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ABSTRACT
The main aim of this study is to examine the impact of applying YouTube to promote students’ performance in speaking skill in Kufrah secondary schools. The nature of this problem guided to choose the quasi-experimental research as a research design for this study. To conduct the experiment, the writer chose AL Ahfad Al Mokhtar School as the target population. The writer randomly selected 50 students from the study area. The oral test was the instrument of this study. The study adopts descriptive analytical method to analyse the collected data. The hypotheses were tested by using the t-test. From the analysis of the data, the results proved that, the performance of students taught using YouTube was significantly higher than that of those taught traditional method. Based on the results, recommendations were made on the need to apply YouTube Videos in EFL teaching and learning in various learning institutions in Libya. Finally, the study suggests that YouTube can promote students’ performance in speaking skill.
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1. Introduction
English language has been taught in Libya since primary school. They studied Listening, Speaking, Writing and Reading. The skills were taught in different strategies. Ideally the students could be accustomed to speaking English language, but in fact, only a few of them were able to communicate in English. It sounds that EFL students were unmotivated in learning English. They faced difficulties in speaking the language. This may be English is not part of their daily social life and the EFL teachers do not use English as medium of instruction. Finally, these things influence students’ performance and achievement. However, the application of YouTube helps to fulfill the lack of target languages environment. Therefore, this paper points out that the application of YouTube is the way to promote students’ performance in speaking skill.

1.1 The Statement of the Problem
Using YouTube in language teaching is not a new perception, the application of YouTube as an instrument for language teaching is a new field of study and little writings has been published concerning the subject. In Libyan schools, the application of YouTube in EFL education is almost rare. Articles related to the application of YouTube in language teaching are lacking. This might be attributed to the fact that some traditional teachers might find it unnecessary to apply YouTube to achieve the objective of teaching a language. Prensky (2001, p.2) described them as "Our digital immigrant instructors, who speak an outdated language, are struggling to teach a population that speaks an entirely new language". Today’s students are speaking the language of the Internet and the technology which makes a gap between them and their teachers. Moreover, of all four English language skills, speaking skill is often neglected and students feel more disappointed with the out-dated method.

1.2 Questions of the Study
The question of this study is as follow:
Can YouTube promote EFL students’ performance in speaking skill of the experimental group compared to those of the control group in Kufrah secondary schools?

1.3 The objective of the Study
The goal of this paper is to examine the impact of applying YouTube to promote students’ performance in speaking skill in Kufrah secondary schools.

1.4 Hypotheses of the Study
There is no an impact of applying YouTube to promote students’ performance in speaking skill in Kufrah secondary schools.

1.5 The Importance of the Study
This study will be beneficial contribution to both EFL teachers and students to develop their performance in speaking skill by applying YouTube and hopefully become useful information. YouTube could be applied as model on promoting students’ performance in speaking skill and it might guide, held and encourage EFL students to communicate in English.

2. Literature Review
2.1 The definition of Speaking Skill
According to Oxford Advanced Dictionary, speaking means to express or communicate opinions, feelings, ideas, etc., by or as talking and it involves the activities in the part of the speaker as psychological (articulator) and physical (acoustic) stage”. According to Bygate (1987) defined “speaking as the production of auditory signals to produce different verbal responses in listeners. It is regarded as combining sounds systematically to form meaningful sentences”. Eckard and Kearny (1981), Florez (1999), Howarth (2001), and Abd El Fattah Torky (2006) defined “speaking as a two–way process including a true communication of opinions, information, or emotions. This top-down view of spoken texts is a collaboration between two or more people in the shared time and the shared context”. “From our study speaking skill is considered as the heart of communication; people speak in order to express all what is in their minds and convey their thoughts”.

2.2 Elements of speaking
Learners need to master some essential basics for their oral production, in order to speak the language confidently and fluently. Harmer (2001) suggests two basic elements: “language features that learners should have knowledge about and the language mental/social process”.

2.3 Process of speaking
Speaking is an active process which is important for all stages of education. Thornbury (2005) assume that “the nature of the speaking process is followed by the teaching of grammar and vocabulary, with a bit of pronunciation thrown in. He indicates that speaking is a complex skill that needs a real practice to be improved because it is more than just a communicative ability”.

