










THE IMPACT OF YOUGLISH ON ENGLISH SPEAKING  
PROFICIENCY IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Miliam Quispe-Vargas<sup>1\*</sup> , Kevin Mario Laura-De La Cruz<sup>2</sup> , Fabiola Talavera-Mendoza<sup>3</sup> ,  
Gabriela Manzur-Vera<sup>1</sup> , Gerber Pérez-Postigo<sup>3</sup> , Osbaldo Turpo-Gebera<sup>3</sup> ,  
Rocio Diaz-Zavala<sup>3</sup> 

<sup>1</sup>Universidad Nacional Jorge Basadre Grohmann (Peru)

<sup>2</sup>Universidad Privada de Tacna (Peru)

<sup>3</sup>Universidad Nacional de San Agustín de Arequipa (Peru)

Corresponding author: [mquispev@unjbg.edu.pe](mailto:mquispev@unjbg.edu.pe)

[kenlaura@upt.pe](mailto:kenlaura@upt.pe), [ftalaveram@unsa.edu.pe](mailto:ftalaveram@unsa.edu.pe), [gmanzurv@unjbg.edu.pe](mailto:gmanzurv@unjbg.edu.pe),  
[gperezpo@unsa.edu.pe](mailto:gperezpo@unsa.edu.pe), [oturpo@unsa.edu.pe](mailto:oturpo@unsa.edu.pe), [rdiaz@unsa.edu.pe](mailto:rdiaz@unsa.edu.pe)

Received May 2023

Accepted August 2023

### Abstract

The era of globalization and information and knowledge in which we find ourselves requires Higher Education to develop English-speaking proficiency in its students to adequately respond to academic and occupational challenges, taking advantage of the virtues of the variety of resources offered by technology. YouGlish is an online oral dictionary whose features can be leveraged for the development of English-speaking proficiency. This study aims to determine the impact of using YouGlish on English speaking proficiency in its subskills of fluency, grammatical appropriateness, pronunciation, communicative interaction, and vocabulary. The research was of quasi-experimental design and was carried out with a sample of 38 students, 19 students in the Control Group and 19 students in the Experimental Group, from a national university in Peru. For data collection, a pre-test and a post-test were applied concerning English-speaking proficiency, and a perception questionnaire on the use of YouGlish was also used. The arithmetic mean indicates that there was an improvement of 45.26 points using YouGlish when comparing the input and output tests. Thus, concluding with an increase in English-speaking proficiency among university students.

**Keywords** – English language, Speaking proficiency, YouGlish, Video.

### To cite this article:

Quispe-Vargas, M., Laura-De La Cruz, K.M., Talavera-Mendoza, F., Manzur-Vera, G., Pérez-Postigo, G., Turpo-Gebera, O., & Diaz-Zavala, R. (2024). The impact of YouGlish on English speaking proficiency in higher education. *Journal of Technology and Science Education*, 14(2), 349-362. <https://doi.org/10.3926/jotse.1710>

-----

## 1. Introduction

English is a global language, the learning of which is necessary to fulfill communicative purposes (Arroba & Acosta, 2021; Göktürk, Çalışkan & Öztürk, 2020) and access to greater opportunities in international trade, studies, scientific activities (Iman, 2017; Sirisrimangkorn, 2018), technology, industry, entertainment, and others (Iman, 2017). Many countries recognize it as key for development and have been implementing actions for its learning (Dewi, Kultsum & Armadi, 2016; EF English Proficiency Index - EF EPI, 2022).

The Peruvian government has also shown its interest in promoting the development of English communicative skills: reading, writing, speaking, and listening. However, speaking is probably one of the skills less worked on and should be encouraged more since it is considered as the means of oral interaction between people (Hakim, 2016; Iman, 2017). The British Council study (2015), shows that most Peruvian students manifested a better perception of their reading and writing skills, more than half (53%) considered their oral skills as poor/basic, and only between three and four percent considered it fluent. According to the EF English Proficiency Index - EF EPI (2022), Peru ranks 51st out of 111 countries, placing it at an average level. Although the *Inglés Puertas al Mundo* National Plan was subsequently implemented, the study by Escobar-Mamani & Gómez-Arteta (2020) shows that deficiencies have been found in English speaking skills in students.

Speaking is one of the necessary and important competencies for the oral and dynamic interaction of participants (Asan & Zuhail, 2020; Hakim, 2016; Hismanoglu & Çolak, 2019). Through it, ideas and emotions can be communicated clearly, fluently, and coherently (Göktürk et al., 2020; Laura-De La Cruz, Gebera & Copaja, 2022; Ministerio de Educación, 2017), using grammatical structures and vocabulary correctly, pronouncing correctly and using an understandable accent so that a conversation can be maintained (Thornbury, 2002). This is where the teacher's role is valuable because it will help the learner overcome any difficulties in speaking English; and at the same time, model pronunciation, intonation, and word stress to provide opportunities for oral production, and perform feedback (Fu & Yang, 2019).

Research conducted for the development of oral expression has revolved around a few key aspects. The first ones are the studies that have emphasized collaborative work activities (literature circles, creative theater) that have fostered the atmosphere in the classroom and the motivation that the learner receives. According to these studies, when students feel that their ideas and opinions are valued and approved, they generate enthusiasm and confidence in their abilities (Kumar, 2021; Nget, Pansri & Poohongthong, 2020). There is a decrease in anxiety because of a less threatening learning environment, and the promotion of cooperative behaviors, commitment, willingness, and solidarity among peers, which allows them to achieve greater participation when speaking (Arta, 2019). The second is research that has used instructional activities (task-based, discussion, and communicative activities) to develop fluency, grammar, pronunciation, comprehension, vocabulary (Iman, 2017), accent, appropriateness (Al-Garni & Almuhammadi, 2019) and interaction (Nget et al., 2020), enabling a group or paired conversation in which participants benefit from information sharing (Al-Garni & Almu-Hammadi, 2019).

