

**İNGİLİZCE'NİN YABANCI DİL OLARAK ÖĞRETİMİNDE  
KONUŞMA BECERİSİNİN GELİŞİMİNDE  
VİDEOKLİPLER'İN KULLANILMASI**

**USING MUSICVIDEOS IN  
EFL SPEAKING CLASSES**

**Didem AYDINMAKİNA  
(Yüksek Lisans Tezi)  
ESKİŞEHİR, 1997**

**ESKİŞEHİR  
MÜHÜR KÜTÜPHANASI**

T.C.  
ANADOLU UNIVERSITY  
THE INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES °

**USING MUSICVIDEOS IN EFL SPEAKING CLASSES**

by  
Didem AYDINMAKINA

Thesis of Master of Arts  
Advisor: Assoc.Prof.İlknur KEÇİK

ESKİŞEHİR  
January, 1997

ESKİŞEHİR İZMİR KÜLTÜRİNGERİ  
KÜLTÜR KURUMU

## ÖZET

Bu çalışma, İngilizce'yi yabancı dil olarak öğrenen Türk öğrencilerinin, İngilizce Dili Sözlü Anlatım başarılarının, videoklip kullanımıyla artırılıp artırılmayacağını inceleyen bir uygulamadır. Dilde akıcılık, dilbilgisi, sözcük dağarcığı ve konu başarısı kategorilerinden oluşan sözlü anlatım yeterlilik sınavı verilmiştir.

Bu çalışma deneysel bir çalışmadır ve bu çalışma için Anadolu Üniversitesi İletişim Bilimleri Fakültesi hazırlık sınıflarında eğitim gören toplam 43 öğrenci uygulamaya katılmıştır. Bu öğrencilerden 22'si Kontrol Grubu'nda, diğer 21 öğrenci ise Deney Grubu'nda yer almıştır. Her iki gruba da 'karşılaştıma' ve 'kabul etme/reddetme' dil işlevleri öğretilmiştir. Deney Grubu'nda bu işlevlerin pekiştirilmesi için yapılan alıştırmalarda videoklipler kullanılmıştır. Kontrol Grubu'nda ise bu pekiştirme resim veya tartışma konuları kullanılarak yapılmıştır. Uygulama öncesi ve uygulama sonrası, öğrencilerin sözlü anlatım başarı durumu, dilde akıcılık, dilbilgisi, sözcük dağarcığı ve konu başarısı kategorilerinden oluşan sözlü anlatım yeterlilik sınavının kullanıldığı ön-test ve son-test ile ölçülmüştür.

Araştıma sonunda Deney ve Kontrol Grupları arasında önemli bir fark ortaya çıkmamıştır. Diğer bir deyişle, videoklip kullanmadan resim ve tartışma konularına tabi tutulan öğrencilerin, videoklip kullanılarak uygulamaya tabi tutulan öğrenciler kadar başarılı olduğu gözlenmiştir.

## ABSTRACT

This study mainly investigates whether there will be an effect on students' speaking improvement when musicvideos are used in speaking classes. A speaking proficiency test, which includes fluency, accuracy, vocabulary and task achievement categories, was used in order to test their proficiency.

This study was an experimental study and it was applied at Anadolu University Communication Sciences Faculty Preparation Program. Totally 43 students from preparatory classes participated in the study. 22 of the students formed the Control Group and 21 students formed the Experimental Group. The Control and the Experimental Group were given 'compare/contrast' and 'agree/disagree' speaking functions. The students in the Experimental Group were exposed to the speaking lessons which musicvideos were used. Musicvideos were used to facilitate the lessons. The students in the Control Group were exposed to pictures and discussion topics to facilitate the speaking lessons instead of musicvideos. Before and after the application, students' proficiencies were tested with the same pre and post-test.

At the end of the study, it was found that there was no significant difference between the Control Group and the Experimental Group. In other words, the students who were not exposed to musicvideos were successful as well as the students who were exposed to musicvideos.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

In the process of conducting this thesis, my gratitude is particularly due to Assoc. Prof. İlknur Keçik, my thesis supervisor, for her endless counsel and for her encouraging support for this thesis. I remain indebted to Prof. Zülal Balpınar, for her guidance, and for allowing me to use the students for my study. I would also like to express my gratitude to my other teachers, Prof. Gül Durmuşoğlu, Asst. Prof. Şeyda Ülsever, Asst. Prof. Hülya Özcan and Asst. Prof. Handan Kopkallı who helped me form this study.

I am also indebted to Assoc. Prof. Embiya Ağaoğlu and Res. Asst. Berna Baloğlu who helped me in statistical calculations.

I owe special thanks to my colleagues Hülya İpek, Funda Gerçek, Özlem Ersöz, Rengin Özarı for taking part in the interviews during the pre-test and the post-test. Also, special thanks to my students who eagerly participated in this study.

Finally, I must express my thanks to my family for the patience and understanding they have shown me through the whole period during which the study was being completed. Also I would like to express my deepest gratitude to Sabri Ağırman and Fethi Kaba for their support and encouragement.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES.....	ix
<b>CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 Background to the problem.....	1
1.2 Problem.....	4
1.3 Aim and Scope of the Study.....	7
<b>CHAPTER II: REVIEW OF LITERATURE .....</b>	<b>9</b>
2.1 Historical Overview of Speaking Skill in Second Language Teaching..	9
2.2 Using Music and Songs in Language Teaching.....	15
2.3 Using Video in Language Teaching.....	20
2.4 Using Musicvideos in Language Teaching.....	25
<b>CHAPTER III: METHODOLOGY.....</b>	<b>28</b>
3.1 Subjects.....	28
3.2 Materials.....	29
3.3 Procedures.....	30
3.4 Data Collection.....	34
3.5 Data Analysis.....	35

<b>CHAPTER IV: RESULTS .....</b>	<b>37</b>
4.1 Comparison of the Experimental and the Control Groups.....	37
4.1.1 Comparison of Speaking Proficiency of the Experimental and the Control Groups.....	37
4.1.2 Comparison of the Use of Vocabulary of the Experimental and the Control Groups.....	39
4.1.3 Comparison of Accuracy of the Experimental and the the Control Groups.....	40
4.1.4 Comparison of Fluency of the Experimental and the the Control Groups.....	41
4.1.5 Comparison of Task Achievement of the Experimental and the Control Groups.....	43
4.2 Comparison of Results within the Experimental and the Control Groups.....	44
4.2.1 Comparison of Speaking Proficiency within the Experimental Group.....	44
4.2.2 Comparison of Speaking Proficiency within the Control Group.....	45
4.2.3 Comparison of Vocabulary within the Experimental Group.....	46
4.2.4 Comparison of Vocabulary within the Control Group.....	47
4.2.5 Comparison of Accuracy within the Experimental Group.....	48
4.2.6 Comparison of Accuracy within the Control Group.....	49

4.2.7 Comparison of Fluency within the Experimental Group.....	50
4.2.8 Comparison of Fluency within the Control Group.....	51
4.2.9 Comparison of Task Achievement within the Experimental Group.....	52
4.2.10 Comparison of Task Achievement within the Control Group.....	53
4.3 Discussion of the Results.....	54
<b>CHAPTER V: CONCLUSION.....</b>	<b>59</b>
5.1 Conclusion.....	59
5.2 Suggestions for Further Research.....	62
<b>BIBLIOGRAPHY.....</b>	<b>63</b>
<b>APPENDICES</b>	
A. Musicvideo Evaluation Forms for the Experimental Group.....	66
B. Pictures Used in the Control Group.....	67
C. Pre-test and Post-test Interview Topics.....	69
D. Evaluation Forms of the Pre and Post-test.....	70
E. Pre and Post-test Scores of the Experimental and the Control Groups...	72
F. Co-variance Analysis Table Showing the Results of Speaking Proficiency.....	76



G. Co-variance Analysis Table Showing the Results of Vocabulary.....	77
H. Co-variance Analysis Table Showing the Results of Accuracy.....	78
I. Co-variance Analysis Table Showing the Results of Fluency.....	79
J. Co-variance Analysis Table Showing the Results of Task Achievement.....	80

## LIST OF TABLES

TABLES	Page
4.1 The Results of t-test for Independent Samples Showing the Differences Between the Experimental and the Control groups in the Pre-test of Speaking Proficiency.....	38
4.2 The Results of t-test for Independent Samples Showing the Differences Between the Experimental and the Control groups in the Pre-test of Vocabulary.....	39
4.3 The Results of t-test for Independent Samples Showing the Differences Between the Experimental and the Control groups in the Pre-test of Accuracy.....	40
4.4 The Results of t-test for Independent Samples Showing the Differences Between the Experimental and the Control groups in the Pre-test of Fluency.....	42
4.5 The Results of t-test for Independent Samples Showing the Differences Between the Experimental and the Control groups in the Pre-test of Task Achievement.....	43
4.6 t-test for Paired Samples in the Experimental Group of Speaking Proficiency.....	45
4.7 t-test for Paired Samples in the Control Group	

of Speaking Proficiency.....	46
4.8 t-test for Paired Samples in the Experimental Group	
of Vocabulary.....	47
4.9 t-test for Paired Samples in the Control Group of Vocabulary .....	48
4.10 t-test for Paired Samples in the Experimental Group	
of Accuracy.....	49
4.11 t-test for Paired Samples in the Control Group of Accuracy.....	50
4.12 t-test for Paired Samples in the Experimental Group	
of Fluency.....	51
4.13 t-test for Paired Samples in the Control Group of Fluency.....	52
4.14 t-test for Paired Samples in the Experimental Group	
of Task Achievement.....	53
4.15 t-test for Paired Samples in the Control Group	
of Task Achievement.....	54

# CHAPTER I

## INTRODUCTION

### 1.1 Background to the Problem

Today English is the world's most widely studied foreign language and for many years, knowing the importance of English Language Teaching (ELT), language experts have worked on improving new techniques in English Language Teaching, putting emphasis on different skills, at different times. In the beginning of the 19th century, foreign language teaching was based on the study of classical Latin and the techniques that were mainly emphasized during that time were rote learning of grammar rules, translation and writing practice. The textbooks written in those days were not speaking oriented either because speaking the foreign language was not the goal. For this reason, while grammar, reading and translating were emphasized in language teaching, speaking skill was neglected during that time (Richards et al., 1986:1-3).

This negligence in regard to speaking skill faded toward the mid-nineteenth century. In this century, for commerce, religion, and government relations in the Western world, learning another language became vital. In this way, the demand for communication among Europeans led the oral proficiency in foreign languages gain importance. Therefore, with this demand, new approaches to language teaching were developed and emphasis was given on speaking skill by individual

language teaching specialists. For example, 'routines' in speaking was first observed by T.Prendergast. He recorded the observation that children use contextual, situational cues, memorized phrases and 'routines' in speaking. Another specialist was F.Gouin who developed an approach based on his observations of children's use of oral language. His method used situations and themes as way of organizing and presenting oral language (Richards et al., 1986:5). These specialists appreciated the need for speaking proficiency as the goal of foreign language learning. Meanwhile in 1886, teaching speaking skill was advocated by the International Phonetic Association Alphabet. The association claimed that to introduce conversational phrases and idioms in oral language, phonetic training should be facilitated (Richards et al., 1986:7). With the similar goal, other scholars as Vietor and Sweet gave importance to speaking and argued that speech patterns, rather than grammar, were the fundamental elements of language. Although the reformers ideas were inadequate to form a method, their attempts led the oral interaction gain importance. For example, L.Sauveur used oral interaction in the target language and used questions as a way of presenting and eliciting language. In other words, direct and spontaneous use of the foreign language was aimed at by the reformers in the nineteenth century. Although the aim was given on spontaneous use of the language, it wasn't achieved well because, speaking classes began with systematic attention to pronunciation, conversation texts, and dialogues (Richards et al., 1986:7-9). The study of speaking proficiency as a whole was not taken into consideration. The students were exposed to the pronunciation activities and mainly controlled activities in the lessons. For example, language was based on dialogues and most of which were not reflecting real life situations. For this reason, it was

difficult for the students to develop speaking skill and to achieve certain degree of proficiency because they were not exposed to real life situations in their speaking classes. The students were directed to memorize some patterns not giving any chance to creativity.

Besides creativity, for one to speak, there must be a need to speak and the people should feel free to choose what they will say. The above mentioned approaches couldn't reach that goal either because the activities were controlled activities. Also the focus on pronunciation, conversation texts and dialogues prevented students to use the language spontaneously and freely.