2.4 The Importance of Speaking
Richards and Rodgers (2001) mention that “reading and writing are the essential skills to be focused on however, little or no attention is paid to the skill of speaking and listening. In the communicative approach, speaking was given more importance since oral communication involves speech where learners are expected to interact verbally with other people. Furthermore, teachers’ talk will be reduced; this means that learners are supported to speak more in the classroom”. (Ur, 2000, p.12) also declares: “of all four language skills called listening, speaking, reading and writing, speaking is the most important one is very necessary for effective communication”.

2.5 Characteristics of Speaking Skill
According to Mazouzi (2013), “learners’ activities should be designed based on an equivalence between fluency and accuracy achievement. Both fluency and accuracy are important elements of communicative approach. Classroom practice can help learners develop their communicative competence. So they should know how the language system works appropriately”.

“The first characteristic of speaking performance is fluency and it is the main aim of teachers in teaching speaking skill”. According to Hughes (2002), “fluency is the learners’ ability to speak in understandable way in order not to break down communication because listeners may lose their interest”. Hedge (2000) expressed that “fluency is the ability to answer coherently by connecting the words and phrases, pronouncing the sounds clearly, and using stress and intonation”.
“The second characteristic of speaking performance is accuracy. Learners should be fluent in learning a foreign language. Therefore, teachers should emphasize accuracy in their teaching process. Learners should pay enough attention to the exactness and the completeness of language form when speaking such as focusing on grammatical structures, vocabulary, and pronunciation” (Mazouzi, 2013).

2.6 Speaking difficulties in Foreign Language Learning
Speaking skill is considered as essential parts in EFL teaching and learning. EFL teachers’ main goal is to enhance their students’ communicative proficiency since the majority of their learners find difficulties in practicing speaking. Parrott (1993) asserts that “teachers must perform tasks that aim to provide learners with the confidence in order to speak English effectively”. Alam (2016) also states that “students’ failure to speak or not getting any opportunity to speak in the language classroom may create disinclination and de-motivation in learning” (p. 28). Students’ success can be measured when they have the ability to speak without hesitations or too much pauses. Because knowing the target language is not the same thing as practicing it. Ur (2000) mention that “there are four main problems in getting students speaks English in the classroom which are: inhibition, nothing to say, low or uneven participation, and mother-tongue use”.

2.7 Literature Review Related to YouTube Videos
There are plenty of researches that have been carried out in the area of application of technology in EFL teaching and learning. Hismanoglu (2012) pointed out that “bringing technology in the classroom helps both teachers and learners to create good learning environment in order to enhance the teaching and learning processes”. Whitlaus and Neff (2006) confirmed that “teachers can use videos as a Web-based mode of teaching and gave students the opportunity to use videos for self-learning”. More importantly, a lot of researchers have tried to highlight the big role of YouTube for teaching and learning in EFL classrooms. Duffy (2008) confirms that “YouTube is being increasingly used by teachers to teach English language as it offers fun and fast access to instruction, culture-based videos, and languages from all over the world “. Moreover, Alhamami (2013) explores “the use of YouTube LLVs as complete language lessons that do not require supplementary language materials”.  

2.8 Advantages of YouTube and Its Applicability to Teaching
The application of YouTube in EFL classroom can have many advantages for both teachers and learners. They are presented as follows:

2.8.1 Seeing language in use.
The first advantage of videos in EFL classroom is that they help learners see and listen to language in its real context. To illustrate, Alimemaj (2010) argues that “videos provide an authentic language used by native speakers, as well as all language genres (songs, debates, talks, poems...). With this, it seems to be the best way for learning vocabulary that is important for the development of one oral fluency “. In addition, Burt (1999) states that: “videos present real language that is not simplified and is spoken at a normal speed with genuine accent” (p. 2). By this way, EFL students should know how to respond to their conversational difficulties by getting used to hearing what native speakers use in their daily lives.

2.8.2 Cross cultural awareness.
In addition to seeing language in use, videos can also develop EFL students’ cultural awareness of the target language. This can be confirmed by Stempleski (1987) who says that: “through videos, students can see how people in the target culture live, their values, customs, clothing, food and how people in that culture interact with one another” (p. 6). By this way, learners will have a basic knowledge of the language studied which is important to be fluent and in context when speaking.