It is recognized that there are numerous studies with positive results for English-speaking development. However, these studies correspond to geographical contexts outside Latin America. Hence the need to search for relevant resources and strategies to develop this proficiency in students in the Peruvian context. In addition, the literature lacks information on supporting the teaching of this competence (speaking) with technological tools, necessary in these times of non-attendant educational trend and whose integration into traditional learning sessions can promote an active and participatory role in class (Angeriz, 2019; Hismanoglu, 2012). An alternative is the use of the YouGlish web tool.

YouGlish is a web tool that works as a video-assisted dictionary through which students can listen to the pronunciation of words in a real context by means of YouTube videos, which means they learn in a meaningful way, as it inserts them into an authentic learning context (Saed, Haider, Al-Salman & Hussein, 2021). In addition to listening to the characters of the videos pronounce the words, the students have the possibility to choose the different English styles/accents that exist (American, British, and Australian); so,

it means that it offers the opportunity to listen to native English speakers or fluent speakers for correct pronunciation, accentuation, intonation, stress, and word usage in real English through YouTube videos (Sastra-Gunada, 2017).

Students can also select the speed of pronunciation (normal, slow, fast) and they can switch from one video to another in case they have not managed to capture the pronunciation of some fragments of the word (Fu & Yang, 2019). The use of this tool can be done whenever they require it since it does not need the presence of the teacher; therefore, YouGlish is not only a traditional tool that presents sections of videos in which the students passively receive English, but this tool promotes active participation in discovering the rules of tacit English usage of native speakers. On the other hand, the study of this tool has been very close in the literature; so, it is considered necessary to test the effectiveness of the benefits it offers for the development of speaking

According to research, the use of YouTube videos can improve students' English proficiency, especially in their listening and speaking skills (Saed et al., 2021). Ariyanto, Rochsantiningsih and Pudjobroto (2018) showed that the videos improved intonation and accent, grammar usage, and word choice to communicate. Hakim (2016) found that the videos helped with pronunciation, an aspect considered one of the most difficult; since, in English, pronunciation differs from its variants (Barhen, 2019). Syunina, Yarmakeev, Shechter, Pimenova and Abdrafikova (2017) found that the use of these videos helped develop their speaking fluency. Yükselir and Kömür (2017), showed that students scored higher on their oral exams. Meanwhile, Fu and Yang (2019) examined the effects of the YouGlish video-online pronunciation dictionary, whose results reveal that this tool can help develop oral communicative skills in pronunciation, intonation, and word usage. Syafiq, Rahmawati, Anwari and Oktaviana (2021) also demonstrated in their study that the use of YouTube videos has significantly contributed to the improvement of communicative speaking skills, but, in addition, notes that other components of English learning, such as grammatical structures, lexis, fluency, and content, were strengthened.

Therefore, the present study aims to (a) determine the impact of YouGlish use on English speaking proficiency in its subskills of fluency, grammatical appropriateness, pronunciation, communicative interaction, and vocabulary, (b) identify the subskills of English speaking proficiency that had a higher degree of development by the use of YouGlish, (c) compare the level of English speaking proficiency after using YouGlish, and (d) determine the students' perception of using YouGlish to improve their English speaking proficiency.

## **2. Method**

### **2.1. Design**

The present study was applied to solve a practical educational question through the comparison of two groups (Hernández-Sampieri & Fernández-Collao, 2016). The study approach was quasi-experimental, with quantitative evaluation through a pre-test and a post-test performed on a control and an experimental group to confirm the expected results (Manterola & Otzen, 2015).

### **2.2. Population and Sample**

The population was composed of students enrolled in a public university in southern Peru.

The sample was selected in a non-probabilistic or guided way, considering the characteristics of the research (Vara-Horna, 2012). Due to the small size of the institution, 38 students from the School of Biology and Microbiology were chosen and divided into two groups: the control group and the experimental group, which consisted of 19 students each.

### 2.3. Techniques for Data Analysis

*Technique.* A test was used to assess speaking-English skills.

*Instruments.* Two tests were conducted to establish the degree of English-speaking proficiency: an entrance test (pre-test) and an exit test (post-test), taking into account the following aspects and indicators defined by the evaluation rubrics (Mukminatien, 2015; Pandiya, 2013):

- Dimension 1: Pronunciation
- Dimension 2: Grammatical appropriateness
- Dimension 3: Vocabulary
- Dimension 4: Fluency
- Dimension 5: Interactive communication

*Measuring scale.* Through a test in which the following categories are considered (Gatica-Lara & Uribarren-Berrueta, 2013):

- Band 1: Very insufficient: Produces brief utterances - words or sentences - with frequent hesitations and pauses.
- Band 2: Insufficient: Performance combines elements of Bands 1 and 3.
- Band 3: Average: Constructs longer utterances but is unable to express complicated ideas unless in well-rehearsed expressions.
- Band 4: Good: Performance combines elements of Bands 3 and 5.
- Band 5: Very Good: Despite considerable hesitation, manages dialogue on common topics.

*Reliability of the instrument.* According to the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR), the oral part of the Preliminary English Test (PET) was considered, an intermediate-level test; and therefore, the third and fourth part of the test. Because the test was developed by the University of Cambridge, it is considered reliable.

### 2.4. Procedure

To begin with, the approval of the application of the present research was obtained from the highest authority of the Professional School of Biology-Microbiology of the university, after having explained the justification and objectives pursued. Then, the informed consent of all the subjects before the study was carried out, describing its purpose and benefits.

Due to the health emergency caused by COVID-19, the English II class sessions were carried out under the e-learning modality, where the classes were through Videoconferences in Google Meet for the synchronous sessions and the Moodle platform of the National University for the asynchronous hours. To do this, the next stages were followed:

First phase. Definition of Teaching Methodology: The control group developed the English-speaking competence following the traditional methodology, while the experimental group developed the same competence using the YouG-lish web tool.