Apart from controlled dialogues, structured question and answer activities, some approaches included free talks and discussions in their speaking lessons. However, these do not offer the kind of support that many nonfluent learners need to produce long turns of informative speech on a range of cognitively demanding topics. Namely, having students talk about a general or free topic without any guidance does not give the efficient practice in speaking lessons. Also the activities in the lesson must arouse in the learners a willingness and need to talk by providing the students with something they feel they have a need or reason to talk about. So such activities in those approaches couldn't fulfill this need most of the time. They could not generate a need to speak in students. A more structured approach organized around realistic tasks that lead to specific outcomes in eliciting extended talk could have been used instead. These activities require the learners to participate actively because their attention is on performing a life-like task. The task orientation gives the student a purpose for talking and, in this way, provides the speaker with interest in and motivation for speaking (Bacon et al., 1990:459). Otherwise, speaking skill will continue to be

considered the most difficult to develop. To overcome these difficulties in speaking skill as Bacon indicated, students interest should also be taken into consideration. Real-life like tasks using realia were considered to cover all such as, create a need, give choice, lead to creativity and arousing an interest in the students.

For this reason, the advocators of this view have encouraged the use of 'authentic', 'from-life' materials in the classroom through visuals in which communicative activities can be built (Richards et al., 1986:80). Visual and audiovisual materials are the materials that students come across in their daily lives. Visual materials that have been used in language teaching are projectors, pictures, charts, and tables. Audiovisual materials are television, films, and computer. However, audio-visual material could be considered to be superior to visual material because it is a combination of sound and vision and this doesn't just enable the learner to hear the language but also enables the learner to see the context in which it is used (Tomalin, 1990:1). Another audiovisual could be musicvideos which combine music and video and these two appeal the young generation (see Chapter II). Although films are used as audiovisuals in language development in general, musicvideos are not commonly used and especially they are not used in speaking development at all. So, to bring a new dimension to the audiovisual component in speaking skill development, musicvideos will be used in this study.

## **1.2 Problem**

In general, in schools, English teaching takes place with a weak syllabus and a methodology and outdated materials with lacking

resources. For this reason, students motivation, attitude and aptitude have not been activated toward English Learning and thus the language learning process does not take place effectively. If we consider the fact that there is very little application of developing the speaking skill in High Schools and the ideal age in language learning cannot be utilized, the proficiency in this skill fades away. Grammar, reading, writing skills are focused in integrated lessons but little emphasis is given to the speaking and listening skills. Students do not get the opportunity to improve and activate their English speaking proficiency thus it can be assumed that students lose their motivation toward English Learning and because of having a lack of desire toward English, they don't have motivation to speak the language when students attend the universities.

Also, many students at the Communication Sciences Faculty Preparation Program seem to have problems with their speaking proficiency. In the Prep. Program, in order to spend more time on each student, every speaking class is divided into two groups and both of the groups have 3-hour speaking lessons in each week throughout the year. However, at the end of the year, their final scores indicate that, their speaking averages have not improved as much as their other skills averages have. There might be several reasons for this dilemma. The students who have problems towards speaking might be introverted or they might not have a desire to activate their speaking ability or for some several reasons, they might not be motivated towards the speaking classes. One way or the other, students show a weak performance in the speaking lesson and this effects their speaking proficiency.

Yet, one of the reasons might be the materials used in these classes. Though pictures as visuals are used from time to time,



audiovisuals are not commonly used and especially, musicvideos are not used at all in these classes.

To improve students' speaking skill, actual realia like music and video can be used. Using music and video separately is not a new vision in second language teaching (see Chapter II). Using songs will enable the students to improve their pronunciation, intonation, stress, vocabulary, and grammar. Also, the results of Murphey's English Language Music (ELM) (see section 2.2) research shows that students enjoy listening to music. Since music is an aural device, it will create a great desire toward lesson and because of the repetition, the lyrics of the song will stay in students' memory. Using music will license the students to think in English because a listener doesn't really focus on what language he or she is listening, he or she just mumbles it. This mumbling will make the memorization possible and the pronunciation of the words would unconsciously assist better in the collective pronunciation memory. Gex (1987:4) indicates that, using video will also improve the students' vocabulary, grammar, intonation, stress, and pronunciation and adds that, the visual nature of video attracts students attention and thus the lesson becomes entertaining.

Due to the fact that, students enjoy listening to music and watching video, using music and video can be compiled as using musicvideo in language teaching. "An emerging wave of empirical studies focuses directly on the attitudes and activities of the audience for music video" (Sun and Lull, 1986:116). Rubin et al. (cited in Sun and Lull, 1986:116) found that college students evaluated musicvideos more favorably and considered them to be more 'active' and 'potent' than audio treatments of music alone.

Considering these facts in mind, it is assumed that, using musicvideos in speaking classes can be very stimulating and compelling. Using musicvideos in speaking lessons will appeal students' interest from every perspective. It will not only appeal their aural sense but also their visual sense. This way, students can join the lesson and mingle with each other in order to increase the amount of speaking time and their proficiency level in the lesson.

In addition, we are living in an era in which visuals have great importance and after the musicvideos entered the music market, only listening to music became inefficient for the youth (see section 2.4). For these reasons, musicvideos can become an actual realia for the students which can increase students' interest toward the lesson. Similarly, musicvideos can attract students attention towards the speaking lessons and increase their proficiency level.

This study aims to find out an answer to the question: "Will the learners improve their speaking proficiency and its components, vocabulary, accuracy, fluency and task achievement when musicvideos are used in speaking classes?".

### **1.3 Aim and Scope of the Study**

Sun and Lull (1986:116) indicates that no doubt musicvideos will continue to attract not only young viewers but also academic researchers and theorists from many disciplines. Considering this in mind, in this study, the general purpose is to find the effectiveness of musicvideos in speaking lessons in teaching English as Foreign Language. The aim of overall study is to find out whether there is a significant difference between the students who have their speaking lessons with musicvideos

and the students who have speaking lessons without musicvideos. In order to find out whether using musicvideos increases the pre-intermediate learners' speaking proficiency, following questions will be answered in the study:

1. Will the learners improve their speaking proficiency by using musicvideos?

This study also aims to investigate the effects of musicvideos on the components of speaking proficiency; vocabulary, accuracy, fluency, and task achievement. Therefore, in order to achieve this aim of the study, following question will be answered.

2. Will the learners improve their vocabulary by using musicvideos?
3. Will the learners improve their accuracy by using musicvideos ?
4. Will the learners improve their fluency by using musicvideos?
5. Will the learners improve their task achievement by using musicvideos ?

## CHAPTER II

### REVIEW OF LITERATURE

#### **2.1 Historical Overview of Speaking Skill in Second Language Teaching**

Today, English is the world's most widely studied foreign language and speaking skills are given more importance than in the history. For example, in the 18th century, foreign language teaching was based on Latin teaching and they believed that, speaking the foreign language was not the goal. For this reason, oral practice was limited to students reading aloud the sentences they had translated. By the nineteenth century, the study of Latin had become the standard way of studying foreign languages in schools. Oral work was reduced to an absolute minimum, while a handful of written exercises, constructed at random, came as a sort of appendix to the rules (Richards et al., 1986:3).

Understanding literary texts was the primary focus of foreign language study from the 1840's to the 1940's. Literary language was superior to spoken language and the ability to communicate in the target language was not a goal for the language instructor. Little attention was given to speaking and listening, and almost none to pronunciation.(Larsen-Freeman, 1986:4-9).

Toward the mid-nineteenth century several factors contributed to a questioning and rejection of structural language teaching. Increased opportunities for communication among Europeans created a demand for

oral proficiency in foreign languages. Vietor, Sweet, and other reformers in the late nineteenth century shared many beliefs about the principles on which a new approach to teaching foreign languages should be based and stated that the spoken language was the primary and that this should be reflected in an oral-based methodology (Richards et al., 1986:5).

Out of the reformers during that time L.Sauveur (1826-1907) used intensive oral interaction in the target language. Also, German scholar F.Franke (1884) (cited in Richards et al., 1986:25) emphasized that a language could best be taught by using it actively in the classroom and therefore, teachers must encourage direct and spontaneous use of the foreign language in the classroom. However, these attempts was still limited to a carefully graded progression organized around question-and-answer exchanges between teachers and students in small, intensive classes. Although dialogue level was emphasized, as it was in the Direct Method and Oral approach, structure was viewed as being at the heart of speaking ability.

In 1950's, speaking skill and listening skill was emphasized after the audiolingual method became into existence. While reading and writing were not neglected, listening and speaking were given priority and in the teaching sequence preceded reading and writing (Stern, 1990:472). Conversational proficiency was seen as the objective in this method. The language was taught by systematic attention to pronunciation and by intensive oral drilling of its basic sentence patterns. Aural-oral training was needed, and this was accomplished with the drills. In order to do the drills in the lessons, tape recorders were used or the teachers did lot of repetitions. Oral proficiency was equated with accurate pronunciation and grammar and the ability to respond quickly and accurately in speech situations. The teaching of

pronunciation, listening comprehension, grammar, and vocabulary were all related to development of oral fluency. Since fluency was very important for this method, it was practiced via tape recorders or the teachers (Richards et al. ,1986: 44-57). It was a program innovative mainly in terms of the procedures used and the intensity of teaching rather than in terms of its underlying theory. However, this method did not convince a number of prominent linguists of the value of an intensive, oral-based approach to the learning of foreign language (Richards et al., 1986:44-46).

In those years, for language teachers, speaking proficiency meant pronunciation, vocabulary, and grammar. In speaking, the emphasis was on accuracy and this was achieved through drills. The drill activities and texts of dialogues used in the lessons did not create the real communication atmosphere for the students. In addition, little attention was given to the characteristics of naturally-occurring conversation, and as a consequence learners rarely became proficient in speaking skill (Richards et al., 1986:56,59,61).

To overcome the inadequacies of existing structural syllabuses, materials, and methods, the original motivation for adopting a communicative approach in the early seventies was remedial. As Widdowson, for example, put it in 1972 (cited in Howatt, 1991:284): “The problem is that students, and especially students in developing countries, who have received several years of formal English teaching, frequently remain deficient in the ability to actually use the language, and to understand its use, in normal communication, whether in spoken or written mode. Improving their practical command of communicative performance made particular sense to students learning English in Britain, who were enrolled in short-term courses”. They wanted to

improve their practical skills, especially in spoken English, and build up their confidence in using the language. This emphasis on language use rather than form in this approach, encouraged course writers to produce topics and the materials with great intrinsic interest, which engaged the students' attention, for example, pair-work activities, games, simulations, authentic listening and reading materials and so on, which brought learners into closer contact with real English (Howatt, 1991:284). The aim was to help learners to become communicatively competent. Therefore, communicative proficiency rather than mere mastery of structures gained importance (Richards et al., 1986:64). As a result of this need of communicative proficiency, teachers concentrated on some issues. Studies on how oral communication skills could be improved, which components influence communication skills were their main concern. In Communicative Language Teaching, one of the main concern of the linguists was that, language was for communication and therefore, students' success were determined as much by their speaking fluency as it was by their accuracy (Larsen-Freeman, 1986:128-130). With the focus on fluency and contextual accuracy, students were expected to interact with each other and students' success were improved by establishing situations likely to promote communication and this was facilitated with the authentic language - language as it is used in a real context (Larsen-Freeman, 1986:128-130). This method gave importance to student interaction and activated the other researchers for further studies.

In the past ten years, increasing interest in the second language acquisition (SLA) field has been directed towards learners in face-to-face interactions. Since work by Long and Hatch (cited in Zuengler, 1993:404), it was first suggested that learners' active involvement in conversations was considered more acquisitionally beneficial than

experience limited to a passive reception of language input. Active participation in conversations meant that learners have the opportunity to receive and produce comprehensible language and to collaborate in the building and maintenance of the conversation.

The importance of content knowledge and interest on a given topic in order to create active participation in the lesson was supported with Selinker and Douglas research (cited in Zuengler, 1993:406). Providing data on one individual, they suggested that when nonnative speakers (NNS) are more knowledgeable and more interested of the domain of the talk than are their interlocutors, they engage actively in building the conversation within that content area. Woken and Swales in 1989 (cited in Zuengler, 1993:405), studied three native speakers (NS)-(NNS) nonnative speakers interactions. In each interaction, the NNSs had more content knowledge than did the NSs; the NNSs were computer software specialists who helped the NS learn how to use some word-processing software. With respect to performance on such measures as directives, questions, and amount of talk, it was the NNSs who were more active in directing and building the interchange.

