

***A Dynamic Usage-Based Approach:
Using Video Segments in Teaching Listening Skill***

Nguyet Thi Thu Huynh, Da Nang University of Foreign Language Studies, Vietnam
Hong Thi Phuong Nguyen, Can Tho University, Vietnam

The Asian Conference on Language Learning 2016
Official Conference Proceedings

Abstract

The National Foreign Language 2020 Project in Vietnam has advocated a shift from traditional Grammar-Translation Method to Communicative Language Teaching (CLT). In line with CLT, a dynamic usage-based perspective to teaching a foreign language focuses on meaning. This approach provides plenty of authentic input and is believed to raise learners' motivation. The current study was conducted to investigate if a dynamic usage-based approach enhanced EFL learners' proficiency. Two classes of first year English students (39 students each) at the Department of English, College of Foreign Languages, Da Nang, Viet Nam participated in this study. The experimental group learnt English with repeated movie segments taken from two movies, 'Mean Girls' (2004) and 'Confession of a Shopaholic' (2009). They focused on listening and delayed speaking. The control group was taught with a regular textbook in which the four language skills were practiced with an emphasis on speaking. The data was collected by means of two standardized PET tests, which are pre-test and post-test, and analyzed by One-way ANOVA and Paired samples t-tests. The findings showed that the experimental group had better development than the Control group in general. The results of this study suggested that a DUB approach affected the students' language ability positively.

Keywords: dynamic, usage-based approach, listening

iafor

The International Academic Forum

www.iafor.org

Introduction

In recent years, the Vietnamese Ministry of Education and Training has advocated the Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) approach to second language teaching. This approach is a meaning-based approach that allows authentic communication in class. It is hoped that the CLT will help Vietnamese learners of English to be able to communicate confidently and fluently in English. However, it is a fact that many high school and college students in Vietnam still have difficulty expressing themselves in English.

To find a better teaching approach that can foster the learning, we tried a new method that was very much in line with the CLT. The new approach is a Dynamic Usage-Based (DUB) approach. This approach focuses on meaning and authentic communication. According to Kemmer and Barlow (2000), usage – based model is the exposure to numerous usage events that results in emerging a user’s language. One of the key statements of usage-based approaches is that the primary purpose of language is communicative, as Tomasello (2003) argued “language structure emerges from language use”. That means the more exposure to language learners have, the more language forms in their mind. Moreover, it is emphasized in the theory of CLT that the authentic materials and the exposure to language play important roles in language teaching. In the light of those mentioned theories, this research makes use of the theory of input: authentic input and repetition of input.

The focus of this research was to investigate the effects of video segments on learners’ listening skill. The use of videos instead of audio recording originated from the idea of Balatova (1994), suggesting that videos had greater positive effects on learners’ comprehension of the story than audio materials did thanks to means of action or body language. Also, inspired by the research on DST by Nguyen (2013), which used video as a source of authentic input and got some considerably positive results for the learner, we carried out this study as a simplified replication. Within the scope of this research, we will mainly focus on learners’ development of listening skill after they are taught with video segments.

Theoretical Background

A Dynamic Usage-Based Approach

There have been a number of theories that are considered usage-based or emergentist and compatible with a dynamic system theory (DST) approach: cognitive linguistics, emergentism, connectionist theories, grammaticalization theory, and usage-based L1 acquisition (Verspoor et al., 2011). Two of them focus on how learner acquires language. The ‘emergentist’ theory examines if complexities can emerge in language through simple iteration. The ‘usage-based’ approach focuses on linguistics communication. Within the scope of this study, we briefly mention some aspects of DST and DUB approach that are applied in this research.