Second phase. Planning and organization of learning sessions for the experimental group.

Third phase. Application of the pre-test: during the first week, the pre-test was administered to both the control and experimental groups to determine the level of Proficiency in English speaking before the intervention.

Fourth Phase. Induction in the use of YouGlish: during the second week, the experimental group received guidance and demonstration of the use of YouGlish following these actions: (1) They received a brief explanation of what YouGlish is, its purpose, and its operation, (2) they observed the teacher's

demonstration using YouGlish, (3) they practiced for themselves using YouGlish. Some students were asked to share their screens in the video conference and perform the procedure themselves.

Fifth phase: Intervention: Between the third and tenth week, the experimental group participated in the activities programmed in the pedagogical methodology of the e-learning modality, where they used the YouGlish web tool to comply with the speaking activities. These activities were based on the communicative approach as students learned and practiced language in different communicative situations of social interaction (Phoeun & Sengsri, 2021). They received feedback and suggestions on how the YouGlish web tool was used by the teacher and their peers, which reinforced the student's familiarity with the web tool.

Sixth phase. Application of the post-test: in the eleventh week, the post-test was applied (to the control group and experimental group) to determine any change in the competence of English speaking. Before being evaluated, the experimental group consulted the YouGlish web tool to confirm for themselves the pronunciation, intonation, use of the word (vocabulary), grammatical relevance, fluency, and interactive communication.

Seventh phase. Questionnaire application: at the end of the post-test, students developed a perception questionnaire on the use of the YouGlish web tool.

### 3. Results

The objectives of this study were to (a) determine the impact of using YouGlish on English-speaking proficiency, (b) identify the sub-skills of English-speaking proficiency that had a higher degree of development by using YouGlish, (c) compare the level of English-speaking proficiency after using YouGlish, and (d) determine the students' perception of using YouGlish to improve their English-speaking proficiency. The results obtained are as follows:

#### 3.1. Demography

The study population corresponds to students from a public university. The sample was composed of students who are in the first year of studies of the Professional Career of Biology and Microbiology. This sample consisted of two groups: one control and one experimental.

The experimental group was made up of students whose most representative ages range between 17 and 20 years (52.7%). The technological means available for their study during this non-face-to-face education were the laptop (57.9%) and the computer (36.8%). 73.7% came from a public educational institution, and 63.2% had a curriculum corresponding to the modality of Regular Education Day (Jornada de Educación Regular), where the hours of English study are 3 hours per week.

The control group was made up of students whose most representative ages range from 17 to 20 years (68.9%). The technological means available for their study during this non-face-to-face education were the laptop (43.8%) and the computer (37.5%). 56.3% came from a public educational institution, and 75% had a curriculum corresponding to the modality of Regular Education Day (Jornada de Educación Regular), where the hours of English study are 3 hours per week.

This information lets us know that both groups shared similar characteristics.

#### 3.2. RO1. Determine the Impact of the Use of Youglish on English-Speaking Proficiency

According to Table 1, there is a significant difference in the development of English-speaking competence between the Control Group and the Experimental Group after receiving their English lessons in the corresponding methodology. On the one hand, in the Control Group, only 15,79% could achieve the Good and Very Good levels and 21,05% were at the Average level. On the other hand, in the experimental group, a total of 36,84% reached the level of Good and Very Good and 26,32% were at the Average level. So, it can be concluded that the students of the Control Group did not improve their English-Speaking

Competence at the B1 level much, as they reached only the Average level, and the students of the Experimental Group improved progressively, as they are at the Good and Very Good levels, which indicates that the impact of the use of YouGlish has been positive.

| Level             | Control  |        |           |        | Experimental |        |           |        |
|-------------------|----------|--------|-----------|--------|--------------|--------|-----------|--------|
|                   | Pre-test |        | Post-test |        | Pre-test     |        | Post-test |        |
|                   | No.      | %      | No.       | %      | No.          | %      | No.       | %      |
| Very Insufficient | 15       | 78,95  | 6         | 31,58  | 16           | 84,21  | 3         | 15,79  |
| Insufficient      | 1        | 5,26   | 6         | 31,58  | 2            | 10,53  | 4         | 21,05  |
| Average           | 1        | 5,26   | 4         | 21,05  | 0            | 0,00   | 5         | 26,32  |
| Good              | 2        | 10,53  | 3         | 15,79  | 1            | 5,26   | 3         | 15,79  |
| Very Good         | 0        | 0,00   | 0         | 0,00   | 0            | 0,00   | 4         | 21,05  |
| Total             | 19       | 100,00 | 19        | 100,00 | 19           | 100,00 | 19        | 100,00 |

Table 1. English-speaking proficiency level with YouGlish application

### 3.3. RO2. Identify the Sub-Skills of English-Speaking Competence with a Higher Degree of Development Using YouGlish

After the use of the web tool YouGlish in the experimental group, there was a progressive change from the Very Insufficient level in the pre-test to the Good and Very Good levels in the post-test. The following figures and tables illustrate how much the experimental group improved in each dimension.

We are going to consider the level at which the percentage of students was greater, even if it is not the highest level, as it is important to be aware that developing any communicative skills is gradual and not the same for all students.