Zuengler and Bent (cited in Zuengler, 1993:406) also investigated actual content knowledge differences in testing the Discourse Domain Model's claims about the relationship between content knowledge and conversational performance. In a study of 90 conversations produced by 45 NS-NNS male pairs, the authors looked at measures, including amount of talk, topic moves, back channels, and fillers. They reported that on several of the measures there was a pattern linking content knowledge and conversational participation. Specifically, those interlocutors (whether NNS or NS) who had relatively greater content



knowledge participated more actively (than did their partners) in building the conversation.

In this research, there was a complementary of participation in dyads, with the relative expert, for example, actively talking while the relative nonexpert actively signaled that he was listening. What this clearly suggests is that when NNSs are engaged in talking about something that they know more or have interest more about than do their interlocutors, their greater content knowledge can override any limitations they may have in their oral proficiency, and enable them to be the talkers in the conversation (Zuengler, 1993:406-427). Therefore, students oral proficiency will be improved, if the lesson is exciting and interesting for them.

Learning a second language can be exciting and productive or painful and useless. One's efforts can end in the acquisition of native-like fluency or a stumbling repertoire of sentences soon forgotten (Dulay et al., 1982:3). To be successful, learners and teachers simply need to know the right techniques because a learner need not have a special inborn talent for learning languages. In order to make the second language learning exciting, students' interests have to be catered, for this reason, the teacher has to be inventive in selecting interesting activities; and must provide a great variety of them (Klein, 1993:14).

Brown (1986:5) defines the successful speaking teacher as the teacher who provides a satisfactory structure to the classroom environment, in selecting or constructing interesting and motivating tasks which will give the student the opportunity to speak and also he adds that professionalism is now judged to lie in the ability to run a good class - one that is socially cheerful and cohesive -, to be familiar with

and to have opinions about the range of materials available, and to know what works well in the classroom.

Johnson (1993:208) refers to the interpretation of the Total Quality Management on skill training. He underlines that, the new material adds to previously acquired knowledge. and he adds that individuals are motivated by different factors. For example, one can be motivated by looking at different pictures, one can get motivated by using the computer and the other can get motivated by listening to music. In the light of the above suggestions, the recent views on language teaching and especially speaking skill development could be summarized as, teacher being creative, using life-like activities and arousing interest for the students.

## **2.2 Using Music and Songs in Language Teaching**

The roots of using music in education started in the early days. Byrd said "...reasons briefly set downe.... to perswade everyone to learne to sing.... It is a singular good remedy for a stutting and stammering in the speech and it is the best means to procure a perfect pronunciation and to make a good Orator." Even William Byrd in 1588 underlined the importance of using music in his "SONETS and SONGS of SADNESS and PIETIE" in such early days (Osman et al., 1978:4).

Chomsky and Schenker gained their principal insights from examining the structure of language and music rather than from examining linguistic and musical behavior. Recent empirical work has shown that music and language share behavioral as well as formal features (cited in Sloboda, 1994:1).

One of Chomsky's main claims has been that, at a deep level, all natural languages have the same structure, and that this structure tells us something universal about the human intellect. Many writers on music have been attracted to the idea that there are musical universals; maybe that there is something particularly natural about tonality (cited in Sloboda, 1994:12). Also, there are some major similarities between language and music:

1. Both language and music are characteristics of the human species that seem to be universal to all humans and specific to humans.

2. The natural medium for both language and music is auditory-vocal. That is, both language and music are primarily received as sequences of sounds and produced as sequences of vocal movements which create sounds. Thus, many of the neural mechanisms for analyzing input and producing output must be shared. The most universal of all musical forms is the song, where words and music are intimately combined (cited in Sloboda, 1994:18).

In 1970's, music was only used as a relaxing tool and not as a teaching material. For example, in Suggestopedia, music was the center in the learning process and was seen as therapy. Gaston (cited in Richards, 1986:143) defined this as to use the unique potential of rhythm to energize and bring order. However, music was not only used to relax learners but also to structure, pace, and punctuate the presentation of linguistic material. In other words, the music was also used as a material in the presentation of the lesson (Larsen-Freeman, 1986:86). In the light of this view, music could be used as a material in the presentation or in the practice of the spoken language. For example, when songs are used, students would not only relax but also be energized to learn the Second Language.

There is no doubt that many people, but especially youngsters enjoy listening to music, so by using songs in the language class teachers get students to do something that they would do in real life. "Many of us, the teachers, have experienced with amazement how quick students are at learning songs. It is also a common experience to forget nearly everything we learn in another language except the few songs that we learnt" (Murphey, 1992:6). Horner says songs are the leading reason why teenagers throughout the world become interested in English and he adds that the learners come along with a song they are just dying to listen to and study; it is by their favorite group; motivation couldn't be better (Horner, 1993:33). For many reasons, songs remain in our brain and this is a great advantage for the teacher to use in the classroom. To show this, Tim Murphey made a survey in a secondary school in Switzerland. While he was collecting data for his research, he prepared a questionnaire and a list of the artists from the current Top 40 and showed it to the teacher. She thought that most of the students were not going to be able to recognize the names as she did but they all recognized them and in fact, they even wrote the names of the songs next to the singers. After this questionnaire, they had a lively discussion about the questionnaire and the teacher was amazed how students voluntarily expressed themselves in English and their musical tastes and habits (Murphey, 1992:5). Therefore, by keeping the student at the center, songs are used to provide the student with material to manipulate in a personally relevant way. In addition songs are used to get to the inner world of the student, to get language out of the student. As it is mentioned in Stevick's Motivational Axes, external aspect of the students is placed on the horizontal axis and it reveals students motivation, whereas emotional aspect is placed on the vertical axis and comprises learner's feelings and anxieties. Furthermore,

our music globe usually have emotion loads. By using this as a reference we can ask students to use their feelings, experiences, and thoughts, stimulated by the music. This view is supported by Stevick (cited in Murphey, 1985:17) because he implies that language course is effective when the aim has contact with the students' interests, and the depth of its use into his emotional life.

There are studies showing how interested the youth is in pop music. Pop music is invariably 75 to 90% English language Music (ELM) the world over and it is probably for many adolescents and adults their major or only, contact with oral English in their environment. Swiss youths, for example, listen to approximately one to two hours of ELM a day (Murphey, 1985:17). An unpublished survey that Murphey conducted, found that Swiss pop radio stations play 75 to 90% ELM, according to the radio station directors, and a governmental survey revealed that the 15 to 24 year old age group in the French-speaking area preferred ELM to any other music; in India, Raychaudhuri (cited in Murphey, 1985:17) found that more than 90% of young people listen to one hour or more of radio music a day.

Murphey (1985: 16) states that using pop music is a great tool for teachers to use in the classroom because pop music is preferred by the teenagers. When Murphey was doing his study on 'Teaching for Peak Relevance Using International Pop Music' he stated that: not only does pop music represent authentic English in their environment, but for the young, it brings their youth culture into the classroom, giving it value, and making school more relevant to them. In River's words, "We must find out what our students are interested in and this is our subject matter" (cited in Murphey, 1985:17). Furthermore, the emotional impact of music in the classroom is of great importance with other things being

equal, a language course is effective in proportion to the breadth of its contact with the students' interests, and the depth of its penetration into his emotional life (Stevick cited in Murphey, 1985).

Murphey has summarized where to use songs in language as follows:

1. Study grammar
2. Practice selective listening comprehension
3. Read songs, articles, books for linguistic purposes
4. Compose songs, articles about songs, letters to singers, questionnaires
5. Discuss a song (do surveys, make hit lists)
6. Translate songs
7. Write dialogues using the words of a song
8. Use a song for gap-fill, cloze or for correction
9. Do role-plays (as people in the song, or the artist/ interviewer)
10. Dictate a song
11. Use music for background to other activities
12. Integrate songs into project work
13. Energize or relax classes mentally
14. Practice pronunciation, intonation, and stresses
15. Break the routine
16. Do choral repetition
17. Teach vocabulary
18. Teach culture
19. Learn about your students and from your students, letting them choose and explain their music (Murphey, 1992:10).

### **2.3 Using Video in Language Teaching**

As the technology has advanced, the interaction between the countries has grown, and face to face interaction among businessman has increased, the motivation to be competent in speaking English has gained importance. Under this consideration, in Second Language Learning, speaking skill became a prime concern. Thus, with the technological advancement, new facilities appeared for the language teachers. Because of being a visual society, the increasing production and distribution of the use of visuals in the society gained importance in recent years. Along with this line, the design and use of visuals in language teaching became extremely important (Richards et al., 1986:80).

In language teaching, the use of visuals started with pictures, handwritten postcards, letters, notes, timetables, and cinemaguides . Since using visual materials creates a great inspiration for the teachers to produce interesting ways when presenting the lesson, they have become an important feature of English language textbooks (Chiaro, 1984:15,17). Chiaro indicates that, when these visuals are used, teachers can go beyond the color reproductions of the textbook. For example, students practicing the function of inviting will be far more stimulated and motivated if given, a copy of Time Out Magazine, from which to choose a place to which to invite their classroom partners for the evening. Such a task is interesting, realistic and consequently meaningful. Chiaro also believes that this type of materials give a sense of reality and meaning to the students, especially to the ones who are studying English as a Foreign Language and who do not have the chance to visit the target language country. Therefore, students would benefit from these materials,

especially in speaking lessons since they would find the real environment as it is in the target language country.

Visuals are also considered to be a very valuable component of the class, which has got many limitations and dullness, being away from the reality. As Doğuelli indicates, visuals are of great help to bring reality to what is an unnatural way of learning a creative, living system of sounds and forms etc., in the face of such a situation, visuals are a way forward (Hill, cited in Doğuelli:1993).

Besides visual materials, audio visual materials are used in language teaching. In the present, transparencies, slides, television, video are commonly used and even computer software began to take place in language teaching as audio visual materials (Heinich et al., 1993:66). Out of these, television and films are very popular in teaching because they reflect the continuation of what we see or what we want to see in the real world. Piaget (cited in Worth, 1981:126) explains the importance of using television, films and other means by indicating that these visuals are a 'copy of reality' and they continue to provide the inspiration for many educational methods, in which the image and audio-visual presentations play a role that certain people look upon as the ultimate triumph of educational progress.

As it is mentioned above, audio visuals have a great importance in educational progress. Audiovisual materials differ from the visual materials because when students are practicing a given task or structure which is a visual material from a textbook, they will be far more stimulated and motivated when they watch an excerpt from a film. Such tasks will be more interesting, realistic and more meaningful for them (Lonergan, 1990:82). Films are a part of everyday life, and one of the most easily accessible English language products available to EFL



students. However, many teachers are wary about using them in the language classroom except as a bit of time-filling end-of-term entertainment. Films are fun, but that does not mean that they do not have a pedagogic value too.

Using video as a classroom material, without diminishing a film's value as entertainment, promotes fluency development as well as enhances students' appreciation and understanding of the film. In fact, because they are associated with entertainment rather than study, they are all the more exploitable as a teaching tool (Voller et al., 1993).

When using a video, it is difficult to squeeze every step of a lesson and using one or one and a half hour of TV in 45 minutes. Therefore, it would be wise and convenient to use short programs such as musicvideos, advertisements, weather forecasts or news about sports. Lonergan (1990:86) believes that since time on television is an expensive commodity, the selected language by the script writers give an effective communication to the viewers. Because usually these 'shorties' (short programs) do not last more than 15 minutes, teachers will not have any problem on choosing an excerpt from a film. By showing the 'shorty', from the beginning to the end, and by having 30-35 minutes left doing the pre and post activities in the class, the teacher will not panic.

Although using video time wisely in a teaching hour is pretty difficult for a language teacher, when it is used wisely, video can play a great role in material development. However, it is not a material to replace a teacher, it is just a teaching devise. For this reason, it should be considered as one segment of a whole. Materials to be used in the class should be prepared in such a way that it should make all the students participate in the lesson.