2.8.3 Raising discussion
Furthermore, videos can be used as means for raising discussion in the EFL class. As stated by Stempleski (1987): “videos can work as a springboard for discussion”. This is really our aim in this study and we mean to promote students’ performance in speaking skill through debates and discussions related to the video actually watched during the pilot procedure. As well, Burt (1999) states that “videos from YouTube help the students comment and ask questions about the video” (cited in Al-zyoud & Kabilan, 2012).

2.8.4 Motivation
Moreover, watching videos can motivate learners to be engaged in different tasks. Yassaei (2012), states that “videos can be effective tools for breaking up the routine and incline the students to study the English language. In doing so, learners will become fluent speakers and autonomous”. As well, Joint Information Systems Committee (2002), report that “videos are appealing materials that evoke students’ emotional reactions and raise their motivation” (cited in Hartsell & Yuen, 2006).
Thus, videos in EFL classes are detected by these researchers to create a fun and stimulating atmosphere that can help learners not only contribute to discussions in class but can be motivated to attend EFL classes as teaching and learning environment become more prominent and safer.

3. Methodology
3.1 Method of the Study
The study adopts descriptive analytical method to analyse the collected data. The hypotheses were tested by using the t-test.

3.2 The Design of the Study
The methodology of the current study is quantitative since data is explained in numerical results. The format used of this study is a quasi-experimental design that integrates a pre- and post-test for both groups. This design was chosen in order to examine the impact of YouTube on speaking skill. It contains both groups the experimental group and the control group. Two groups were randomly selected; one group taught through using YouTube videos to represent the experimental group while the other group received a traditional method of instruction to represent the control group.

3.3 Population and Sample of the Study
The population of this study is from secondary schools’ students who study at Al Ahfad Al Mokhtar secondary school in the Region of Kufrah. The writer chose a random sample from the population of study composed of (50) students.

The participants of this study comprised of 50 students allocated in two classes with no random assignment of subjects as the students were assigned by the school. Both classes were randomly assigned into two sections. One section was selected as the experimental group, consisting of 25 students. While the other section selected to be the control group consisting of 25 students. Before starting the experiment, both groups were given a speaking skill pre-test. Both groups received the same test to examine their equal level of proficiency. The two groups' speaking results were measured using the post-test and the outcomes of the two tests were analysed.

3.4 Instrument of Data Collect
3.4.1 Oral Test
The teacher-researcher-made achievement test, was the measurement instrument. The aim, before the intervention was to prove that teachers on the field concentrate on written and reading text as a form of enhancing speaking skill in Libya. The second goal was to prove that, the ability to speak is tied to the application of YouTube. It was with this in mind, that the achievement test was designed; to prove or disprove the research hypotheses. The achievement test was divided the points into six criterions, namely pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary, fluency, comprehension and task.

3.4.2 The Tests
Data was collected through tests as a tool of the study. The tests were planned by the writer.

3.4.3 The Pre-test
The tools were a pre-test and a post-test. Both tests aim at assessing the students’ speaking outcomes. The pre-test was designed by the writer. It was given to both groups experimental and control group before starting the treatment. This was done to be as a standard to be compared with the results of the post-test. Both tests were the same test – the outcomes were the final results.

3.4.4 The post-test
A post-test was given to both groups. It has the same design as the pre-test, and again, all the students were given the same amount of time and instructions to complete the test.
4. Data Analysis and Discussion
Discussion of the Outputs and Testing Procedure
- Data of Experimental Group

Table 1: The students’ scores of Pre-test and Post-test of Experimental Group are as follows:

| Students | Pre-test points | Post-test points | Earned |
|----------|----------------|-----------------|--------|
| 1.       | 46             | 63              | 17     |
| 2.       | 63             | 70              | 7      |
| 3.       | 43             | 66              | 23     |
| 4.       | 74             | 80              | 7      |
| 5.       | 56             | 63              | 7      |
| 6.       | 60             | 73              | 13     |
| 7.       | 63             | 76              | 13     |
| 8.       | 53             | 70              | 17     |
| 9.       | 63             | 66              | 3      |
| 10.      | 56             | 70              | 14     |
| 11.      | 56             | 73              | 17     |
| 12.      | 50             | 70              | 20     |
| 13.      | 56             | 63              | 7      |
| 14.      | 56             | 76              | 20     |
| 15.      | 39             | 63              | 23     |
| 16.      | 50             | 70              | 20     |
| 17.      | 50             | 73              | 23     |
| 18.      | 56             | 80              | 24     |
| 19.      | 50             | 73              | 23     |
| 20.      | 56             | 73              | 17     |
| 21.      | 56             | 73              | 17     |
| 22.      | 53             | 63              | 10     |
| 23.      | 53             | 66              | 13     |
| 24.      | 50             | 63              | 13     |
| 25.      | 50             | 63              | 13     |
| Σ        | 1358           | 1739            | 381    |