Table 2 shows the results in the Pronunciation dimension. From the Insufficient level in the pre-test (52,63%), students advanced to the Average level (42,11%), and some of them to the Good and Very good levels (26,32% each). Students at the Average level can speak clearly but make some mistakes in pronunciation that sometimes affect the clarity of the message. However, there are also 52,64% of students who speak very clearly and have very few mistakes in pronunciation.

| Level             | Control  |        |           |        | Experimental |        |           |        |
|-------------------|----------|--------|-----------|--------|--------------|--------|-----------|--------|
|                   | Pre-test |        | Post-test |        | Pre-test     |        | Post-test |        |
|                   | Nº       | %      | Nº        | %      | Nº           | %      | Nº        | %      |
| Very insufficient | 7        | 36,84  | 0         | 0,00   | 3            | 15,79  | 0         | 0,00   |
| Insufficient      | 8        | 42,11  | 7         | 36,84  | 10           | 52,63  | 1         | 5,26   |
| Average           | 1        | 5,26   | 7         | 36,84  | 5            | 26,32  | 8         | 42,11  |
| Good              | 3        | 15,79  | 5         | 26,32  | 1            | 5,26   | 5         | 26,32  |
| Very good         | 0        | 0,00   | 0         | 0,00   | 0            | 0,00   | 5         | 26,32  |
| Total             | 19       | 100,00 | 19        | 100,00 | 19           | 100,00 | 19        | 100,00 |

Table 2. Distribution of the pronunciation dimension in English-speaking proficiency

Table 3 shows the results in the Grammatical Appropriateness dimension. From the Very Insufficient level in the pre-test (47.37%), students advanced to the Good level (36.84%) and some of them to the Very Good level (15.79%). Students at the Good level can use grammatical structures very well with minor errors that do not affect the message.

Table 4 shows the results in the Vocabulary dimension. From the Insufficient level in the pre-test (78.95%), students advanced to the good level (47.37%), and some of them to the Very Good level (15.79%). Students at the Good level use vocabulary with some minimal errors and explain new concepts, but not always correctly.

| Level             | Control  |        |           |        | Experimental |        |           |        |
|-------------------|----------|--------|-----------|--------|--------------|--------|-----------|--------|
|                   | Pre-test |        | Post-test |        | Pre-test     |        | Post-test |        |
|                   | Nº       | %      | Nº        | %      | Nº           | %      | Nº        | %      |
| Very insufficient | 12       | 63,16  | 0         | 0,00   | 9            | 47,37  | 0         | 0,00   |
| Insufficient      | 3        | 15,79  | 6         | 31,58  | 7            | 36,84  | 3         | 15,79  |
| Average           | 1        | 5,26   | 8         | 42,11  | 2            | 10,53  | 6         | 31,58  |
| Good              | 3        | 15,79  | 5         | 26,32  | 1            | 5,26   | 7         | 36,84  |
| Very good         | 0        | 0,00   | 0         | 0,00   | 0            | 0,00   | 3         | 15,79  |
| Total             | 19       | 100,00 | 19        | 100,00 | 19           | 100,00 | 19        | 100,00 |

Table 3. Distribution of the Grammatical Appropriateness dimension in English-speaking proficiency

Table 5 shows the results in the Fluency dimension. From the Very Insufficient level in the pre-test (47.37%), most of the students reached the Average level (42.11%) and some others the Very Good level (26.32%) and the Good level (15.79%). Students at the Average level show occasional hesitations and pauses that minimally distort the clarity of the message.

| Level             | Control  |        |           |        | Experimental |        |           |        |
|-------------------|----------|--------|-----------|--------|--------------|--------|-----------|--------|
|                   | Pre-test |        | Post-test |        | Pre-test     |        | Post-test |        |
|                   | Nº       | %      | Nº        | %      | Nº           | %      | Nº        | %      |
| Very insufficient | 4        | 21,05  | 0         | 0,00   | 1            | 5,26   | 0         | 0,00   |
| Insufficient      | 11       | 57,89  | 6         | 31,58  | 15           | 78,95  | 3         | 15,79  |
| Average           | 1        | 5,26   | 7         | 36,84  | 2            | 10,53  | 4         | 21,05  |
| Good              | 3        | 15,79  | 6         | 31,58  | 1            | 5,26   | 9         | 47,37  |
| Very good         | 0        | 0,00   | 0         | 0,00   | 0            | 0,00   | 3         | 15,79  |
| Total             | 19       | 100,00 | 19        | 100,00 | 19           | 100,00 | 19        | 100,00 |

Table 4. Distribution of the Vocabulary dimension in English-speaking proficiency

| Level             | Control  |        |           |        | Experimental |        |           |        |
|-------------------|----------|--------|-----------|--------|--------------|--------|-----------|--------|
|                   | Pre-test |        | Post-test |        | Pre-test     |        | Post-test |        |
|                   | Nº       | %      | Nº        | %      | Nº           | %      | Nº        | %      |
| Very insufficient | 13       | 68,42  | 0         | 0,00   | 9            | 47,37  | 0         | 0,00   |
| Insufficient      | 2        | 10,53  | 8         | 42,11  | 7            | 36,84  | 3         | 15,79  |
| Average           | 1        | 5,26   | 5         | 26,32  | 2            | 10,53  | 8         | 42,11  |
| Good              | 3        | 15,79  | 5         | 26,32  | 1            | 5,26   | 3         | 15,79  |
| Very good         | 0        | 0,00   | 1         | 5,26   | 0            | 0,00   | 5         | 26,32  |
| Total             | 19       | 100,00 | 19        | 100,00 | 19           | 100,00 | 19        | 100,00 |

Table 5. Distribution of the fluency dimension in English-speaking proficiency

| Level             | Control  |        |           |        | Experimental |        |           |        |
|-------------------|----------|--------|-----------|--------|--------------|--------|-----------|--------|
|                   | Pre-test |        | Post-test |        | Pre-test     |        | Post-test |        |
|                   | Nº       | %      | Nº        | %      | Nº           | %      | Nº        | %      |
| Very insufficient | 16       | 84,21  | 0         | 0,00   | 16           | 84,21  | 0         | 0,00   |
| Insufficient      | 1        | 5,26   | 6         | 31,58  | 1            | 5,26   | 2         | 10,53  |
| Average           | 0        | 0,00   | 8         | 42,11  | 1            | 5,26   | 7         | 36,84  |
| Good              | 2        | 10,53  | 5         | 26,32  | 0            | 0,00   | 7         | 36,84  |
| Very good         | 0        | 0,00   | 0         | 0,00   | 1            | 5,26   | 3         | 15,79  |
| Total             | 19       | 100,00 | 19        | 100,00 | 19           | 100,00 | 19        | 100,00 |

Table 6. Distribution of the Interactive Communication dimension in English-speaking proficiency



Table 6 shows the results in the Interactive Communication dimension. From the Very Insufficient level in the pre-test (84.21%), most of the students reached the Average and Good levels with 36.84% respectively. These students can interact with their interlocutor, but those at the Average level show frequent doubts, and those at the Good level occasionally show doubts in giving their answers, but this does not affect the naturalness of the conversation.