Some of the writers have stressed how segments of film and other video materials can be utilized in the lesson. Stoller (1988) has advocated the use of films as linguistic models for skills development. Stempleski and Tomalin (1990a, 1990b) remind us of the educational value of authentic broadcast and video material and show how it can be used to create both imaginative and skill-developing activities. Natusch (1990) advocates the use of fragments of film to teach language functions. Carr and Duncan (1987) believe class time is better spent discussing a film, rather than watching it in its entirety. Blakely (1984) believes showing films is viable only after students have a thorough knowledge of the language and culture concerned. Visscher (1990) warns against placing too much emphasis on the verbal component of video and gives some ideas for exploiting the language-generating potential of short scenes (cited in Voller et al, 1993:342,343).

Many activities, which can be done with video films, are suggested by different scholars. Gex (1987) suggests:

1. Slotted dictation
2. Reading the script and exercises on reading
3. Vocabulary exercises
4. Grammar exercises
5. Pair dictation by using the script.

Tomalin (1990) proposes :

1. Teaching new structures
2. Teaching language functions (making an offer, rejecting an offer)
3. Teaching a complete transaction (showing an extract and making students complete)

4. Teaching to say things with different degrees of emotion (calm persuasion, more insistent, threatening)

Voller et al. (1993) indicates:

1. It can be used to create both imaginative and skill-developing activities
2. Discussing the film
3. Doing focused viewing exercises

Lonergan (1990) suggests:

1. You can practice prediction and description
2. Copying gesture, register and intonation

Doğueli (1993) adds:

1. To present the country and its culture
2. To bring some color into the classroom
3. To observe/review language use in a visibly real context and situation
4. To bring the real world into the classroom
5. To calm the students down when they are bored and restless.
6. To provide a 'real-world' stimulus for listening, speaking, writing and vocabulary study.
7. To activate and motivate students

Not only the video activities were listed but also the benefits of the video were focused. Etiz (1995:49) has summarized the benefits of using video as follows:

1. It is a flexible tool for the teacher. S/he can create many activities
2. It is an authentic material.
3. In special cases, it leads to the students' oral production.
4. Beyond the words, students can view the action.

5. It is a great facilitator
6. It also improves students' notetaking in ESP courses.
7. It is a great potential to use in ESP courses in academic and implementation life

## **2.4 Using Musicvideos in Language Teaching**

As mentioned above, in language teaching, using music is a great device for the teachers. Not only pop music represents authentic English in the class, it also brings the culture that the youth want to confront in the classroom and this makes the school, the class and the lesson more relevant to them. To find the areas that the students are interested in and to make the lesson flow, using music is a great tool for the teachers.

Stevick (cited in Murphey, 1985:17) claims that a language course is effective when there is contact with students interests. Besides using music, video is also used as a great teaching tool on the aspect of students' interest. Using video as a classroom device does not only encourages students' fluency development but also it increases their acknowledgment and interest toward the lesson because it is the same entertainment that they confront outside the classroom. In addition, they become more contented when they see the continuation of their daily routine.

Based on previous research assessing the motivations for both viewing television and listening to music, Sun and Lull (1986:118) conducted a factor analysis of reported motivations for viewing MTV. Categories of the research were: Music appreciation, Enjoyment/Entertainment, Visual appreciation, Pass time/habit, Information, Emotional response, Social learning, Escape, and Social

interaction. The reasons comprising the 'music appreciation' and 'visual appreciation' motives for viewing total nearly 40 percent of all reasons given, indicated that the audience was actively involved. Young people had strong feelings about musicians, songs, genres, and lifestyle features associated with musical elements of culture and subculture. The research showed that these commitments and alliances were likely to significantly influence the MTV viewing experience (Sun et al., 1986:124).

With the MTV research in view, we can say that musicvideos are powerful. Aufderheide (1986) states that whatever one's view, the rapid spread of the musicvideo and its influence on popular culture is motive enough. Their raw materials are aspects of commercial popular culture, their structures those of dreams. These are fascinating elements of a form that becomes not only a way of seeing and of hearing but of being. Music videos invent the world they represent (Aufderheide, 1986:59,77).

An emerging wave of empirical studies focuses directly on the attitudes and activities of the audience for music video. Rubin and Rubin's (cited in Sun et al., 1986:116) search on audience for musicvideo showed that college students evaluated musicvideos more favorably and found them interesting, also, considered them to be more 'active' and 'potent' than audio treatments alone. Moreover, the researchers interpreted this finding to imply greater 'cognitive involvement' in music for musicvideo viewers compared to those who experience it on radio, records, tapes, or discs.

Undoubtedly, because of the students' interest, musicvideos attracted the researches. For example, in Ankara University TÖMER Language Teaching Center, teachers are using Turkish musicvideos (for foreigners) to teach Turkish as a foreign language. They use musicvideos as material to teach grammatical structures and Turkish culture in an

entertaining way. Also, they use musicvideos in speaking lessons to facilitate Turkish idioms (Yeni Yüzyıl:14). The application in TÖMER can be supported with Sun and Lull's (1986:124) statement: "No doubt musicvideos will continue to attract not only young viewers but also academic researchers and theorists from many disciplines".

## CHAPTER III

### METHODOLOGY

#### 3.1 Subjects

Turkish speaking students who are studying English as a foreign language in preparatory class of Communication Sciences Faculty of Anadolu University were chosen for the study.

To form the classes in the Preparatory Program at the beginning of 1995-96 academic year, Michigan Placement Test was given to the students. The students had been placed to the preparatory classes because their grades were lower than 70 out of hundred. From the results of the placement test, classes C and D were determined as beginners and A and B as pre-intermediate. A total number of 43 students were chosen for this study. The subjects were chosen from the pre-intermediate level students (class A and B), since they are considered to be at the same level based on the scores of the placement test. The subjects were divided into two groups as the Control Group and the Experimental Group.

The Control group consisted of 22 students, and in this study they were taught the functions of “compare and contrast”, and “agree and disagree” in speaking lessons without using the musicvideos.

The Experimental group consisted of 21 students, and they were taught the same functions by using the musicvideos.

### 3.2 Materials

The musicvideo to be used for the Experimental Group in teaching the function ‘compare and contrast’ is the song named ‘Class of 74, 75’ by the group The Connells. The reason for choosing this musicvideo is that it shows the physical appearance of the group, that is The Connells, and their friends when they graduated in 1975 and shows how they look now in 1996 and also how their life has changed since 1975. It was a suitable musicvideo for the function ‘compare and contrast’ because it created variety to facilitate ‘compare and contrast’. Not only their physical appearance but also the changes in their life styles were compared. The second musicvideo to be used for the Experimental Group to teach ‘agree and disagree’ is the song named ‘Always’ by the group Bon Jovi. The musicvideo, ‘Always’, is about a love story. The musicvideo consists of a female character who was in love with two men. It was difficult for the female character to make a decision but at the end of the musicvideo, she decided to choose the one that she was first in love with. This musicvideo had a movielike scenario and it had lots of sound and visual effects. The musicvideos ‘Always’ and ‘Class of 74 and 75’ are both used for the speaking function “agree and disagree”. Students were supposed to find the differences between the two musicvideos when they filled out the two musicvideo evaluation forms, adapted from Murphey, (1992:115) (see Appendix A) in the lesson of ‘agree and disagree’. Two different musicvideos were used in the activity because the subjects were to discuss the two musicvideos, in terms of whether they ‘agree or disagree’ on the topics mentioned in the musicvideo evaluation forms (see Appendix A) after filling out the evaluation forms.



For the Control Group, in the function, ‘compare and contrast’, two pictures (Appendix B) were used to facilitate the lesson. One picture was a top model and the other was a poor woman carrying her dead child, who died of hunger. For the function, ‘agree/disagree’, general discussion topics on students’ life, school life, equality between men and women were given to the students and these topics are discussed in order to facilitate the ‘agree/disagree’ speaking structures.

### **3.3 Procedures**

To determine the subjects speaking proficiency level, a pre-test was given at the beginning of the research. This test consisted of ‘compare and contrast’ and ‘agree and disagree’ topics (see Appendix C) and these topics were tested in the pre-test and the post-test. The performance of the students was tested with a speaking evaluation form (see Appendix D). The same test was used as a post-test at the end of the application. Since the research was based on speaking skill, the pre-test (see Appendix C) and the post-test were given as interviews.

In the Experimental Group and the Control Group, for the topics ‘compare/contrast’, ‘agree/disagree’ six teaching hours have been spent in Communication Sciences Faculty Preparation Program at the beginning of the Fall Semester of 1995-1996.

For the topic ‘compare and contrast’, three teaching hours have been spent for each group. The “compare/contrast” function consisted of ‘er...than’, ‘more/less...than’, ‘(not)as...as’ structures and also the irregular comparative forms of good, bad, and far. The “compare and contrast” structure ‘er...than’ was taught for the comparative of short adjectives and adverbs and also for some two-syllable adjectives such as

lucky, clever, and etc. For other two-syllable adjectives and longer adjectives, the “compare and contrast” structure ‘more...than’ was taught.

For the topic, ‘agree and disagree’, three teaching hours have been spent for each group. The “agree and disagree” function consisted of agree, half-agree, and disagree speaking structures. The structures that were covered in ‘agree’ were: ‘I agree’, ‘I quite agree’, ‘Yes, of course’, ‘Yes, exactly’, ‘It certainly is’, ‘You’re quite right’, ‘You’re absolutely right’. The structures that were covered in ‘half-agree’ were: ‘I agree up to a point’, ‘Yes, I agree but...’, ‘Yes in a way but....’, ‘You may be right but...’. The formal structures that were covered in ‘disagree’ were: ‘I disagree’, ‘I don’t agree at all’, ‘I’m afraid I can’t quite agree’. The informal structures that were covered in ‘disagree’ were: ‘I’m not so sure about that’, ‘That’s nonsense’, ‘You are wrong’.

In the presentation stage of the ‘compare/contrast’ function, a situation was given to both the Experimental and Control Groups. The situation was about a new quick soup that was sold in the market and how it was different from the other brands. The situation was written on the board and from the situation, the speaking structures of ‘compare and contrast’ were elicited from the students by asking the similarities and the differences between this soup and the others. Then by giving different examples either about the students or any other situations in the class, four types of comparisons (for example:-er,more than), question types and different types of comparisons (for example:as...as,as not....as, however, but) were elicited from the students. When the students had difficulty, they were supported by examples. The lesson presentation was same for both the Experimental and the Control Groups.

However, in the practice stage, the musicvideo 'Class of 74 and 75' was used with the Experimental Group. Students listened to the sound without seeing the picture and some prediction questions were asked. These questions were prediction questions because the lyrics of the song was quite different from the subject of the musicvideo. The lyrics were about what happened in the band's class during the years of 1974 and 1975. However, in the musicvideo, the subject was about how the class was in 1974 and 1975 and how it was different in 1996. The comparison of how people looked in 1974,75 and how they looked in 1996 was seen throughout the video. These prediction questions such as, 'What is the name of the song?' and 'What do you think the subject of the musicvideo is?' were asked while the students listened to the sound without seeing the picture. This procedure was followed in order to have the students listen to the song to get a general impression before they watch the musicvideo. After viewing the musicvideo, the students were asked to answer the same questions (the questions that were asked when listening to the sound without seeing the picture). This time they were to compare their guesses to their observations first on their own and then with a friend as pairwork. The main focus of this individual and pairwork activity was to find the differences between their guesses and observations. Later, questions about the differences of 1974 and 1996 were asked to the students in terms of the atmosphere, the setting, and the physical appearance of the characters in the musicvideo. Hence, students were supposed to compare and contrast 1974 and 1996 on these aspects by using the function of 'compare and contrast'. Whenever there was a contradiction in the discussion or whenever difficulty occurred, the musicvideo was framed. Later, as the last step, the characters' life styles were compared as a class.

In the Control Group, for the practice stage of ‘compare/contrast’, pictures (see Appendix B) were given to the students to facilitate the practice. Two pictures of women, one top model and one poor woman holding her dead child, were given to each pair and students were asked to compare and contrast the women’s physical appearance as pairwork. After describing the women’s physical appearance, students were supposed to compare the women’s lifestyles. Then pairs were mingled and students discussed the pictures as a class.

With the other topic, ‘agree and disagree’, more or less similar procedure was followed. In the presentation stage, students’ ideas about a given topic were elicited in both the Experimental and the Control Group in order to obtain the speaking structures of ‘agree and disagree’. The topic was about television addiction. Their contradicting ideas were written on the board. If the students didn’t come up with contradicting ideas, contradicting ideas were provided by writing them on the board. From the sentences written on the board, students were supposed to elicit the ‘agree/disagree’ structures.