Traditional linguistics used to consider input in language development as a one-way stream of information from the outside to the inside of a system. It is stable and not influenced by the fact that it is in interaction with another cognitive and social system. However, de Bot (2005) argued that from a DST perspective, there is a continuous

interaction between different sub-systems of language. They interact with each other, interconnect and change overtime. Originated from DST, Dynamic Usage-Based linguistics was born, which could be summarized in the two aphorisms: 'meaning is use' and 'structure emerges from use' (Tomasello, 2009). The former represents an approach to the functional or semantic dimension of linguistic communication, which focuses on how people use linguistic conventions to achieve social end. The latter was made explicit by Langacker (2000), which believes that language structures emerge from individual acts of language use and through repeated language use. That means the more learners are exposed to language and try to use it, the more likely they are able to use it as conventional units. To date, there have been a number of studies and articles about principles or characteristics of a DUB approach and its implications. Based on the characteristics of a DUB approach to second language teaching, and the positive effects of using video in class, we decided to conduct this study to examine the effectiveness of a DUB approach in practice.

One of the characteristics of DUB is that it focuses on input. As Richards, Platt, & Weber put it, input is "language which a learner hears or receives and from which he or she can learn" (Richard et al., 1989, p. 143). This suggests before we expect output from learners, they should be exposed to valid input frequently. Therefore, in the CLT method, we should put learners into authentic and meaningful communicative contexts instead of providing them sample contexts that are un-communicative so that they could get the meaning out of it. Authentic input is defined as real-life language materials, not those which are designed on purpose for teaching (Wallace, 1992), so they must be real language produced by native speakers, which is informative and socio-linguistically appropriate. Therefore, besides the material taken from the textbook for reading and writing sessions, we chose relevant video segments from entertaining movies familiar with learners' life and their prior knowledge to carry out this experiment. The movie language was also considered; it had to be neither too easy nor too difficult for the learners to understand the movies.

The second characteristic of DUB is frequency of input. When applying video in class activities, teachers have to make use of it. That means it should be shown over and over again, and be replayed in a lot of relevant activities designed to exploit it. Thanks to the visual aids and familiar topics of the movies, learners will find it more motivating to engage in class activities. In line with this characteristic, Smiskova and Verspoor (2012) zoomed in the development of chunks in sub-groups of high input and low-input learners. Results showed that high-input learners developed a greater range of chunk types. While low-input learners show a random like variability without clear developmental stages, the high input learners show this random-like variability early on, but after a year there is a rather sudden increase of variability and then a new stage.

Another characteristic of DUB is the exposure to authentic usage – based events and chunks. Froehlich observes that: "Foreign language education nowadays has to be fun" (Froehlich, 1999, p. 150-151). He suggests that L2 learners today like learning in authentic contexts, where they can have a chance to see and hear L2 native speakers simultaneously in an entertaining way. A good movie is both relaxing to watch and engaging to learn the language because of its near-everyday natural language and meaningful context exchanges in conversations between characters. Chunks are another aspect that should be noticed in language classrooms. Instead of learning

isolated words, DUB exposes learners to formulaic language or combinations of words that frequently go together to help learners be more natural and idiomatic in using the language. This characteristic of authentic usage of language was one of the reasons why we utilized movies in our study.

Although exposure to second language plays an important role in language teaching, we cannot omit the role of L1 as a scaffold to get meaning across. While being exposed to second language, learners need to understand its meaning. Along with visual aids, contexts, or examples, teacher also can use L1 as an effective tool. In contrast with the idea that using L1 in L2 classes may cause negative effects, several studies have been carried out to prove the effect of using L1 in L2 classes. All of them have shown that L1 does help improve the comprehension and acquisition of L2 in terms of abstract vocabulary and complex grammar points. In other words, by using L1, teachers can enable students to catch up with and comprehend the lesson instead of getting lost or forming fossilizations. Thus, they may feel more engaged and motivated. However, the amount of L1 used in class must be considered depending on the learners, the lessons and the specific social settings.