From the results obtained in each dimension, the values of the Good and Very Good levels have been added to identify the sub-skill in which the students in the experimental group have shown better development. The order is as follows: 63.11% showed improvement in Vocabulary; 52.68% in Grammatical Appropriateness; 52.64% in Pronunciation; 52.63% in Interactive Communication; and 42.11% in Fluency. These values indicate that the sub-skill that developed best was Vocabulary.

### 3.4. RO3. Compare the Level of English-Speaking Proficiency After Using YouGlish

| Level             | Control  |        |           |        | Experimental |        |           |        |
|-------------------|----------|--------|-----------|--------|--------------|--------|-----------|--------|
|                   | Pre-test |        | Post-test |        | Pre-test     |        | Post-test |        |
|                   | Nº       | %      | Nº        | %      | Nº           | %      | Nº        | %      |
| Very insufficient | 15       | 78,95  | 6         | 31,58  | 16           | 84,21  | 3         | 15,79  |
| Insufficient      | 1        | 5,26   | 6         | 31,58  | 2            | 10,53  | 4         | 21,05  |
| Average           | 1        | 5,26   | 4         | 21,05  | 0            | 0,00   | 5         | 26,32  |
| Good              | 2        | 10,53  | 3         | 15,79  | 1            | 5,26   | 3         | 15,79  |
| Very good         | 0        | 0,00   | 0         | 0,00   | 0            | 0,00   | 4         | 21,05  |
| Total             | 19       | 100,00 | 19        | 100,00 | 19           | 100,00 | 19        | 100,00 |

Table 7. English-speaking proficiency level with YouGlish application

According to Table 7, before the use of the YouGlish web tool, both the control and experimental groups showed that their English-speaking proficiency was Very Insufficient with 78.95% and 84.21% respectively. After the completion of the English sessions with the conventional methodology for the control group and the application of the YouGlish web tool for the experimental group, most of the students in the control group remained at the Very Insufficient and Insufficient levels (31.58% each level). However, the experimental group showed a gradual change, as 26.32% of the students advanced to the Average level, and 36.84% reached the Good and Very Good levels (the sum of 15.79% and 21.04% respectively). This is positive progress as it shows that by helping students with web tools such as YouGlish, it is possible to develop their English-speaking proficiency little by little.

Statistical data confirm that the study group achieved an average of 19.74 points in the pre-test administered to students of the School of Biology and Microbiology of a public university in southern Peru, and an average of 65 points in the post-test after the application of YouGlish.

| Group     | Mean  | N  | Deviation | Deviation Mean error |
|-----------|-------|----|-----------|----------------------|
| Pre-test  | 19,74 | 19 | 24,747    | 5,677                |
| Post-test | 65,00 | 19 | 22,048    | 5,058                |

Table 8. Statistical correlations between samples

|                             | Significance | Deviation | Deviation Mean error | Confidence interval of 95% |          | t      | Gl | Sig. (bilateral) |
|-----------------------------|--------------|-----------|----------------------|----------------------------|----------|--------|----|------------------|
|                             |              |           |                      | Inferior                   | Superior |        |    |                  |
| Pre-test and Post-test Exam | -45,263      | 33,311    | 7,642                | -61,319                    | -29,208  | -5,923 | 18 | 0,000            |

Table 9. Importance of the variable English-speaking proficiency

Therefore, the YouGlish application was beneficial as it increased by 45.26 points. Similarly, since 0.000 is less than the predefined 0.05, the alternative hypothesis is accepted.

This shows that the application of YouGlish improves students' English-speaking proficiency.

### 3.5. RO 4. To Determine Students' Perception of Using YouGlish to iMprove their English-Speaking Proficiency

| Level of perception                       | The use of YouGlish in the English-speaking proficiency |               |
|---|---|---------------|
|   | N   | %             |
| <i>Dimension 1: Ease of use</i>           |   |               |
| Agree                                     | 8   | 42.1          |
| Totally agree                             | 11  | 57.9          |
| <b>Total</b>                              | <b>19</b>   | <b>100.00</b> |
| <i>Dimension 2: Usefulness</i>            |   |               |
| Neither agree nor disagree                | 1   | 5.3           |
| Agree                                     | 10  | 52.6          |
| Totally agree                             | 8   | 42.1          |
| <b>Total</b>                              | <b>19</b>   | <b>100.00</b> |
| <i>Dimension 3: Video content</i>         |   |               |
| Agree                                     | 7   | 36.8          |
| Totally agree                             | 12  | 63.2          |
| <b>Total</b>                              | <b>19</b>   | <b>100.00</b> |
| <i>Dimension 4: Motivational capacity</i> |   |               |
| Neither agree nor disagree                | 1   | 5.3           |
| Agree                                     | 8   | 42.1          |
| Totally agree                             | 10  | 52.6          |
| <b>Total</b>                              | <b>19</b>   | <b>100.00</b> |

Table 10. Perception of YouGlish use in English- speaking proficiency

Table 10 demonstrates the excellent level of perception achieved by the students in the experimental group when YouGlish was used in the four given dimensions. An average of 43.4% indicated a favorable opinion, while 53.95% indicated a very favorable perception. The participants liked the convenience, usefulness, incentive, and variety of pronunciation accents that allow them to independently reinforce their speaking-English skills.