In the Experimental Group, for the practice of ‘agree/disagree’ speaking structures, two musicvideo evaluation forms (see Appendix A) were given to the subjects and they were to rate the musicvideos on the categories of the song, the singer, and the clip after viewing the musicvideos. When the subjects filled the forms by themselves, they were to discuss the two musicvideos and to agree on their score in groups of four. The follow up activity was to write the groups overall scores and then to discuss their ideas as a class.

In the Control Group, for the practice stage of the function, ‘agree/disagree’, general discussion topics on students’ life, school life, equality between women and men were given to the students to discuss

as a pairwork activity. An example to the general discussion topics was, 'Students lives are easy when they live together with their families in the same city'. Later, students were to discuss these topics as a class with the structures that they have learned.

### **3.4 Data Collection**

To collect data, the subjects were given a speaking proficiency test as a pre-test and a post-test. A pair of students were interviewed by a pair of teachers in these tests. The student pairs have been selected randomly. Also the same student pairs were interviewed in the post-test by the same teachers. For the pre-test and the post-test the Speaking Evaluation Form used by the preparatory program of the Communication Sciences Faculty for five years had been used. This Speaking Proficiency Evaluation Form (see Appendix D) consists of four components to be tested: fluency, accuracy, vocabulary, and task achievement. The Fluency component of the Evaluation Form tests how fluent the students are, and how comfortable they are in everyday contexts. The Accuracy component tests to what extent the students are sufficient to deal with everyday contexts with a wide range of structures related to the topic. The Vocabulary component tests students' ability to use a range of appropriate vocabulary for everyday tasks, and tests if they generally have adequate range for discussing abstract topics. The last component, the Task Achievement tests how effective the students are in communicating both actively and receptively, both in everyday contexts and on more abstract topics and especially on the topics that they had been taught in speaking. After the teachers had given grades for four

components and had gotten the speaking proficiency average separately, they obtained the overall score.

In the test, each pair received a different topic on the covered topics: 'compare and contrast', 'agree and disagree'. These topics were used for both the pre-test and the post-test. Students were to use the 'compare/contrast' speaking functions for 'compare/contrast' topics and 'agree/disagree' speaking functions for 'agree/disagree' topics. 7 minutes were spent on the first part of the interview and it was to test compare and contrast topic. Also, the second part of the interview lasted 7 minutes and it was to test 'agree and disagree' topic. Interview lasted for 15 minutes.

### **3.5 Data Analysis**

To get the subjects speaking proficiency average, four parts of the speaking proficiency test were used. In the first and the second part of the interview, subjects were evaluated on their fluency, grammatical accuracy, vocabulary appropriateness and task achievement out of 100. Since task achievement covers the speaking functions taught in the lessons, 'compare/contrast' and 'agree/disagree' speaking functions were evaluated under the task achievement part of the proficiency. Subjects averages were taken individually by the teachers and at the end, their final averages were taken by the pair teachers (see Appendix E).

The pre-test and the post-test were graded separately in the same procedure. To measure the differences between the Control Group and the Experimental Group, in terms of general speaking proficiency and its components; fluency, accuracy, vocabulary, and task achievement, the results of 't-test for independent samples' was used in the analysis stage.

However, the results of t-test showed that there was a significant difference between the Control Group and the Experimental Group in the pre-test. Therefore, 'analysis of co-variance' was used to get the development difference between the groups. Besides, each group was evaluated within itself to see the within group development.

## **CHAPTER IV**

### **RESULTS**

The aim of this study is to find out whether using musicvideos increases the pre-intermediate learners' speaking proficiency and its components; fluency, accuracy, vocabulary, and task achievement. To compare general proficiency, first the results of the pre-tests were compared through t-test for Independent Samples calculations. Since these results revealed a difference between the Experimental and the Control groups, co-variance analysis were applied to the results to find out whether there is a significant difference between the Experimental and Control groups. Later, t-test for Paired Samples was administered to find the within group differences in the Experimental and the Control groups for the speaking proficiency and its components; fluency, accuracy, vocabulary, and task achievement.

#### **4.1 Comparison of the Experimental and the Control Groups**

##### **4.1.1 Comparison of Speaking Proficiency of the Experimental and the Control Groups**

To see if there is a significant difference between the pre-test results of the Experimental Group (Group 1) and the Control Group (Group 2), the pre-test results were tested by t-test for independent samples. The calculations are shown in Table 4.1.



**TABLE 4.1**

The Results of t-test for Independent Samples Showing the Differences Between the Experimental Group and the Control in the Pre-test of Speaking Proficiency

<b>GROUP</b>	<b>MEAN SCORE</b>	<b>MEAN DIFFERENCE</b>
GROUP 1 (n=21)	62,8	17,1
GROUP 2 (n=22)	45,7	

(  $t= 3,60$  ,  $p=0,001$ )

There were 21 subjects in the Experimental Group and the mean of the test scores in the pre-test was calculated as 62,8. However, the mean in the Control Group for 22 subjects was 45,7. In other words, the mean of the test scores in the Experimental Group was higher than the mean of the test scores of the subjects in the Control Group.

As it can be seen in Table 4.1, there is a statistically significant difference in terms of general speaking proficiency between the Experimental Group and the Control Group in the pre-test ( $t=3.60$ ,  $p=0,001$ ). In other words, before the study, there was a difference in the Experimental and the Control groups' performance in the use of 'compare/contrast' and 'agree/disagree' speaking functions.

Since there is a difference between the general speaking proficiency of the Experimental and the Control groups, co-variance analysis (see Appendix F) was used.

The results of the co-variance analysis were not found statistically significant between the Experimental and the Control groups ( $F=0,009 < F_{1,40,0,05} = 251,1$  ,  $p=0.926$ ). This suggests that the use of musicvideos is not more efficient than the use of pictures and discussion topics in the improvement of general speaking proficiency.

#### 4.1.2 Comparison of the Use of Vocabulary of the Experimental and the Control Groups

To see if there is a significant difference between the pre-test results in terms of the use of vocabulary of the Experimental (Group 1) and the Control (Group 2) groups, the pre-test results were analyzed by t-test for independent samples. The calculations are shown in Table 4.2.

**TABLE 4.2**

The Results of t-test for Independent Samples Showing the Differences Between the Experimental and the Control Groups in the Pre-test of Vocabulary Use

<b>GROUP</b>	<b>MEAN SCORE</b>	<b>MEAN DIFFERENCE</b>
GROUP 1 (n=21)	61,5	15,2
GROUP 2 (n=22)	46,3	

(  $t= 3,37$  ,  $p=0,002$ )

There were 21 subjects in the Experimental Group and the mean of the test scores in the pre-test was calculated as 61,5. However, the mean in the Control Group for 22 subjects was 46,3. That is to say, the mean of the test scores in the Experimental Group was higher than the mean of the test scores in the Control Group.

As it can be seen in Table 4.2, there is a statistically significant difference in terms of vocabulary use between the Experimental and the Control Groups in the pre-test ( $t=3,37;p=0,002$ ). That is to say, before the study, there was a difference in the Experimental and the Control groups' performance in the vocabulary. Since there is a difference between the vocabulary use of the Experimental and the Control groups, co-variance analysis was used.

The results of the co-variance analysis (see Appendix G) were not found statistically significant between the Experimental and the Control groups ( $F=0,031 < F_{1;40;0,05} = 251,1$  ,  $p=0,861$ ). That is to say, the analysis indicate that there was not a statistically significant difference between the Experimental and the Control groups in the improvement of vocabulary. Depending on these results, the use of musicvideos is not found to be more efficient than the use of pictures and discussion topics in the improvement of vocabulary.

#### 4.1.3 Comparison of Accuracy of the Experimental and the Control Groups

To see if there is a significant difference between the pre-test results in terms of the accuracy of the Experimental (Group 1) and the Control (Group 2) groups, the pre-test results were analyzed by t-test for independent samples. The calculations are shown in Table 4.3.

**TABLE 4.3**  
The Results of t-test for Independent Samples Showing the Differences Between the Experimental and the Control Groups in the Pre-test of Accuracy

GROUP	MEAN SCORE	MEAN DIFFERENCE
GROUP 1 (n=21)	61,5	13,1
GROUP 2 (n=22)	48,4	

(  $t= 3,01$  ,  $p=0,005$  )

There were 21 subjects in the Experimental Group and the mean of the test scores in the pre-test was calculated as 61,5. However, the mean in the Control Group for 22 subjects was 48,4. That is to say, the mean of

the test scores in the Experimental Group was higher than the mean of the test scores in the Control Group.

As it can be seen in Table 4.3, there is a statistically significant difference in terms of accuracy between the Experimental and the Control Groups in the pre-test ( $t=3,01;p=0,005$ ). The pre-test results proved that, the accuracy performance of the Experimental and the Control groups was different and thus co-variance was needed.

The results of the co-variance analysis (see Appendix H) were not found statistically significant between the Experimental and the Control groups ( $F=0,166 < F_{1;40;0,05} = 251,1, p=0,686$ ). We can say that, analysis of co-variance showed that there was not a statistically significant difference between the Experimental and the Control groups in the improvement of accuracy after the application. This suggests that the use of musicvideos is not more efficient than the use of pictures and discussion topics in the improvement of accuracy.

#### **4.1.4 Comparison of Fluency of the Experimental and the Control Groups**

To see if there is a significant difference between the pre-test results in terms of the fluency of the Experimental (Group 1) and the Control (Group 2) groups, the pre-test results were analyzed by t-test for independent samples. The calculations are shown in Table 4.4.

**TABLE 4.4**

The Results of t-test for Independent Samples Showing the Differences Between the Experimental and the Control Groups in the Pre-test of Fluency

GROUP	MEAN SCORE	MEAN DIFFERENCE
GROUP 1 (n=21)	65,6	15,7
GROUP 2 (n=22)	49,9	

(  $t= 3,30$  ,  $p=0,002$ )

There were 21 subjects in the Experimental Group and the mean of the test scores in the pre-test was calculated as 65,6. However, the mean in the Control Group for 22 subjects was 49,9. That is to say, the mean of the test scores in the Experimental Group was higher than the mean of the test scores in the Control Group.

As it can be seen in Table 4.4, there is a statistically significant difference in terms of fluency between the Experimental and the Control Groups in the pre-test ( $t=3,30;p=0,002$ ). That is to say, before the study, the fluency performance of the Experimental and the Control groups was different and thus co-variance analysis was needed.

The results of the co-variance analysis (see Appendix I) were not found statistically significant between the Experimental and the Control groups ( $F=0,366 < F_{1,40;0,05} = 251,1$ ,  $p=0,548$ ). In other words, there was not a significant difference between the Experimental and the Control groups in the improvement of fluency after the application.

The results of the co-variance analysis (see Appendix J) were not found statistically significant between the Experimental and the Control groups ( $F=0,017 < F_{1;40;0,05} = 251,1$ ,  $p=0,896$ ). In other words, analysis of co-variance showed that there was not a significant difference between the Experimental and the Control groups in the improvement of task achievement after the application. This suggests that the use of musicvideos is not more efficient than the use of pictures and discussion topics in the improvement of task achievement.

At the end of the study, through co-variance analysis, the results were not found statistically significant in terms of general speaking proficiency, vocabulary, accuracy, fluency, and task achievement. However, to see whether there is a significant difference within the Experimental and the Control groups, t-test for paired samples was applied, in terms of general speaking proficiency, vocabulary, accuracy, fluency, and task achievement.

## **4.2 Comparison of Results within the Experimental and the Control Groups**

### **4.2.1 Comparison of Speaking Proficiency within the Experimental Group**

In order to accomplish the above aim, Experimental Group was handled within itself. The Experimental Group's pre-test results were compared and also t-test for paired samples were calculated. The results are given in Table 4.6:

**TABLE 4.6**  
t-test for Paired Samples in the Experimental Group of Speaking Proficiency

<b>GROUP (n=21)</b>	<b>MEAN SCORE</b>	<b>MEAN DIFFERENCE</b>
PRE-TEST	62,8	7,0
POST-TEST	69,8	

(  $t= 2,73$  ,  $p=0,013$  )

As it can be seen in Table 4.6 , the mean score in the pre-test was calculated as 62.8 in the post-test while it was 69.8 in the post-test. Also it is observed that the subjects in the Experimental Group increased their scores by 7.0. This result was found significant at the 0.05 significance level ( $t=2.73$ ,  $p=0,013$ ).