Previous studies

Several studies investigated the effect of a DUB approach to second language teaching. First of all, Herron, Morris, Secules, and Curtis (1994) compared the effect of video-based versus text-based instruction in the foreign language classroom. Participants were first and second-year students at Emory University, who learned French as a foreign language. They were divided into two groups, with 14 students each (n=14). One was labeled as Control group, and other was named as Experimental group. The Control group was instructed by means of texts, reading texts aloud, cultural notes, cultural information and vocabulary. The Experimental group learned French by watching drama once a week. Then they were asked to do the comprehension questions as homework. After that, they were shown the explanation sections of the drama two days per week. While showing the video, the teacher stopped it every one or two minutes to check comprehension, or occasionally ask for repetition of key features, grammar points or discussion of cultural differences. The two groups were then tested by five on-going tests during two semesters. While the tests in the first semester didn't show any significant difference between the two groups, the final test did show that Experimental Group had significant higher scores than Control Group in listening and writing. This indicates that the use of videos does not have significant effect immediately; instead, learners needs time to internalize the language.

The second empirical study by Gruba (1999) investigated the role of digital video media in second language listening comprehension, and how it influences comprehension process. The study was conducted at Japanese Department of The University of Melbourne with two stages. First, the pilot research was designed to explore the unsolved issues in the theoretical background. This pilot study consisted of four participants, whose levels of proficiency ranged from beginning to advanced levels. The purpose of the pilot study was to set out a preliminary seven – category framework of listener interactions with the digital videotexts. In the main study, twelve non-native Japanese speakers at upper-intermediate level were selected. The participants provided retrospective verbal reports while they interacted with the

videotext and engaged with videotext during self-directed responses to open-ended task demands. The finding results pointed to a view that visual elements work in a number of ways that go beyond merely 'supporting' verbal elements; they are better thought of as integral resources to comprehension whose influence shifts from primary to secondary importance as a listener develops a mature understanding of the videotext.

An article by Canning-Wilson (2000) generalized some practical aspects of using video in the foreign language classroom. The researcher mentioned her previous large-scale research where learners were found to prefer entertainment movies to documentaries or pedagogic films. Also, she summarized the research by Herron, Hanley and Cole (1995), which concluded that using videos helps develop comprehension scores for students learning French by its contexts. Nevertheless, she suggested some key questions that teachers should take into consideration if they want to apply videos in Foreign or Second language classes.

The latest research, which also examined the use of video in foreign language teaching, especially from a DUB perspective, was conducted by Nguyen (2013). The aim of the research was to investigate the effectiveness of a DUB approach to second language teaching. A total of 163 first-year and second-year Vietnamese students from seven intact classes participated in the study. They were at low level of English and were divided into Control Group (three classes) and Experimental Group (four classes). Both of them took the same course (General English 1) at Can Tho University, but the teaching materials were different. The material used in the Control group class was a kind of task-based textbook, while the Experimental group watched two popular English – spoken movies. Four teachers acted as instructors. Two of them taught both Control group and Experimental group, another was just in charge of Control group and the last one just taught Experimental group. The results based on the pre-test scores, post-test score, the Willingness to Communicate and Self-confidence (WTC-SC) questionnaire, and a Language exposure questionnaire. Data were analyzed using T-tests and Anova Tests. The results showed that the Experimental group, which was exposed to video clips had greater improvement in their scores in most examined aspects. This suggested that the movie DUB approach was successful in enhancing the learner's general proficiency and self-confidence, and starting to familiarize the learner with the use of authentic language.

In conclusion, previous studies showed that the use of videos in teaching English had positive effects on learners. While Herron, Morris, Secules, and Curtis (1994) suggested that the effect of using video needs time to prove, Gruba (1999) found out that watching video helped learners understand the videotext better. Moreover, the kinds of video that are used in teaching are also important. From the result of Canning-Wilson's research (2000), we found that entertaining movies can get more attention of learners than documentaries. Last but not least, Nguyen (2013) conducted an experiment that used video segment from a DUB perspective. The results showed that enough authentic input could bring positive effect on learners' language proficiency.

The Study

This study wanted to see whether the use of video segments positively affected the listening skill of English as a foreign language learners. To this end, a pretest-posttest quantitative study was carried out.