## 4. Discussion and Conclusions

The purpose of this study was to determine the effect of the YouGlish web tool on English-speaking proficiency, as well as to identify which sub-skills (pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary, fluency, and communicative interaction) were developed the most, to compare the level of this proficiency before and after the use of YouGlish, and to determine the students' perceptions of this tool.

The results obtained from the post-test and the perception questionnaire on the use of YouGlish show that Youglish is a useful web tool that can be integrated into English sessions, as it has a positive impact on the development of English language proficiency. This tool not only provides search results on the screen, but each word or phrase appears within a context of real English usage, where learners can develop pronunciation, vocabulary, and grammatical appropriateness, and perceive fluency and communicative interaction of the characters communicating in the youtube videos; that is, they motivate to learn and stay attentive for longer (Hamad, Metwally & Alfaruque, 2019). Meanwhile, Fu and Yang (2019) examined the effects of this online pronunciation dictionary, YouGlish videos, and revealed that this tool can help develop oral communicative skills in pronunciation, intonation, and word usage. This is

confirmed by Syafiq et al. (2021), whose study showed that the use of YouTube videos contributed significantly to the improvement of English language proficiency, mentioning components such as grammatical structures, lexis, fluency, and content. Yükselir and Kömür (2017) also showed that students performed better on their speaking tests using online videos.

After the implementation of YouGlish, most of the students (26.32% at the Average level and 36.84% at the Good and Very Good levels) have been able to improve their English proficiency in the different sub-skills. The improvement has been gradual and almost uniform in all skills. However, the one with the highest percentage was vocabulary (63.11%). The students demonstrated that they can communicate with minimal errors and that they can explain new concepts of words they do not know. This was followed by grammatical adequacy (52.68%), pronunciation (52.64%), interactive communication (52.63%), and finally fluency (42.11%). These results are confirmed by what was found in the study of Kabooha and Elyas (2018), who found that YouTube videos had significant effects on vocabulary acquisition, as they also improved their ability to better recognize and understand the target vocabulary. Meanwhile, Fu and Yang (2019) found that YouGlish had a better effect on the sub-skill of word usage (Grammar), as, according to the researcher, YouGlish videos provide learners with meaningful context that helps them understand how that word is used in real spoken English. Ariyanto et al. (2018) showed that the videos improved intonation and accent, grammar usage, and word selection to communicate. Syunina et al. (2017) found that the use of these authentic videos helped learners overcome common problems encountered in speaking English, such as hesitation, paraphrasing, fluency, and accuracy. With his study, the researcher demonstrated that students can improve their fluency, but acknowledges that more effort is required to achieve this. Hakim (2016) found that videos helped with pronunciation, an aspect considered one of the most difficult; since, in English, pronunciation differs from its variants (Barhen, 2019). Gilakjani (2016) also points out that pronunciation development does not only involve pronouncing individual sounds or words correctly but should be incorporated into classroom activities with follow-up by the teacher and outside the classroom. Observations from the studies by Syunina et al. (2017) and Gilakjani (2016) might explain why in the present study, although the students also developed pronunciation and fluency, they progressed better in vocabulary.

This study demonstrates that the use of YouGlish can help students overcome the limitations of passive video use in developing their English proficiency. In the applied perception questionnaire, a large percentage of the students claimed that they can develop the subskills of pronunciation, vocabulary, grammatical appropriateness, fluency, and communicative interaction without needing the teacher's help. A similar conclusion is reached by the study of Fu and Yang (2019), who note that YouGlish can help solve the problem of restricted access students have to native speakers and can use this tool outside the classroom for further exposure to authentic English. Adding to this are Kabooha and Elyas (2018), Sastra-Gunada (2017), and Silviyanti (2014) who argue that YouTube videos offer the opportunity to have better exposure to the aspects involved in speaking English such as correct pronunciation, stress, intonation, accent, and real English word usage as its audiovisual feature attracts students, excites them, and disposes them to watch different videos and then practice pronunciation and converse as native speakers.

It is also worth noting that based on Bruner's discovery learning principle (Bruner, 1961), students can develop their English language proficiency by participating in the target search process on YouGlish as they actively participate in information search, scan all these various information and select the one that meets their main goal. Fu and Yang (2019) point out that this process helps students develop, in addition to oral English proficiency, their inductive reasoning skills, an important additional contribution to cognitive development provided by YouGlish. Low and Sweller (2005), through the cognitive theory of Multimedia Learning Theory, also explain that the presentation of information in video format combines both the visual and auditory sense, which makes the use of videos for language teaching more effective than the use of only one sense.

The English-speaking proficiency is one of the least worked on in the sessions. It is, for many students and teachers, a competence that requires a lot of effort and strategy to learn and to teach, since it involves the development of different sub-skills that will allow the user of the language to be competent in the use of oral English.

Our study has aimed to determine the impact that YouGlish has on English-speaking proficiency in university students. YouGlish is a web tool that functions as an online visual-oral dictionary that has qualities that support the development of English-speaking proficiency. Although its creation is not recent, it is a little-explored resource that has proven to have a positive impact on the development and improvement of this competence and its sub-skills: pronunciation, grammatical appropriateness, vocabulary, fluency, and interactive communication. This is confirmed by the results obtained before and after applying the YouGlish web tool in the sessions of the experimental group, where the progress that the students had in each of the sub-skills is evidenced; as well as the perception that they make of their learning after having used the tool. In addition to the improvement of the sub-skills, it is inferred from the applied perception questionnaire that the use of YouGlish has also allowed them to develop autonomy and have a more active role in their English learning process since they can easily access it, navigate through the different resources it offers; however, not everyone considers that registering as users have been neither simple nor difficult.