Hence, it can be said that, there is a statistically significant difference in the development of speaking proficiency between the pre-test and the post-test of the Experimental group. In other words, the subjects in the Experimental group taught by musicvideos showed a development in the proficiency of speaking skill.

#### **4.2.2 Comparison of Speaking Proficiency within the Control Group**

As it was mentioned in section 4.6, the Control Group was handled within itself. The Control Group's pre-test results were compared and also t-test for paired samples were calculated. The results are given in Table 4.7:

**TABLE 4.7**  
t-test for Paired Samples in the Control Group of Speaking Proficiency

<b>GROUP (n=21)</b>	<b>MEAN SCORE</b>	<b>MEAN DIFFERENCE</b>
PRE-TEST	45,7	17,2
POST-TEST	63,0	

(  $t= 6,48$  ,  $p=0,000$  )

As it can be seen in Table 4.7, the mean score in the pre-test was calculated as 45,7 in the post-test while it was 63,0 in the post-test. Also it is observed that the subjects in the Control Group increased their scores by 17,2. This result was found significant at the 0.05 significance level ( $t=6,48$  ,  $p=0,000$ ).

Hence, it can be said that, there is a significant difference in the development of speaking proficiency between the pre-test and the post-test of the Control group. In other words, the subjects in the Control group taught by without musicvideos in speaking classes showed a development in the proficiency of speaking skill.

#### **4.2.3 Comparison of Vocabulary within the Experimental Group**

To determine whether musicvideos in speaking classes helped the learners improve the use of vocabulary, the Experimental Group was handled within itself. The Experimental Group's pre-test results were compared and also t-test for paired samples were calculated. The results are given in Table 4.8:



**TABLE 4.8**  
t-test for Paired Samples in the Experimental Group of Vocabulary

<b>GROUP (n=21)</b>	<b>MEAN SCORE</b>	<b>MEAN DIFFERENCE</b>
PRE-TEST	61,5	0,7
POST-TEST	60,8	

(  $t= 0,22$  ,  $p=0,829$ )

As it can be seen in Table 4.8, the mean score in the pre-test was calculated as 61,5 and the mean score was 60,8 in the post-test. The difference of the means was 0,7 in the Experimental group. This result was not found significant at the 0.05 significance level ( $t=0,22$ ;  $p=0,829$ ).

It can be said that, there is not a statistically significant difference in the development of the use of vocabulary between the pre-test and the post-test of the Experimental group. In other words, the subjects in the Experimental group taught by musicvideos in speaking classes did not show a development in the use of vocabulary.

#### **4.2.4 Comparison of Vocabulary within the Control Group**

To determine whether speaking classes without musicvideos helped the learners improve the use of vocabulary, the Control Group was handled within itself. The Control Group's pre-test results were compared and also t-test for paired samples were calculated. The results are given in Table 4.9:

**TABLE 4.9**  
t-test for Paired Samples in the Control Group of Vocabulary

<b>GROUP (n=21)</b>	<b>MEAN SCORE</b>	<b>MEAN DIFFERENCE</b>
PRE-TEST	46,3	15,1
POST-TEST	61,4	

(  $t = -6,03$  ,  $p = 0,000$  )

As it can be seen in Table 4.9, the mean score in the pre-test was calculated as 46,3 in the post-test while it was 61,4 in the post-test. The difference of the means was -15,1 in the Control group. This result was found significant at the 0.05 significance level ( $t = -6,03; p = 0,000$ ).

Hence, it can be said that, there is a significant difference in the development of the use of vocabulary between the pre-test and the post-test of the Control group. In other words, the subjects in the Control group who were not taught by musicvideos in speaking classes showed a development in the use of vocabulary.

#### **4.2.5 Comparison of Accuracy within the Experimental Group**

To determine whether musicvideos in speaking classes helped the learners improve accuracy, the Experimental Group was handled within itself. The Experimental Group's pre-test results were compared and also t-test for paired samples were calculated. The results are given in Table 4.10:

**TABLE 4.10**  
t-test for Paired Samples in the Experimental Group of Accuracy

<b>GROUP (n=21)</b>	<b>MEAN SCORE</b>	<b>MEAN DIFFERENCE</b>
PRE-TEST	61,5	0,5
POST-TEST	61,0	

(  $t = 0,17$  ,  $p = 0,867$  )

As it can be seen in Table 4.10, the mean score in the pre-test was calculated as 61,5, and the mean score was 61,0 in the post-test. The difference of the means was 0,5 in the Experimental group. This result was not found significant at the 0.05 significance level ( $t = 0,17$ ;  $p = 0,867$ ).

It can be said that, there is not a statistically significant difference in the development of accuracy between the pre-test and the post-test of the Experimental group. In other words, the subjects in the Experimental group taught by musicvideos in speaking classes did not show a development in accuracy.

#### **4.2.6 Comparison of Accuracy within the Control Group**

To determine whether speaking classes without musicvideos helped the learners improve the accuracy, the Control Group was handled within itself. The Control Group's pre-test results were compared and also t-test for paired samples were calculated. The results are given in Table 4.11:

**TABLE 4.11**  
t-test for Paired Samples in the Control Group of Accuracy

<b>GROUP (n=21)</b>	<b>MEAN SCORE</b>	<b>MEAN DIFFERENCE</b>
PRE-TEST	48,4	13,0
POST-TEST	61,4	

(  $t = -5,43$  ,  $p = 0,000$  )

As it can be seen in Table 4.11, the mean score in the pre-test was calculated as 48,4 in the post-test while it was 61,4 in the post-test. The difference of the means was -13,0 in the Control group. This result was found significant at the 0.05 significance level ( $t = -5,43; p = 0,000$ ).

Hence, it can be said that, there is a statistically significant difference in the development of accuracy between the pre-test and the post-test of the Control group. In other words, the subjects in the Control group who were not taught by musicvideos in speaking classes showed a development in accuracy.

#### **4.2.7 Comparison of Fluency within the Experimental Group**

To determine whether musicvideos in speaking classes helped the learners improve the fluency, the Experimental Group was handled within itself. The Experimental Group's pre-test results were compared and also t-test for paired samples were calculated. The results are given in Table 4.12:

**TABLE 4.12**  
t-test for Paired Samples in the Experimental Group of Fluency

<b>GROUP (n=21)</b>	<b>MEAN SCORE</b>	<b>MEAN DIFFERENCE</b>
PRE-TEST	65,6	5,6
POST-TEST	71,2	

(  $t = -1,75$  ,  $p = 0,095$  )

As it can be seen in Table 4.12, the mean score in the pre-test was calculated as 65,6 in the post-test while it was 71,2 in the post-test. The difference of the means was -5,6 in the Control group. This result was found significant at the 0.05 significance level ( $t = -1,75; p = 0,095$ ).

Hence, it can be said that, there is a significant difference in the development of fluency between the pre-test and the post-test of the Experimental group. In other words, the subjects in the Experimental group, taught by musicvideos in speaking classes, showed a development in fluency.

#### **4.2.8 Comparison of Fluency within the Control Group**

To determine whether speaking classes without musicvideos helped the learners improve fluency, the Control Group was handled within itself. The Control Group's pre-test results were compared and also t-test for paired samples were calculated. The results are given in Table 4.13:

**TABLE 4.13**  
t-test for Paired Samples in the Control Group of Fluency

<b>GROUP (n=21)</b>	<b>MEAN SCORE</b>	<b>MEAN DIFFERENCE</b>
PRE-TEST	50,0	21,2
POST-TEST	71,2	

(  $t = -6,11$  ,  $p = 0,000$  )

As it can be seen in Table 4.13, the mean score in the pre-test was calculated as 50,0 in the post-test while it was 71,2 in the post-test. The difference of the means was -21,2 in the Control group. This result was found significant at the 0.05 significance level ( $t = -6,11$ ;  $p = 0,000$ ).

Hence, it can be said that, there is a statistically significant difference in the development of fluency between the pre-test and the post-test of the Control group. In other words, the subjects in the Control group who were not taught by musicvideos in speaking classes showed a development in fluency.

#### **4.2.9 Comparison of Task Achievement within the Experimental Group**

To determine whether musicvideos in speaking classes helped the learners improve task achievement, the Experimental Group was handled within itself. The Experimental Group's pre-test results were compared and also t-test for paired samples were calculated. The results are given in Table 4.14:

**TABLE 4.14**  
t-test for Paired Samples in the Experimental Group of Task Achievement

<b>GROUP (n=21)</b>	<b>MEAN SCORE</b>	<b>MEAN DIFFERENCE</b>
PRE-TEST	60,9	10,4
POST-TEST	71,2	

(  $t = -3,53$  ,  $p = 0,002$  )

As it can be seen in Table 4.14, the mean score in the pre-test was calculated as 60,9 in the post-test while it was 71,2 in the post-test. The difference of the means was -10,4 in the Control group. This result was found significant at the 0.05 significance level ( $t = -3,53; p = 0,002$ ).

Hence, it can be said that, there is a statistically significant difference in the development of task achievement between the pre-test and the post-test of the Experimental group. In other words, the subjects in the Experimental group taught by musicvideos in speaking classes showed a development in task achievement.

#### **4.2.10 Comparison of Task Achievement within the Control Group**

To determine whether speaking classes without musicvideos helped the learners improve the task achievement in speaking proficiency, the Control Group was handled within itself. The Control Group's pre-test results were compared and also t-test for paired samples were calculated. The results are given in Table 4.15:

**TABLE 4.15**  
t-test for Paired Samples in the Control Group of Task Achievement

GROUP (n=21)	MEAN SCORE	MEAN DIFFERENCE
PRE-TEST	36,2	26,8
POST-TEST	63,0	

(  $t = -6,73$  ,  $p = 0,000$  )

As it can be seen in Table 4.15, the mean score in the pre-test was calculated as 36,2 in the post-test while it was 63,0 in the post-test. The difference of the means was -26,8 in the Control group. This result was found significant at the 0.05 significance level ( $t = -6,73; p = 0,000$ ).

Hence, it can be said that, there is a statistically significant difference in the development of task achievement between the pre-test and the post-test of the Control group. In other words, the subjects in the Control group who were not taught by musicvideos in speaking classes showed a development in task achievement.

### 4.3 Discussion of the Results

This study searched if there was a significant difference between the improvement of two speaking classes one of which used musicvideos as a practice in development of speaking proficiency and its components vocabulary, accuracy, fluency, and task achievement.

These results revealed that, using musicvideos for the practice of the functions in speaking classes did not effect students' **speaking proficiencies** as much as using pictures and discussion topics did. The within group comparison of the Experimental and the Control groups, indicated that both the Experimental where musicvideos are used and the



Control groups where other means, pictures and discussion topics are used showed improvement. However, as it was observed, the Control group improved more than the Experimental group did.

These results do not seem to support Rubin and Rubin (cited in Sun et.al., 1986:116), and Zuengler's (1993) views. In Rubin and Rubin's (Ibid:116) research on audience for musicvideo, college students evaluated musicvideos more favorably and found them interesting, also, they considered them to be more 'active' and 'potent' than audio treatments alone. Moreover, Zuengler's search on NNS in 1993 (see section 2.1) shows us that when NNS are engaged in talking about something that they may have interest more than their interlocutors do, their greater content knowledge and interest can override any limitations they may have in their oral proficiency. Therefore, if the lesson is exciting and interesting, students oral proficiency will be improved. Considering Rubin and Rubin's and Zuengler's researches in mind, it was supposed that musicvideos would effect students' proficiency because it would create an interest. However, unlike the results of Rubin and Rubin and Zuengler's studies, the results of this study showed that, using musicvideos in speaking classes are not more effective than using other means such as, pictures. Therefore, since there is not a significant difference between the Experimental and the Control groups' speaking proficiency, we can say that using pictures, due to their visual nature, might have influenced learners in the way that musicvideos did. This could be explained that, although, pictures cannot be treated as audio treatment, they provided learners visual support and activated their imagination as would the musicvideos.

The reason for musicvideos not being effective in this study might be using musicvideos only in the practice stage of the lesson. This might

not be enough for the students to activate their English. When musicvideos had also been used in the presentation of the lesson, the subjects might have spent more time with the musicvideos, get familiar with them and with their increased interest, their proficiency might have improved.