Sample, materials and measurements

Two classes of freshmen participated in this study. They were English majors at English Department (ED), College of Foreign Languages, Da Nang University. Each class consisted of 39 students, who had learnt English at school for seven years and had had little contact with English outside class. Most participants were female.

The first year students in ED were trained with the goal that they would be qualified for the CEFR B1 level at the end of their first school year. To this end, the textbooks used in the course are 'Solutions Pre-Intermediate' (Oxford University Press – 2007) and PET Results (Oxford University Press – 2010). In Experimental Group, the listening part of these books was replaced by movie segments taken from 'Mean girls' (2004) and 'Confession of a Shopaholic' (2009). Since this is a quantitative research, the process of collecting data was adopted by testing. The tests used in the research were Preliminary English Tests (PET), which were relevant to level B1 (CEFR). There were two different tests applied in the experiment procedure. One was pre - test, taken at the beginning of the semester. The other was post - test, taken at the end of the semester. Each test included four skills: reading, writing, listening and speaking. The pre-test was taken from the Cambridge Handbook for Teachers, the post-test was designed by Office for Testing and Quality Assurance as PET format. These tests met the requirements of validity and the reliability of ISO 9001:2008 standard (Cambridge English Preliminary: Handbook for teachers – p. 2).

The experiment took place for one semester (15 weeks). Both classes were instructed by one instructor who was the researcher herself. In Control Class, students were taught as teacher's guide provided by the ED' Science Council. That means they had to use inputs from textbooks, and deliver outputs as required. In Experimental Class, video segments from entertainment movies as mentioned above were applied as replacement for pedagogic audio recordings. The researcher chose some meaningful and humorous segments from these movies to show students. Other input resources for reading and writing were used as usual.

Procedures of using video segments in Experimental Class

The procedure of using video follows steps explained by Nguyen (2013) and was slightly modified to suit the samples in the research.

Step 1. Students were provided with some unfamiliar words or useful expressions, idioms that they would meet in the scene. Since the students in this class majored in English, in some cases this step may be skipped.

Step 2. Students watched the movie segment for the first time. Before watching, teacher didn't ask them anything. Students just watched the segment without subtitles.

Step 3. Teacher asked them some general questions about what had happened in the scene, or asked them to guess the gist of the scene. In this step teacher may ask some more questions to elicit the answers.

Step 4. Students watched the segment again for several times. The number of replay depends on the complexity of the segment. This time, students were asked to focus on what the characters said. Teacher may ask some questions that related to the callouts, for instant, “What is the rule of this class?” or “How did the girl feel on her first day at school?”

Step 5. Students were showed and handed out the subtitles of the segments. Teacher read the lines or words on the power point slides. Students watched the segments one or two more times with subtitles. While they were watching, they were reminded to pay attention to the pronunciation and intonation of the characters. In the early part of the experiment, they were just asked to repeat and imitate the oral features as the characters. Afterwards, in later periods, they were asked to dub the segments, or practice role- playing.

As a Usage-based approach, grammar did not play an important role in this class. Instead, the instructor tried to expose students to as many authentic inputs as possible. In the very first classes, the instructor didn't force students to produce any speaking output. Instead, they just practiced some simple forms of speaking such as dubbing the segments with the transcript from in their handouts. Then, they were gradually asked to do role-playing as the movies' gist or role-playing by their own dialogue in the same situations in later classes. Unlike the Control Group who had to practice using some phrases provided by the textbook; the Experimental Group had plenty of room for creativity by making new dialogues and acted like actors and actresses in specific topic as the segments, such as making new friends, invitation, interviewing for a job, talk show... They were elicited and encouraged to speak and talk as much as possible without being corrected. At the end of each period, the instructor generalized some common errors made during the post-listening session (indeed speaking session) to remind students not to let them become systematic errors. It is not an inattention to speaking practice, indeed, as Nguyen (2013) cited from Postovsky (1974), there were positive effects when output was delayed, therefore, the speaking skill should not be forced or practiced at early stages.