The findings of this study allow us to affirm that the effect produced in the experimental group has been favorable compared to the control group, whose level had poor progress. Therefore, it is considered convenient to integrate the use of YouGlish in English sessions as a support to strengthen English speaking proficiency. This tool can become a very useful pedagogical resource for both teachers and students who want to use English orally. However, before its use, it is necessary to know in depth the benefits offered by both Youglish and the use of Youtube or online videos to use them effectively in classes and help our students not only be good readers or writers in English but also be good speakers in a foreign language. This study is a basis for future studies that apply this YouGlish online visual-oral dictionary to develop English speaking competence that can be used not only at the university level but with a school population that needs to be exposed to real oral English or the development of qualitative research with self-taught students in English.

### **Declaration of Conflicting Interests**

The authors declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

### **Funding**

The authors received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

### **References**

- Al-Garni, S.A., & Almuhammadi, A.H. (2019). El efecto del uso de actividades comunicativas de enseñanza de idiomas en las habilidades de habla de los estudiantes de EFL en la Universidad de Jeddah. *Enseñanza del idioma inglés*, 12(6), 72. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v12n6p72>
- Angeriz, E. (2019). *Sección II Tecnologías digitales en la educación y la infancia*. 102. Available at: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/j.ctvt6rmh6.8.pdf?refreqid=excelsior%3A96c7dce8596f199dec9b4416fabf7be6>
- Ariyanto, N., Rochsantiningsih, D., & Pudjobroto, H. (2018). Mejorar la habilidad para hablar de los estudiantes mediante el uso de videos de Youtube. *Educación en Inglés*, 6(3), 278. <https://doi.org/10.20961/eed.v6i3.35883>
- Arroba, J., & Acosta, H. (2021). Narración digital auténtica como estrategia de enseñanza alternativa para desarrollar habilidades orales en las clases de efl. *Revista LEARN: Red de Investigación de Educación y Adquisición de Idiomas*, 14(1), 317-343.

- Arta, B. (2019). Estudios múltiples: la influencia del enfoque de aprendizaje colaborativo en las habilidades de habla inglesa de los estudiantes de secundaria de Indonesia. *English Language Teaching Educational Journal*, 1(3), 149. <https://doi.org/10.12928/eltej.v1i3.143>
- Asan, H., & Zuhul Ç.S. (2020). Efectos de los juegos educativos en las habilidades de habla y la ansiedad del habla de los estudiantes de primaria (Eğitsel Oyunların İlkokul Öğrencilerinin Konuşma Becerilerine ve Konuşma Kaygılarına Etkisi). *Journal of Theoretical Educational Science*, 13, 685-700.
- Barhen, D. (2019). Youglish. *TESL-EJ*, 23(2).
- British Council (2015). *Estudio English in Perú*. Available at: <https://www.britishcouncil.pe/programas/educacion/ingles/estudio-english-peru>
- Bruner, J. (1961). El acto de descubrimiento. *Harvard Educational Review*, 21-32.
- Dewi, R.S., Kultsum, U., & Armadi, A. (2016). Usar juegos comunicativos para mejorar las habilidades de habla de los estudiantes. *Enseñanza del Idioma Inglés*, 10(1), 63. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v10n1p63>
- EF English Proficiency Index - EF EPI (2022). *El ranking mundial más grande según su dominio del inglés*. EF EPI. Available at: <https://www.ef.com.pe/epi/>
- Escobar-Mamani, F., & Gómez-Arteta, I. (2020). WhatsApp para el desarrollo de habilidades de comunicación oral y escrita en adolescentes peruanos. *Comunicar*, 28(65), 111-120. <https://doi.org/10.3916/C65-2020-10>
- Fu, J.S., & Yang, S.H. (2019). Explorando cómo YouGlish facilita la competencia oral de los estudiantes de EFL. *Tecnología Educativa y Sociedad*, 22(4), 47-58.
- Gatica-Lara, F., & Uribarren-Berrueta, T.N.J. (2013). ¿Cómo elaborar una rúbrica? *Investigación en Educación Médica*, 2(5), 61-65. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s2007-5057\(13\)72684-x](https://doi.org/10.1016/s2007-5057(13)72684-x)
- Gilakjani, A. (2016). Instrucción de pronunciación en inglés: una revisión de la literatura. *Revista Internacional de Investigación en Educación Inglesa*, 1(1), 1-6.
- Göktürk, Ö., Çaliskan, M., & Öztürk, M.S. (2020). Los efectos de las actividades de teatro creativo en el desarrollo de habilidades de habla inglesa. *Revista de actividades basadas en la investigación*, 10(1), 1-17. Available at: <http://proxy.ub.umu.se/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=eric&AN=EJ1265727&site=ehost-live&scope=site>
- Hakim, M.I.A.A. (2016). El uso del video en la enseñanza del habla English (Una investigación cuasi-experimental en la escuela secundaria superior en Sukabumi). *Revista de Inglés y Educación*, 4(2), 44-48.
- Hamad, M.M., Metwally, A.A., & Alfaruque, S.Y. (2019). El impacto del uso de YouTubes y pistas de audio imitación YATI en la mejora de las habilidades orales de los estudiantes de EFL. *Enseñanza del Idioma Inglés*, 12(6), 191. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v12n6p191>
- Hernández-Sampieri, R., & Fernández-Collao, C. (2016). Libro Metodología de la investigación SAMPIERI. In *Libro Metodología de la investigación SAMPIERI*.
- Hismanoglu, M. (2012). El impacto de la globalización y la tecnología de la información en la política de enseñanza de idiomas en Turquía. *Procedia - Ciencias Sociales y del Comportamiento*, 31(2011), 629-633. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2011.12.115>
- Hismanoglu, M., & Çolak, R. (2019). Un estudio sobre las perspectivas de los profesores turcos de EFL sobre el uso del drama para desarrollar las habilidades de habla de los estudiantes en el aula de EFL. *Novitas-ROYAL (Investigación sobre la Juventud y el Lenguaje)*, 13(2), 187-205.