\[
M = 54.32 \quad M = 69.56
\]
The above table clarifies or shows that the highest scores of students of experimental group in the pre – test is 74 and the lowest is 39 and the average score is 54.32. while the average of the post-test is 69.56. The total score earn in this group are 381. It can be seen from the results that there is a significant difference between the pre-test and post-test.

- Data of Controlled Group

Table 2: The students’ scores of Pre-test and Post-test of Controlled Group are as follows:

| Students | Pre-test points | Post-test points | Gained |
|----------|----------------|------------------|--------|
| 1.       | 56             | 63               | 7      |
| 2.       | 56             | 56               | 0      |
| 3.       | 50             | 56               | 6      |
| 4.       | 46             | 56               | 10     |
| 5.       | 46             | 53               | 7      |
| 6.       | 66             | 70               | 4      |
| 7.       | 56             | 66               | 10     |
| 8.       | 76             | 80               | 4      |
| 9.       | 56             | 60               | 4      |
| 10.      | 60             | 63               | 3      |
| 11.      | 53             | 63               | 10     |
| 12.      | 53             | 56               | 3      |
| 13.      | 53             | 60               | 7      |
| 14.      | 46             | 66               | 20     |
| 15.      | 46             | 56               | 10     |
| 16.      | 50             | 60               | 10     |
| 17.      | 43             | 53               | 10     |
| 18.      | 53             | 60               | 7      |
| 19.      | 60             | 63               | 3      |
| 20.      | 50             | 63               | 13     |
| 21.      | 50             | 60               | 10     |
| 22.      | 76             | 83               | 7      |
| 23.      | 53             | 60               | 7      |
| 24.      | 53             | 56               | 3      |
| 25.      | 66             | 70               | 4      |
| Σ        | 1373           | 1552             | 179    |

\[ M = 54.92 \quad M = 62.08 \]
The above table shows that the highest scores of students of controlled group in the pre–test is 76 and the lowest is 43 and the average score is 54.92. while the average of the post-test is 62.08. The total score earn in this group are 179. It can be seen from the results that the experiment group is higher scores than the controlled group.

Below we will find the table of findings (Standard Deviation) that shows how the statistical analysis of data rejected the research hypotheses.

**Table 3: Presentation of Standard Deviation of both Groups.**

| Students | X (X) | Y (Y) | X (X-Mx) | Y (Y-My) | X² | Y² |
|----------|-------|-------|----------|----------|----|----|
| 1        | 17    | 7     | 1.5      | -0.38    | 2.24 | 0.14 |
| 2        | 7     | 0     | -8.5     | -7.08    | 72.32 | 50.07 |
| 3        | 23    | 6     | 8.1      | -0.48    | 65.55 | 0.23 |
| 4        | 7     | 10    | -8.5     | 2.92     | 72.32 | 8.55 |
| 5        | 7     | 7     | -8.5     | -0.38    | 72.32 | 0.14 |
| 6        | 13    | 4     | -1.9     | -3.68    | 3.63  | 13.51 |
| 7        | 13    | 10    | -1.9     | 2.92     | 3.63  | 8.55 |
| 8        | 17    | 4     | 1.5      | -3.68    | 2.24  | 13.51 |
| 9        | 3     | 4     | -11.9    | -3.68    | 141.71 | 13.51 |
| 10       | 14    | 3     | -1.8     | -3.78    | 3.25  | 14.26 |
| 11       | 17    | 10    | -1.9     | 2.92     | 3.63  | 8.55 |
| 12       | 20    | 3     | 1.5      | -3.78    | 2.24  | 14.26 |
| 13       | 7     | 7     | -1.9     | -0.38    | 3.63  | 0.14 |
| 14       | 20    | 20    | 4.8      | 12.92    | 23    | 167.03 |
| 15       | 23    | 10    | -8.5     | 2.92     | 72.32 | 8.55 |
| 16       | 20    | 10    | 4.8      | 2.92     | 23    | 8.55 |
| 17       | 23    | 10    | 8.1      | 2.92     | 65.55 | 8.55 |
| 18       | 24    | 7     | 4.8      | -0.38    | 23    | 0.14 |
| 19       | 23    | 3     | 8.1      | -3.78    | 65.55 | 14.26 |
| 20       | 17    | 13    | 8.2      | 6.22     | 67.17 | 38.74 |
| 21       | 17    | 10    | 8.1      | 2.92     | 65.55 | 8.55 |
| 22       | 10    | 7     | 1.5      | -0.38    | 2.24  | 0.14 |
| 23       | 13    | 7     | 1.5      | -0.38    | 2.24  | 0.14 |
| 24       | 13    | 3     | -5.2     | -3.78    | 27.08 | 14.26 |
| 25       | 13    | 4     | -1.9     | -3.68    | 3.63  | 13.51 |
| 381      | 179   | 0.1   | -0.1     | 889.04   | 427.84 |     |