Data Collection and Analysis

Except for the speaking skill that was graded instantly, other skills of both tests were graded at the end of the experiment. Different raters were invited to assure the objectiveness of the scores. The grading scale adopted in ED is 10 – point. Although the test tested four language skills, within the range of this research, mainly the listening skill scores were reported in this paper.

The independent variables were the method of teaching (with or without movie), and the dependent variables were the tests' scores. The score we focused on was that of the listening test because we applied a DUB approach in this session. However, to have a general view of the effect of DUB approach on students' development, we also examined and analyzed other scores like Speaking, Reading and Writing. First, we compared the pre-test scores of two classes to see if their initial level was the same.

Secondly, we compared their post-test scores to see if the phenomenon found in the previous step remained or not. Then, we analyzed them separately to investigate their inner development. Data were analyzed using One-way ANOVA and the Paired samples T-tests with relevant formulated hypotheses. The decision level (alpha error) was set at .05.

Results

The initial English proficiency

At first, both groups had to take the same pre-test to investigate their initial English proficiency, especially listening skill. Their gained scores were then analyzed by one-way ANOVA. The pre-test result (scores) was the dependent variable, and the type of group (Experimental or Control) was independent variable. The null hypothesis was that there was no difference between the two groups. The alpha error was set at $p < .05$.

A One-way ANOVA on pre-test of listening skill showed that there was significant difference between the two groups, $F(1,76) = 4.36$, $p = .04$. In other words, the Control group was more proficient than the Experimental Group. Moreover, based on the SD result, the Control group was slightly more homogeneous than the Experimental group.

Table 1 Means and Standard Deviations of the Pre-test Listening Scores of two groups

Group	N	Mean	SD	Minimum	Maximum
Experimental	39	4.25	1.63	1.2	8.0
Control	39	4.95	1.31	1.6	7.2

Note. Significant at the $p < .05$ level

Regarding other skills, there was another significant difference in reading skill, in which Control group also defeated Experimental group, $F(1,76) = 9.37$, $p = .003$. The remaining skills, speaking and writing did not record any considerable difference, $F(1,76) = .79$; $p = .38$, and $F(1,76) = .77$, $p = .78$ respectively.

An analysis on the average scores of the two groups was made to have a general view of the results. As expected from the component scores, the Control Group significantly outperformed the Experimental Group, $F(1,76) = 5.31$, $p = .02$. In other words, in this step, we can correctly reject the null hypothesis (H_0) that there is no difference between the two groups in the pre-test. Instead, we can accept the H_1 , which is the Control group has a higher initial level of language proficiency than the Experimental group.

Table 2: Means and Standard Deviations of the Pre-test's Average Scores of two groups

Group	N	Mean	SD	Minimum	Maximum
Experimental	39	4.73	.66	3.4	6.2
Control	39	5.05	.55	4.0	6.3

Note. Significant at the $p < .05$ level

The between-group difference after using DUB approach

The one-way ANOVA was used again to analyze the scores gained in the post-test, which is indeed their final-term examination, to track their development. Although the Control group's initial level of proficiency outweighed that of Experimental group, in post-test, this gap seemed to be narrowed. In the average scores gained by the two groups, there were no considerable difference between the two group, $F(1,76) = 1.28$, $p = .26$. In other words, the Experimental Group seemed to catch up with the Control Group. From this statistical result, we cannot reject the second null hypothesis (H_0), instead, we must accept that the gap between them is no longer notable.

Table 3: Means and Standard Deviations of the Post-test's Average Scores of two groups

Group	N	Mean	SD	Minimum	Maximum
Experimental	39	6.93	.74	5.5	8.9
Control	39	7.12	.76	5.9	8.9

Note. $p > .05$

The component scores came out with some interesting results. In comparison with Control group, the gained results showed no noticeable effects of a DUB approach on listening skill of Experimental group. In the average scores of the listening's post-test, the Control Group once again significantly outdistanced the Experimental Group, $F(1,76) = 6.83$, $p = .01$. The results from reading skill witnessed the same phenomenon, $F(1,76) = 20.71$, $p = .00$, with a more remarkable difference. As for speaking skill, its results had no change in which Experimental Group maintained the same level with Control Group, $F(1,76) = .172$, $p = .68$. However, the Experimental Group surpassed the Control Group in the writing skill, $F(1,76) = 14.57$, $p = .00$. Table 4 shows means and standard deviations of the Pre-test and Post-test's Scores of the two groups.