- Iman, J.N. (2017). Instrucción de debate en el aula de EFL: Impactos en el pensamiento crítico y la habilidad para hablar. *Revista Internacional de Instrucción*, 10(4), 87-108. <https://doi.org/10.12973/iji.2017.1046a>
- Kabooha, R., & Elyas, T. (2018). Los efectos de YouTube en la instrucción multimedia para el aprendizaje de vocabulario: percepciones de estudiantes y profesores de EFL. *Enseñanza del idioma inglés*, 11(2), 72. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v11n2p72>
- Kumar, T. (2021). Deseo de aprender, aprender a brillar?: Idolatrar la motivación para mejorar la habilidad para hablar entre los estudiantes de L2 Tribhuwan. *Revista Chipriota de Ciencias de la Educación*, 16(1), 411-422.
- Laura-De La Cruz, K.M., Gebera, O.W.T., & Copaja, S.J.N. (2022). Aplicación de la gamificación en la educación superior en la enseñanza del inglés como lengua extranjera. In Mesquita, A., Abreu, A., & Carvalho, J.V. (Eds.), *Perspectives and Trends in Education and Technology. Smart Innovation, Systems and Technologies* (256, 323-341). Springer, Singapore. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-16-5063-5\\_27](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-16-5063-5_27)
- Low, R., & Sweller, J. (2005). El principio de modalidad en el aprendizaje multimedia. In Mayer, R.E. (Ed.), *The Cambridge Handbook of Multimedia Learning* (147-158).
- Manterola, C., & Otzen, T. (2015). Estudios cuasi-experimentales. *International Journal of Morphology*, 33(1), 382-387.
- Ministerio de Educación (2017). *Curriculo Nacional de la Educación Básica*. Available at: <http://www.minedu.gob.pe/curriculo/>
- Mukmination, N. (2015). Las ventajas de utilizar un procedimiento de puntuación analítica en la evaluación oral. *TEFLIN Journal - Una Publicación sobre la Enseñanza y el Aprendizaje del Inglés*, 11(1), 35. <https://doi.org/10.15639/teflinjournal.v11i1/35-46>
- Nget, S., Pansri, O., & Poohongthong, C. (2020). El efecto de la instrucción basada en tareas para mejorar las habilidades de habla inglesa de los estudiantes de noveno grado. *Revista LEARN: Language Education and Acquisition Research Network*, 13(2), 208-224.
- Pandiya (2013). Rubrics on Scoring English Tests for Four Language Skills. *Jurnal Pengembangan Humaniora*, 13(1), 43-49. Available at: <http://jurnal.polines.ac.id/jurnal/index.php/ragam/issue/view/96>
- Phoeun, M., & Sengsri, S. (2021). El efecto de un aula invertida con un enfoque comunicativo de enseñanza de idiomas en la capacidad de hablar inglés de los estudiantes de pregrado. *Revista Internacional de Instrucción*, 14(3), 1025-1042. <https://doi.org/10.29333/iji.2021.14360a>
- Saed, H.A., Haider, A.S., Al-Salman, S., & Hussein, R.F. (2021). El uso de YouTube en el desarrollo de las habilidades orales de los estudiantes universitarios jordanos de EFL. *Heliyon*, 7(7), e07543. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2021.e07543>
- Sastra-Gunada, I.W. (2017). Uso de YouTube Video; Un medio basado en TI para mejorar la habilidad de habla de los estudiantes. *ResearchGate*, January, 1-10. <https://doi.org/10.24815/siele.v1i1.1119>
- Silviyanti, T.M. (2014). Investigar las percepciones de los estudiantes de EFL al escuchar mediante el uso de videos de películas en inglés en YouTube. *Estudios en Lengua y Educación Inglesa*, 1(1), 42.
- Siristrimangkorn, L. (2018). El uso del aprendizaje basado en proyectos centrado en el drama para promover las habilidades orales de los estudiantes de EFL. *Avances en Lenguaje y Estudios Literarios*, 9(6), 14. <https://doi.org/10.7575/aiaac.all.v9n.6p.14>
- Syafiq, A.N., Rahmawati, A., Anwari, A., & Oktaviana, T. (2021). Aumento de la habilidad para hablar a través de videos de YouTube como material de aprendizaje de inglés durante el aprendizaje en línea en la pandemia de Covid-19. *Elysa: Journal of English Language Studies*, 3(1), 50-55. <https://doi.org/10.31849/elsya.v3i1.6206>

Syunina, A.S., Yarmakeev, I.E., Shechter, D., Pimenova, T.S., & Abdrafikova, A.R. (2017). Materiales de video auténticos como medio para el desarrollo de la fluidez del habla en la clase de EFL. *Revista moderna de métodos de enseñanza de idiomas*, 7(9), 522-528.

Thornbury, S. (2002). *How to teach speaking* (1<sup>st</sup> ed.). Pearson Education ESL

Vara-Horna, A. (2012). *Desde la Idea hasta la sustentación: 7 pasos para una tesis exitosa* (3th ed.). Lima, Perú: Fondo editorial de la Universidad de San Martín de Porres.

Yükselir, C., & Kömür, S. (2017). Usar videos en línea para mejorar las habilidades de habla de los estudiantes de EFL. *European Journal of Education Studies*, 3(5) 255-266. <https://zenodo.org/records/495750>

Published by OmniaScience ([www.omniascience.com](http://www.omniascience.com))

Journal of Technology and Science Education, 2024 ([www.jotse.org](http://www.jotse.org))



Article's contents are provided on an Attribution-Non Commercial 4.0 Creative commons International License.

Readers are allowed to copy, distribute and communicate article's contents, provided the author's and JOTSE journal's names are included. It must not be used for commercial purposes. To see the complete licence contents, please visit <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>.