If we look at the components of speaking proficiency separately, for the **vocabulary component**, we can say that using musicvideos for the practice of the functions in speaking classes is not more efficient than the use of pictures and discussion topics in the improvement of the use of vocabulary. Also, the results proved that, within group differences, the Experimental group did not improve via musicvideos in the practice stage of the speaking classes. However, the Control group, using pictures and discussion topics at the end of the study showed an improvement. This could be due to the motivation of the Control group rather than the effect of the activities because neither of the Experimental and the Control groups had emphasis on vocabulary activities.

The reason of the improvement of the Control group might be, in the practice stage of the Control group, pictures were used in 'compare and contrast' function as a pairwork. However, for the same function in the practice stage of the Experimental group, they talked about their guesses and observations as a pairwork after they watched the musicvideo. While, the students in the Control group used pictures throughout the pairwork activity, the students in the Experimental group talked about their guesses and observations in the pairwork activity, after they watched the musicvideos. In other words, the students in the Control group might have had more time to concentrate on two pictures while the students in the Experimental group might have had less time to

concentrate on changing scenes in the musicvideos. If the students in the Experimental group had less time to focus on the vocabulary and put it into use in the pairwork activity, this might have effected the result. Therefore, if musicvideos were not only used in the practice stage but also in the presentation stage, the students might have had more time to concentrate on the changing scenes and be exposed to the vocabulary items.

For the **accuracy component** of the speaking proficiency, using musicvideos in the practice stage of the speaking classes did not have effect on students' accuracy in speaking proficiency as much as using pictures and discussion topics. Moreover, the results showed that, within group differences, the Experimental group did not improve via musicvideos in speaking classes. However, the Control group benefited from the pictures and discussion topics at the end of the study. On the other hand, this could be due to the accuracy process in the application because neither of the Experimental and the Control groups had emphasis on specific accuracy activities. However, the Control group had made more errors than the Experimental group did and thus, the error corrections were seriously applied by the students in the Control group. That is to say, these corrections that were handled by the Control group might have effected their result on the accuracy component.

This study showed that, using musicvideos for the practice of the functions in speaking classes is not more efficient than the use of pictures and discussion topics in the improvement of students' **fluency component**. However, the within group comparison of the Experimental and the Control groups, proved that both the Experimental and the Control groups improved via musicvideos and without musicvideos in speaking classes. Both the Experimental and the Control groups showed

statistically significant improvement within groups. Yet, it was observed that the Control group's improvement was greater than the Experimental Group's.

For the **task achievement component** of speaking proficiency, using musicvideos for the practice of the functions in speaking classes did not effect students' task achievement as much as using pictures and discussion topics. The within group comparison of the Experimental and the Control groups, proved that both the Experimental and the Control groups improved. However, it was observed that the Control group showed greater improvement than the Experimental group did. The reason for the Experimental group not to improve as much as the Control group did might be that, the students in the Communication Sciences Faculty Preparation Program were not familiar with the use of musicvideos as they were with the pictures in their classes.

## CHAPTER V

### CONCLUSION

#### 5.1 Conclusion

This study aimed at determining the effectiveness of musicvideos over pictures and other means in speaking classes. The study was conducted with the pre-intermediate preparatory class students attending the Communication Sciences Faculty and it sought the effect of musicvideos in students' speaking proficiency and its components, vocabulary, accuracy, fluency, and task achievement

To reveal the effectiveness of musicvideos in speaking classes, following questions were answered. The first one was: "Will the learners improve their speaking proficiency by using musicvideos?". Co-variance Analysis showed that there is no difference between the Experimental and the Control groups' speaking proficiency on the practice of the functions: 'compare and contrast' and 'agree and disagree'. That is musicvideos are not found to be more effective than other teaching materials i.e., pictures and discussion topics in speaking classes. Though there is not a significant difference between the groups, both the Experimental and the Control groups showed improvement at different rates. The Control group where pictures and discussion topics were used showed greater improvement in general speaking proficiency than the Experimental group did where musicvideos were used.

The other question answered at the end of the study was: “Will the learners improve their vocabulary by using musicvideos?”. Statistical Analysis indicated that there is no difference between the Experimental and the Control groups’ vocabulary usage improvement. When within group differences are considered, a difference was observed within the Control group, but not within the Experimental group. As it is also stated in the Discussion of the Results part (see section 4.3), vocabulary improvement cannot be considered as the direct outcome of the study because such an aim was not pursued during the study.

The next question answered at the end of the study was: “Will the learners improve their accuracy by using musicvideos?”. Co-variance Analysis indicated that there is no difference between the Experimental and the Control groups’ accuracy on the practice of the functions. Though there is not a significant difference between the groups, a difference was found within the Control group, but not within the Experimental group, in terms of accuracy component.

The following question that was answered at the end of the study was: “Will the learners improve their fluency by using musicvideos?”. Statistical Analysis showed that there is no difference between the Experimental and the Control group’s fluency on the practice of the functions. Both, within the Experimental and the Control groups, a difference was observed. That is to say, both the Experimental and the Control group showed improvement.

The final question answered at the end of the study was: “Will the learners improve their task achievement by using musicvideos?”. Co-variance Analysis confirmed that there is no difference between the Experimental and the Control groups’ task achievement on the practice of the functions. There was a difference within both the Experimental

and the Control groups. Although both are statistically significant, the improvement in the Control group is higher than the Experimental group.

As it is found, the results did not support the superiority of musicvideos to the pictures or discussion topics. However, it is not possible to claim that the visa versa is true either, since the difference between the Experimental and the Control groups is not found to be significant

When within group differences are considered, the Control group is found to have improved more than the Experimental group have. The reason of which maybe due to picture or discussion topic usage but it can also be due to other reasons as familiarity to the means used in the class or the motivation level of the groups.

At the moment, depending on these results, musicvideos can not be suggested as materials to replace pictures or discussion topics. However, there is no doubt that they can be offered as a supplementary material in speaking classes. As we all know, pictures and discussion topics are widely used in speaking classes in ELT to increase students proficiency and since variety is always motivating in ELT classes, musicvideos can create variety since the students are not often exposed to this kind of visual moving material in their lessons. Thus, musicvideos could be more effective when used together with other means.

Speaking teachers who prefer sticking on some traditional approaches in speaking, such as giving a topic and expecting students to talk, could be encouraged to use pictures and discussion topics in the practice stage, in order to increase the vocabulary use and the accuracy of their students in speaking classes. These implications can be generalized to that, pictures and discussion topics could be used for the students to practice the speaking functions. However, these pictures and

discussion topics should be chosen appropriately by the teacher in order to cover the function that is going to be taught.

## **5.2 Suggestions for Further Research**

This study was limited with ‘compare/contrast’ and ‘agree/disagree’ speaking functions, so, the results cannot be generalized to all speaking functions. For this reason, when musicvideos are used to teach different speaking functions, students' proficiency may change. So, a further study could be on speaking skill to cover the functions of describing people's character, appearance and describing places, likes/dislikes, or argumentation.

Besides, a study could be conducted to find the effect of musicvideos when they are used throughout the whole phases of the lesson.

Musicvideos can be used for different skills and its effect may be tested. It can be used as a background information for all the skills or they maybe used as a facilitator to a warm-up stage and this can be investigated.



## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aufderheide, P. (1986) "Music Videos: The Look of the Sound" Journal of Communication. 36(1).
- Bacon, S.M. and M.D. Finnemann (1990) "A Study of the Attitudes, Motives, and Strategies of University Foreign Language Students and Their Disposition to Authentic Oral and Written Input" The Modern Language Journal. 74(4).
- Brown, G. (1986) "Grading and Professionalism in ELT" P. Meara (Ed) Spoken Language. Great Britain: Centre for Information on Language Teaching and Research.
- Chiaro, D. (1984) "Using Authentic Visual Materials" MET. 12 (2).
- Doğueli, T. (1993) "Directing Listening" Ş. Ülsever (Ed) Developing Aural and Oral Skills. Eskişehir: ETAM A.Ş.
- Dulay, H., M.Burt, S.Krashen (1982) Language Two. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Etiz, F. (1995) "Yabancı Dil Öğretiminde Yararlanılan Teknik Eğitim Araçları ve Özellikle Videonun Kullanımı" DİL Dergisi. 34 (8).
- Gex, J.C. (1987) "Devising Exercises for Use with Film in the Classroom" TESOL Newsletter. 21 (1).

Heinich, R., M. Michael, D.R. James (1973) Instructional Media and the New Technologies of Instruction. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.

Horner, D. (1993) "Classroom Ideas: songs and music" MET. 2(3).

Howatt, A.P.R. (1991) A History of English Language Teaching. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Johnson, R.S. (1993) TQM: Quality Training Process. Wisconsin: ASQC Quality Press.

Klein, K. (1993) "Teaching Young Learners" FORUM. 31(2).

Larsen-Freeman, D. (1986) Techniques and Principles in Language Teaching. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lonergan, J. (1990) Video in Language Teaching. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Murphey, T. (1985) "Teaching for Peak Relevance Using International Pop Music" TESOL Newsletter. 19(6).

..... (1992) Music and Song. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Osman, A.H. and J. McConochie (1978) "If You Feel Like Singing" FORUM.16(4).

“Pop Kliple Türkçe Dersleri”. Yeni Yüzyıl Gazetesi. Oct.13,1996. p.14.

Richards, J.C. and T.S. Rodgers (1986) Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sloboda, J.A. (1994) The Musical Mind: The Cognitive Psychology of Music. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Stern, H.H. (1991) Fundamental Concepts of Language Teaching. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Sun, S. and J. Lull (1986) “The Adolescent Audience for Music Videos and Why They Watch” Journal of Communication. 36(1).

Tomalin, B. (1990) Video, TV & Radio in the English Class. London: Macmillan Publishers Ltd.

Voller P. and S. Widdows (1993) “Feature films as text: a framework for classroom use” ELT Journal. 47(4).

Worth, S. (1981) Studying Visual Communication. Philadelphia: University of Philadelphia.

Zuengler, J. (1993) “Encouraging Learners’ Conversational Participation: The Effect of Content Knowledge” Language Learning. 43(3).

## APPENDIX A

### Musicvideo Evaluation Form for the Experimental Group

How would you rate this musicvideo? 1=very bad, not at all...very good, very much.

1   2   3   4   5   6      SONG1      SONG 2

#### **THE SONG:**

The music

The lyrics

The voice

#### **THE SINGER(S):**

The look

Acting

Dancing

#### **THE CLIP:**

Special effects

Originality/Creativity

Story-line

Costumes and make-up

#### **OVERALL SCORE FOR THE MUSICVIDEO:**

## APPENDIX B

continued



THE PIETA OF BAIDOA

Foreign help is too late for this young mother, who has wrapped her dead child in a burial blanket.

## APPENDIX C

### PRE-TEST AND POST-TEST INTERVIEW TOPICS

#### **COMPARE AND CONTRAST TOPICS:**

Which one is better:

1. living in a small town and/or a big city
2. high schools giving education in English and high schools giving education in Turkish.
3. teaching machines (computers) or teachers
4. living alone or living with your friends

#### **AGREE AND DISAGREE TOPICS:**

1. Everybody should learn English
2. Turkish films are not as successful as American films
3. Students don't have to attend the classes at all.
4. Children get more education inside the classroom rather than outside with their friends.

## APPENDIX D

## Evaluation Forms of the Pre-test and Post-test

## FLUENCY

90 - 100	Comfortable and natural speed and rhythm in everyday contexts. There may be some hesitation when speaking on more abstract topics.
80 - 89	Speaks with minimal hesitation in everyday contexts. Hesitation when discussing abstract topics, but does not demand unreasonable patience of the listener.
70 - 79	Does not hesitate unreasonably in everyday contexts, though may experience some difficulty with more abstract topics.
60 - 69	Hesitates noticeably in everyday contexts. Abstract topics create a problem and demands patience on the part of the listener.
50 - 59	Unacceptable hesitation in everyday contexts.
40 - 49	Speech very disconnected.
0 - 39	Not capable of connected speech.

## GRAMMATICAL ACCURACY

90 - 100	Few if any errors over a wide range of structures, including tenses, prepositions, etc. which are completely sufficient to deal with everyday contexts, and more than adequate for abstract topics
80 - 89	Basic structures are sound though more difficult structures may sometimes be inaccurate.
70 - 79	Basic structures sufficiently controlled to deal adequately with everyday contexts with few verb tense and preposition errors. Difficulty experienced with more complex structures.
60 - 69	Basic structures are sometimes inaccurate in everyday contexts. More complex structures are not often attempted, and are often inaccurate.
50 - 59	Basic structures are often inaccurate in everyday contexts. More complex structures are rarely attempted, or grossly inaccurate.
40 - 49	Gross distortion of basic structures.
0 - 39	No awareness of basic grammatical functions.