The above table clarifies that; the two groups were unequal in their effectiveness on the students’ performance in speaking skill. According to the statistic calculation of the t-test formula is that, the experimental group which has a higher mean than the controlled group.

**Discussion on Research Findings from Tested Hypotheses**

There was a hypothesis in this study. After doing all the statistical work, we rejected the null hypothesis. Below we will see how the result of the data analysis rejected the null hypothesis and gave us solid inferences.

**Test of Hypotheses**

**The Null Hypothesis**

Here, the hypothesis was; there is no an impact of applying YouTube to promote students’ performance in speaking skill in Kufrah secondary schools.
During the presentation of the treatment for controlled group, we realized that, the students were very familiar with the traditional method. But from the post-test results, they were very weak from their scores. After we finished the work on the data analysis we found that their performance was lower than the experimental group. As such we rejected the null hypothesis.

Discussion on Research Findings
On this point as mentioned above, we compared the performance of the 50 students before the presentation of treatment and that after the treatment. Below we have again re-stated the research hypotheses and discussed the findings from the analysed to see how we can relate these findings to a case in the entire Kufrah secondary schools’ students in particular, and Libya in general.

General Research Hypothesis
This hypothesis supposed that, the performance of students taught using YouTube is significantly higher than that of those taught the traditional method. We chose this study because of the fact that, the situation in Kufrah Secondary Schools as far as the teaching of EFL is concerned is very unattractive, especially in speaking skill. The students’ lack of good speech and communicative competence is not only in Kufrah, but in most Libyan secondary schools. Therefore, the writer had to conduct this study to see how possible it can be to change this picture not only in Kufrah secondary schools, but all over Libya.

From the study findings, we suggest that, YouTube should be introduced in Kufrah/Libyan secondary schools’ curriculum development. If YouTube proved its workability in improving the speaking skill in the 25 randomly selected students, then it could work well with all other students’ performance in speaking skill in Kufrah and other Libyan secondary schools. So, our sampled students (25) form an experimental base for implementing the programme on all Libyan EFL students’ cognitive speaking skill.

5. Conclusion
To sum up, the hypothesis was tested to prove the workability and replicability of the YouTube that were presented during the study. Also, the hypothesis helped us to measure the difference between them to determine the best one. YouTube was the best. This experience can be generalized onto all Kufrah secondary schools, because its workability and replicability in Al Ahfad Al Mokhtar secondary school was visible and undoubted. So, the findings did not only tell us that, YouTube has a positive effect on students’ performance in Al Ahfad Al Mokhtar secondary school, but it also indicated this YouTube can be used in any place and at any time; it can improve students’ speech performance and communicative competence perfectly well.

6. Recommendations
The recommendations of this study are as follows:

1. Libyan Ministry of Education should consider the possibility of using YouTube in the Libyan context.
2. EFL teachers should realize the positive effects of YouTube Videos on themselves and their students.
3. EFL teachers and students should learn about YouTube Videos implementation and application options and how YouTube Videos can be integrated into the Libyan teaching and learning context, through workshops, seminars and enriching curriculum content.
4. EFL students should welcome studying and learning English language through YouTube Videos.
5. EFL Students should be encouraged to use the YouTube Videos to learn outside the classroom and language laboratory.