Table 4: Means and Standard Deviations of the Pre-test and Post-test's Scores of two groups

Skill	Group	N	Pre-test Mean (SD)	p-value	Post-test Mean (SD)	p-value
Listening	Experimental	39	4.25 (1.63)	.04	5.41 (1.29)	.01
	Control	39	4.95 (1.31)		6.22 (1.43)	
Speaking	Experimental	39	3.54 (.97)	.38	7.04 (.66)	.68
	Control	39	3.33 (1.14)		7.11 (.85)	
Reading	Experimental	39	5.90 (1.38)	.003	7.75 (.92)	.00
	Control	39	6.17 (.90)		8.64 (.79)	
Writing	Experimental	39	5.20 (.31)	.78	7.48 (1.08)	.00
	Control	39	5.17 (.34)		6.50 (1.17)	
Average score	Experimental	39	4.73 (.66)	.02	6.93 (.74)	.26
	Control	39	5.05 (.55)		7.13 (.78)	

Since the initial levels of language proficiency of the two groups were different, which was proved to affect the task outcomes (Lesser, 2004), the between-group comparison didn't seem to reflect exactly and thoroughly the effect of DUB approach on Experimental group. Thus, Paired samples T-tests were used to examine the internal development of each group.

The internal development of each group

Paired samples T-test was used to track the development of the same group over the time.

As expected, Control Group gained more in post-test than pretest in all skills. A paired-samples t-test showed that the difference was significant. In terms of overall development, on average, Control Group performed better in the post-test (M= 7.13, SE = .12) than in the pre-test (M = 5.05, SE = .09). This difference was significant, $t(38) = 16.73$, $p < .001$. The results are summarized in Table 5:

Table 5: Means and Standard Deviations of proficiency gain scores of Control group

Skill	N	Pre-test Mean (SD)	Post-test Mean (SD)	Gain Mean (SD)
Listening	39	4.95 (1.31)	6.22 (1.43)	1.26 (1.81)
Speaking	39	3.33 (1.15)	7.11 (.85)	3.78 (1.13)
Reading	39	6.71 (.90)	8.64 (.79)	1.93 (.99)
Writing	39	5.17 (.34)	6.50 (1.17)	1.33 (1.13)
Average score	39	5.05 (.55)	7.13 (.78)	2.08 (.78)

The paired samples t-test also recorded a considerable development of the Experimental Group over the time of the experiment. In fact, they had higher scores in all tested skills. In general, the Experimental Group performed better in the post-test (M = 6.93, SE = .12) than in the pre-test (M = 4.73, SE = .11). This difference was significant, $t(38) = 20.72$, $p < .001$, suggesting that the Experimental Group did have considerable development after being instructed with a DUB approach.

Table 6: Means and Standard Deviations of proficiency gain scores of Experimental group

Skill	N	Pre-test Mean (SD)	Post-test Mean (SD)	Gain Mean (SD)
Listening	39	4.25 (1.63)	5.41 (1.29)	1.16 (2.00)
Speaking	39	3.54 (.97)	7.03 (.66)	3.49 (1.04)
Reading	39	5.90 (1.38)	7.75 (.92)	1.86 (1.38)
Writing	39	5.20 (.31)	7.48 (1.08)	2.28 (.99)
Average score	39	4.73 (.66)	6.93 (.74)	2.21 (.66)

As can be seen in Table 6, the overall gain mean of the Experimental Group was higher than that of the Control Group. It was resulted from the great leap of the writing skill. For the remaining skills (listening, speaking and reading), the Control Group seemed to have slightly higher gain score than Experimental Group.