## APPENDIX D

continued

### VOCABULARY RESOURCE - APPROPRIATENESS

90 - 100	Wide and appropriate range of vocabulary for everyday tasks, and generally adequate range for discussing more abstract topics.
80 - 89	Shows few gaps in vocabulary for everyday tasks, though more abstract topics reveal weaknesses.
70 - 79	Vocabulary adequate for everyday tasks, though may experience difficulty when discussing abstract topics.
60 - 69	Vocabulary occasionally insufficient to accomplish everyday tasks. Abstract tasks are not usually handled.
50 - 59	Vocabulary often insufficient to accomplish everyday tasks.
40 - 49	Severe lack of vocabulary makes it almost impossible to communicate.
0 - 39	Vocabulary too slight for even minimal communication.

### INTERACTIVE COMMUNICATION - TASK ACHIEVEMENT

90 - 100	Wholly effective at communicating both actively and receptively, both in everyday contexts and on more abstract topics.
80 - 89	Communicates effectively in everyday contexts, but lacks natural responsiveness when dealing with more abstract topics.
70 - 79	Communication level mainly adequate in everyday contexts, but awkward and non-effective on more unexpected ground.
60 - 69	Sometimes does not communicate naturally even in everyday contexts. Does not do well with abstract topics.
50 - 59	Does not communicate naturally even in everyday contexts.
40 - 49	Rarely able to communicate even at a basic level.
0 - 39	Understanding and communication minimal.



## APPENDIX E

### Pre and Post-test Scores of the Experimental and the Control Groups

EXPERIMENT GROUP PRE-TEST SCORES							
Student	Evaluator	Fluency	Accuracy	Vocabulary	Task Ach.	Scores	Total Average
1	E1	70	68	63	68	67	67
	E2	66	65	63	68	66	
2	E1	68	70	68	65	68	67
	E2	62	68	66	68	66	
3	E1	73	68	68	65	69	67
	E2	69	65	60	60	64	
4	E1	74	75	72	70	73	70
	E2	67	68	67	65	67	
5	E1	64	60	58	58	60	55
	E2	52	53	50	45	50	
6	E1	62	60	58	58	60	57
	E2	55	53	52	50	53	
7	E3	45	35	35	40	39	40
	E1	50	43	30	35	40	
8	E3	58	46	58	40	51	52
	E1	58	55	55	40	52	
9	E3	80	70	78	85	78	78
	E1	80	72	70	85	77	
10	E3	70	68	66	75	70	67
	E1	65	60	60	68	63	
11	E3	84	76	75	70	76	77
	E1	85	75	78	73	78	
12	E3	68	68	66	75	69	70
	E1	70	70	67	74	70	
13	E3	92	80	78	75	81	81
	E1	90	80	80	73	81	
14	E4	20	25	30	15	23	22
	E5	20	20	20	20	20	
15	E4	60	53	65	52	58	62
	E5	70	65	65	60	65	
16	E4	48	50	50	50	50	37
	E5	20	25	25	25	24	
17	E3	90	84	80	75	82	82
	E1	87	82	80	73	81	
18	E4	65	64	63	62	64	65
	E5	70	70	65	60	66	
19	E4	66	65	65	64	65	65
	E5	68	65	65	62	65	
20	E4	64	61	60	62	62	61
	E5	62	60	60	58	60	
21	E3	84	65	78	85	78	77
	E1	85	60	70	85	75	
						Average:	62,81

## APPENDIX E

continued

CONTROL GROUP PRE-TEST SCORES							
Student	Evaluator	Fluency	Accuracy	Vocabulary	Task Ach.	Scores	Total Average
1	E5	68	65	63	60	64	64
	E4	64	62	63	63	63	
2	E5	70	70	68	62	68	67
	E4	66	65	65	65	65	
3	E5	30	30	30	35	31	26
	E4	20	19	21	20	20	
4	E5	78	75	75	65	73	66
	E4	58	57	58	57	58	
5	E5	68	65	65	58	64	60
	E4	57	55	59	48	55	
6	E5	65	62	62	60	62	58
	E4	53	50	55	52	53	
7	E2	50	45	40	40	44	43
	E1	45	40	40	40	41	
8	E2	50	50	45	47	48	49
	E1	55	55	45	45	50	
9	E2	53	50	50	53	52	50
	E1	45	50	50	45	48	
10	E2	56	53	53	56	55	54
	E1	58	55	50	45	52	
11	E2	62	65	60	66	63	61
	E1	60	60	55	60	59	
12	E2	62	63	60	63	62	60
	E1	55	60	55	57	57	
13	E2	75	70	72	66	71	69
	E1	70	65	68	60	66	
14	E1	20	20	20	10	18	21
	E3	30	25	25	10	23	
15	E1	55	50	40	20	41	43
	E3	55	60	50	10	44	
16	E1	35	30	20	10	24	28
	E3	35	45	35	10	31	
17	E1	40	35	30	10	29	30
	E3	37	40	37	10	31	
18	E1	35	30	30	10	26	30
	E3	35	40	45	10	33	
19	E1	30	30	20	10	23	26
	E3	35	40	30	10	29	
20	E1	35	30	30	10	26	28
	E3	38	30	38	10	29	
21	E1	50	40	40	20	38	38
	E3	42	45	50	10	37	
22	E1	50	40	30	15	34	35
	E3	45	45	40	10	35	
						Average:	45.72

## APPENDIX E

continued

EXPERIMENTAL GROUP POST-TEST							
Student	Evaluator	Fluency	Accuracy	Vocabulary	Task Ach.	Scores	Total Average
1	E1	78	74	74	76	76	73
	E2	70	67	68	70	69	
2	E1	74	75	70	70	72	74
	E2	73	77	74	75	75	
3	E1	70	65	65	68	67	68
	E2	75	63	65	70	68	
4	E1	78	64	64	76	71	71
	E2	75	67	66	74	71	
5	E1	78	60	60	72	68	69
	E2	75	68	67	70	70	
6	E1	78	68	68	73	72	72
	E2	75	70	68	75	72	
7	E3	57	54	50	52	53	55
	E1	60	57	55	50	56	
8	E3	60	58	55	56	57	61
	E1	68	65	60	65	65	
9	E3	79	72	69	77	74	77
	E1	83	78	75	79	79	
10	E3	48	48	50	50	49	46
	E1	40	40	45	45	43	
11	E3	75	75	75	80	76	77
	E1	78	76	72	83	77	
12	E3	65	58	60	68	63	63
	E1	62	60	60	65	62	
13	E3	77	78	78	85	80	82
	E1	80	82	84	86	83	
14	E4	59	48	50	50	52	55
	E5	60	56	58	58	58	
15	E4	77	69	75	78	75	76
	E5	78	75	76	77	77	
16	E4	65	60	62	65	63	63
	E5	65	58	62	64	62	
17	E3	77	77	78	82	79	79
	E1	76	74	80	80	78	
18	E4	73	73	73	78	74	71
	E5	68	66	66	68	67	
19	E4	78	80	76	82	79	78
	E5	74	78	74	80	77	
20	E4	79	80	78	80	79	77
	E5	73	74	74	77	75	
21	E3	77	78	74	80	77	78
	E1	80	76	76	82	79	
						Average:	69.76

## APPENDIX E

continued

CONTROL GROUP POST-TEST							
Student	Evaluator	Fluency	Accuracy	Vocabulary	Task Ach.	Scores	Total Average
1	E5	70	62	68	72	68	71
	E4	74	73	72	75	74	
2	E5	70	65	70	75	70	73
	E4	76	74	74	76	75	
3	E5	45	40	40	40	41	46
	E4	50	52	50	51	51	
4	E5	67	60	65	62	64	68
	E4	73	71	70	73	72	
5	E5	50	45	45	42	46	51
	E4	60	55	55	55	56	
6	E5	68	67	65	68	67	65
	E4	63	61	61	62	62	
7	E2	44	45	43	45	44	47
	E1	50	52	50	48	50	
8	E2	63	62	64	65	64	63
	E1	59	57	62	65	61	
9	E2	73	70	68	73	71	70
	E1	70	66	64	72	68	
10	E2	75	70	70	73	72	68
	E1	70	62	60	64	64	
11	E2	73	74	73	76	74	69
	E1	60	65	60	70	64	
12	E2	77	78	80	80	79	76
	E1	70	70	70	78	72	
13	E2	80	80	83	85	82	79
	E1	75	75	75	78	76	
14	E1	55	50	45	50	50	54
	E3	60	58	53	55	57	
15	E1	65	55	45	50	54	59
	E3	73	65	55	60	63	
16	E1	72	70	68	68	70	66
	E3	67	60	60	60	62	
17	E1	48	40	40	45	43	49
	E3	60	50	52	55	54	
18	E1	68	58	60	68	64	63
	E3	65	56	65	60	62	
19	E1	50	40	48	40	45	51
	E3	60	55	58	50	56	
20	E1	65	60	63	64	63	61
	E3	62	57	56	56	58	
21	E1	68	63	68	60	65	67
	E3	70	65	70	70	69	
22	E1	72	70	68	70	70	69
	E3	65	65	70	70	68	
						Average:	62.95

## APPENDIX F

### Co-variance Analysis Table Showing the Results of Speaking Proficiency

#### Analysis of Variance

#### UNIQUE sums of squares

All effects entered simultaneously

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	DF	Mean Square	F	Sig of F
Covariates	1463, 319	1	1463, 319	26, 231	,000
X	1463, 319	1	1463, 319	26, 231	,000
Main Effects	, 488	1	, 488	, 009	,926
VAR00001	, 488	1	, 488	, 009	,926
Explained	1961, 207	2	980, 603	17, 578	,000
Residual	2231, 445	40	55, 786		
Total	4192, 651	42	99,825		

43 cases were processed.

0 cases (, 0 pct) were missing.

## APPENDIX G

### Co-variance Analysis Table Showing the Results of Vocabulary

Analysis of Variance  
UNIQUE sums of squares  
All effects entered simultaneously

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	DF	Mean Square	F	Sig of F
Covariates	1598,799	1	1598,799	29,040	,000
X	1598,799	1	1598,799	29,040	,000
Main Effects	1,706	1	1,706	,031	,861
VAR00001	1,706	1	1,706	,031	,861
Explained	1981,831	2	990,916	17,998	,000
Residual	2202,238	40	55,056		
Total	4184,070	42	99,621		

43 cases were processed.

0 cases (, 0 pct) were missing.

## APPENDIX H

### Co-variance Analysis Table Showing the Results of Accuracy

#### Analysis of Variance

#### UNIQUE sums of squares

All effects entered simultaneously

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	DF	Mean Square	F	Sig of F
Covariates	1489,307	1	1489,307	26,713	,000
X	1489,307	1	1489,307	26,713	,000
Main Effects	9,272	1	9,272	,166	,686
VAR00001	9,272	1	9,272	,166	,686
Explained	1950,534	2	975,267	17,493	,000
Residual	2230,083	40	55,752		
Total	4180,616	42	99,538		

43 cases were processed.  
0 cases (, 0 pct) were missing.

## APPENDIX I

### Co-variance Analysis Table Showing the Results of Fluency

Analysis of Variance  
UNIQUE sums of squares  
All effects entered simultaneously

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	DF	Mean Square	F	Sig of F
Covariates	958,812	1	958,812	17,185	,000
X	958,812	1	958,812	17,185	,000
Main Effects	20,432	1	20,432	,366	,548
VAR00001	20,432	1	20,432	,366	,548
Explained	1401,338	2	700,669	12,558	,000
Residual	2231,790	40	55,795		
Total	3633,128	42	86,503		

43 cases were processed.  
0 cases (, 0 pct) were missing.



## APPENDIX J

### Co-variance Analysis Table Showing the Results of Task Achievement

#### Analysis of Variance

UNIQUE sums of squares

All effects entered simultaneously

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	DF	Mean Square	F	Sig of F
Covariates	1620,232	1	1620,232	20,043	,000
X	1620,232	1	1620,232	20,043	,000
Main Effects	1,410	1	1,410	,017	,896
VAR00001	1,410	1	1,410	,017	,896
Explained	2337,189	2	1168,595	14,456	,000
Residual	3233,508	40	80,838		
Total	5570,698	42	132,636		

43 cases were processed.

0 cases (, 0 pct) were missing.