

(Page 2)

DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

DIRECTIONS: Please respond by using the scale stated below each category:

___AGE: 20-29 30-39 40-49 50-59 60+
 1 2 3 4 5

___SEX: F M
 1 2

(1) YEARS EXPERIENCE IN TEACHING ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE (ESL)

___ LESS THAN 2 2-5 6-9 10-14 15+
 1 2 3 4 5

(2) YEARS EXPERIENCE IN TEACHING

___ LESS THAN 2 2-5 6-9 10-14 15+
 1 2 3 4 5

(3) YEARS EXPERIENCE IN TEACHING ADULTS

LESS THAN 2 2-5 6-9 10-14 15+
 1 2 3 4 5

___ HIGH SCHOOL + 1
 BACHELORS 2
 MASTERS 3
 MASTERS + 4
 DOCTORATE 5

LOCATION OF CLASSROOM:

___ RURAL 1
 URBAN 2
 SUBURBAN 3
 INSTITUTIONALIZED 4
 OTHER 5

Please respond to the following questions by using the scale provided below:

STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	NO OPINION	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE
5	4	3	2	1

_____ (1) Using video based instruction in the ESL classroom is an effective instructional tool.

_____ (2) Using video based instruction in the ESL classroom is an active student activity.

_____ (3) Using video based instruction in the ESL classroom is easy.

_____ (4) Using video based instruction in the ESL classroom engages more learners.

_____ (5) Using video based instruction in the ESL classroom requires less teacher preparation time than non-video based instruction.

_____ (6) Using video based instruction in the ESL classroom demonstrates language concepts more concretely to the student.

_____ (7) Using video based instruction in the ESL classroom allows the teacher time to individualize instruction.

_____ (8) Using video based instruction in the ESL classroom integrates repetition and reinforcement in each lesson.

_____ (9) Using video based instruction in the ESL classroom facilitates teaching and makes it more enjoyable.

_____ (10) Using video based instruction in the ESL classroom will be a significant part of my instructional strategies in the future.

Appendix C

CHECKLIST FOR ADULT ESL CLASSROOMS PARTICIPATING IN THE "IN-ENGLISH" SPECIAL MINI PROJECT

Directions: Place appropriate scaled number indicating level of application in the space provided in front of each statement. Use the scale as outlined below.

Scale :	1	2	3	4	5
	least		moderate		highest

- _____ 1. Students (85%) are actively engaged in video lesson responses.
- _____ 2. Teacher(s) is actively engaging students in video lesson.
- _____ 3. Students (85%) are not passively watching video.
- _____ 4. Teacher(s) is coordinating additional instructional materials in the video lesson other than "In English" materials.
- _____ 5. Attendance is maintained throughout the instructional class time that video is being implemented.
- _____ 6. Teacher(s) encourages discussion from topics/vocabulary introduced in video lesson.
- _____ 7. Students (85%) exhibit positive reaction to utilization of video in classroom instruction.
- _____ 8. Students (85%) respond in workbooks or on other written lessons in direct correlation to video lesson utilized in classroom.
- _____ 9. Teacher(s) positively presents video lesson.
- _____ 10. Student's (85%) positively participate in video lesson.
- _____ 11. Students are engaged in video or video-related activity more than 50% of classtime.

- _____ 12. Classroom facility is adequately set-up for video utilization without waste of instructional time.
- _____ 13. Video monitor is of adequate size for all to observe easily.
- _____ 14. Class size is manageable size for video utilization.

Directions: Check applicable statement listed below. Check only one of the two statements.

- _____ 15a. Class levels of proficiency in English are grouped by closely related levels of proficiency.
- _____ 15b. Class levels of proficiency in English are grouped in multi-levels, not by closely related levels of proficiency.

Additional observations and information:

Project Site: _____

Teacher(s): _____

Number of students: _____

Date of observation: _____

NOTES

3/5/92