Discussion

Factors that affect the results

The first factor was the format of the test. All students did not know the format of the PET test until they were introduced only one week before the pre-test. In addition, most of them were not used to listening and speaking skill, thus, they could not perform well in the pre-test. After being trained in the course, they can master the

format and such communicating skills as speaking and listening. As a matter of fact, both Control Group and Experimental Group scored much greater in post-test than in pre-test.

When carrying out the DUB approach in Experimental Group, the instructor asked students if they would rather learn with movie segments or learn with traditional recording, 32/39 (82%) students agreed that watching video was much more interesting. This could have led to the greater improvement of this group, in comparison with Control Group. This result met what Canning-Wilson (2000) concluded: 'entertainment movie segments are far more interesting than pedagogic materials.'

In the Experiment Group where students learned listening skill with movie segments, the videos were repeated for a number of times so language could have come naturally into learners' mind. The entertaining movie could have been another advantage: it helped learners to be motivated to watch to follow the story line. In the Control Glass, the participants listened to the CDs only twice or, occasionally, three times. This limited time may have hindered them from internalize the language in their mind. In the Experimental Glass, students excitedly asked the instructor to replay the videos for a number of times so that they can identify the gist of the segments. Moreover, those segments could be used in post - listening activities without any boredom. As explained, instructors made use of the videos in speaking activities: intonation and pronunciation training, dubbing or role-playing, etc. All students appeared to be eager to participate in the post-listening activities, which were, indeed, kinds of speaking practice.

The use of authentic input is considered as a factor that contributed to the improvement of Experimental group. Watching movie segments helped them to get used to different accents of the speakers. Moreover, when they watched the movie segments, they focused more on the intonations and facial expression of the actors/actresses, which was useful for their speaking skill. Actually, in those practice time, students were asked to imitate what they had seen on the screen like the characters' gestures, intonation in each sentence that convey an implication or purpose, as well as facial expressions in each scene. All of these helped students have more natural speaking style unconsciously as noticed by the researcher.

Another possible factor that affects the outcomes of the students would be the objectiveness and subjectiveness in the assessment procedure. While the listening and reading skill were tested entirely based on fixed keys, which ensures the objectiveness and accuracy in assessment, the writing and speaking skill relied much on markers or examiners' condition. Thus, their results, to some extent, were assessed with some subjective sensation and produced some unexpected results. According to Hammer (2007), receptive skills and productive skills interact and support each other in many ways. More specific, what we hear and see strongly influence what we say or write. However, surprisingly, the Experimental Group outperformed the Control Group on writing skill while it performed worse on listening and reading skills – receptive skills. Although it might be resulted from the input they got in the listening classes, the subjectiveness of the assessment might have get involved.

The initial level of English proficiency is another factor that is worth concerning. As mentioned above, Leiser (2004) found that there is a relationship between learners' proficiency and their outcomes. Language proficiency affects the amount of attention that learners pay to the form, the types of form they attend to and the extent of their success in solving the language problems they meet. Specifically, those who have higher levels of proficiency are more ready to notice grammatical features (which are very important in terms of speaking and writing assessment). This finding helped to partly explain the development of the Control Group and Experimental Group in this research. The Control group, which could be treated as more proficient, was more likely to improve their English skills, whilst the Experimental Group, which was less proficient, found it more difficult to gain new grammar forms as well as solving the language problem. On theory, they needed more effort to catch up with and to surpass the Control Group because they had a lower starting point. In this experiment, after being treated in the same time with Control Group by different methods, the Experimental Group scored nearly the same as those of the Control group. Although they didn't beat the Control Group's scores, their distance seemed to be narrowed as they had higher gain score. This suggested that they had faster development rate than Control Group.

In addition, the two groups' language ability was tested by only two tests at the beginning and end of the research. It could not reflect their development over the time of experiment. As mentioned in session 2, during the development of language learners, there are usually phase shift between two attractor states. We do not know exactly when students in this experiment reached their attractor state. Thus, the final test may possibly have fallen on either their high or low peak, and did not perfectly demonstrate their language development.