References
[1] Abd El Fattah Torky, S. (2006). The Effectiveness of a Task- Based Instruction Program in Developing the English Language Speaking Skills of Secondary Stage Students. Ph.D. Dissertation. Curricula and Methods of Teaching Department, Women’s College, Ain Shams University.
[2] Alam, M. (2016). Problems in teaching English speaking skill in large classes or Rural Colleges in Bangladesh. International Journal of Social Sciences, 44(1), 26-38.
[3] Alhamami, M. (2013). Observation of YouTube language learning video (YouTube LLVS). Teaching English with Technology, 13(3), 3-17.
[4] Alimemaj, Z. (2010, May). YouTube Language Learning and Teaching Techniques. The Magazine of Global English Speaking Higher Education, 2 (3), 10-12. Panethnic Limited. Retrieved on January, 2015, from http://www.anglohigher.com/magazines/download_pages/61.
The Impact of Using YouTube Videos to Promote Students’ Performance in Speaking Skill: A Case Study of a School in Libya

[5] Al-zyoud, K., & Kabilan, M. (2012, August 31). The use of YouTube in Teaching English Literature: The Case of Al-majma’ah Community College. International Journal of Linguistics, 4 (4), 525-551. Doi:10.5296/ijl.v4i42930.

[6] Burt, M. (1999). Using Videos with Adult English Language Learners. National Clearinghouse for ESL Literacy Education Washington DC. No: ED 445551, 1-11. Retrieved on October, 2014, from http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED434539.pdf

[7] Bygate, M. (1987). Speaking. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

[8] Duffy, P. (2008). Engaging the YouTube Google-Eyed Generation: Strategies for Using Web 2.0 in Teaching and Learning (pp.173-182).

[9] Eckard, R., & Kearny, M. (1981). Teaching Conversational Skills in ESL. Washington: Center of Applied Linguistics.

[10] Florez, M. A. (1999). Improving Adult English Language Learners’ Speaking Skills. ERIC Digest. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED: 435204)

[11] Harmer, J. (2001). The Practice of English Language Teaching. The 3th Edition. Longman:

[12] Hartsell, T., & Yuen, S. (2006). Video Streaming in Online Learning. AACE Journal, 14 (1), 31-43. Retrieved on January, 2015, from http://www.editlib.org/p/6152/article_6152.pdf

[13] Hedge, T. (2000). Teaching and Learning in the Language Classroom. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

[14] Hismenoglu, M. (2012). The Impact of Globalization and Information Technology on Language Policy in Turkey.

[15] Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 31, 629-633. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2011.12.115

[16] Howarth, P. (2001). Process Speaking. Preparing to Repeat Yourself. MET, 10(1), 39-44.

[17] Hughes, R. (2002). Teaching and Researching Speaking. New York: Pearson Education.

[18] Mazouzi, S. (2013). Analysis of Some Factors Affecting Learners’ Oral Performance. A Case Study: 3rd Year Pupils of Menaa’s Middle Schools. M. A. Dissertation, Department of Foreign Languages, English Division, Faculty of Letters and Languages, Mohamed Khider University of Biskra, People’s Democratic Republic of Algeria.

[19] Parrott, M. (1993). Tasks for language teachers: A resource book for training and development. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

[20] Prensky, M. (2001). Digital natives, digital immigrants. Digital Natives Digital Immigrants, 9(5), 1-6.

[21] Richards, J.C. & Rodgers, T.S. (2001). Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

[22] Stempleski, S. (1987, April). Short Takes: Using Authentic Video in the English Class. Paper Presented at the Annual Meeting of the International Associations of Teachers of English as a Foreign Language, 1-17. Belgium. ED 294453. Retrieved on December, 2014, from http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED294453.pdf

[23] Thornbury, S. (2005). How to Teach Speaking. Harmer, J. (Ed). London: Longman.

[24] Ur, P. (2000). Discussions that work. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

[25] Whithaus, C., & Neff, J. M. (2006). Contact and interactivity: Social constructionist pedagogy in a video-based, management writing course. Technical Communication Quarterly, 15(4), 431-456. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15427625tcq1504_2

[26] Yassaei, S. (2012). Using Original Videos and Sound Effects to Teach English. English Teaching Forum, (1), 12-16. UK. Retrieved on December, 2014, from http://americanenglish.state.gov/files/a/resource_files/50_1_4_yassai.pdf