Finally, because of the delay in output, learners' speaking skill performance did not record any significant improvement. It is suggested that the experiment should take place in a longer period, about two semesters upwards, to give students time to adopt authentic input, which is long enough for authentic input from listening to come to their long-term memory so that output could be produced with considerable development.

Conclusion

In general, this research succeeded in finding the answer to the research question. Although the statistical results did not produce ideal results that definitely suggests that the use of movie segments from a DUB perspective has noticeable positive effect on learners' development, considering all factors and relating theories, the results in this research does suggest the fact that the movie method results in the greater development of students. Therefore, this could be treated as a case study at UFLS to indicate the effectiveness of this method. Further research in a larger scale is suggested if shortcomings in terms of testing process, facilities and the duration of the experiment are to be minimized.

References:

- Arthur, P. (1999). Why use video? A teacher's perspective. *Visual Support in English Language Teaching*, 2(4), 4.
- de Bot, K., Lowie, W., & Verspoor, M. (2005). *Second language acquisition: An advanced resource book*. London: Routledge.
- Froehlich, J. (1999). Language lab - Multimedialab - Future lab. In G. Hogan-Brun & U. O. H. Jung (Eds.), *Media, multimedia, omnimedia* (149-155). Frankfurt: Peter Language Publishers.
- Gass, S. M., & Mackey, A. (2006). Input, interaction and output: An overview. *AILA Review*, 19, 3-17.
- Gruba, P. A. (1999). *The role of digital video media in second language listening comprehension*. The University of Melbourne, Melbourne.
- Hammer, J. 2007. *The Practice of English Language Teaching* (4th ed.). London: Pearson.
- Herron, C., Morris, M., Secules, T., & Curtis, L. (1995). A comparison study of the effects of video-based versus text-based instruction in the foreign language classroom. *The French Review*, 68(5), 775-795.
- Nguyen, T.P.H. (2013). *A dynamic usage-based approach to second language teaching*. Unpublished PhD dissertation. University of Groningen, Groningen.
- Krashen, S. (1984b). *The input hypothesis: Issues and implications*. London: Longman.
- Langacker, R. W. (2000). A dynamic usage-based model. In M. Barlow & S. Kemmer (Eds.), *Usage-based models of language* (1-63). Stanford: CSLI.
- Leeser, M. J. (2004). Learner proficiency and focus on form during collaborative dialogue. *Language Teaching Research*, 8, 55-81.
- Long, M. (1983). Linguistic and conversational adjustments to non-native speakers. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 5, 177-193.
- Richards, J., Platt, J., & Weber, H. (1989). *Longman Dictionary of Applied Linguistics*. Hong Kong: Longman.
- Spada, N. (2006). Communicative language teaching: Current status and future prospects. In J. Cummins & C. Davis (Eds.), *Kluwer handbook of English language teaching*. Amsterdam: Kluwer Publications.
- Tomasello, M. (2009). The usage-based theory of language acquisition. In E. Bavin (Ed.), *Handbook of Child Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Verspoor, M., Lowie, W., & van Dijk, M. (2008). Variability in Second Language Development From a Dynamic Systems Perspective. *The modern Language Journal* 92, 214-231.

Verspoor, M., de Bot, K., & Lowie, W. (Eds). (2011). *A dynamic approach to second language development: Methods and techniques*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Verspoor, M. H., & Smiskova, H. (2012). Foreign language development from a dynamic usage-based perspective. In, R. M. Manchón (Ed.), *L2 writing development: Multiple perspectives* (17-46). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Wallace, C. (1992). *Reading*. Oxford: Oxford University Press

Textbooks

Cambridge English Preliminary: *Handbook for teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Quintana, J. (2010). *PET Result*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Falla, T., & Davies, P. A. (2007). *Solutions Pre-Intermediate Student's book*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Movies

Mean girls (2004)

Confessions of a Shopaholic (2009)

Correspondence email: htnguyet@ufl.udn.vn