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Observational learning: Bandura (1977)

- One of social learning theories.
- People observe others and acquire a new human behavior by modeling them.
- When people observe an inappropriate model, they would not imitate it because a negative effect would be expected.
- People's cognitive skills should be developed by observing both appropriate and inappropriate models.
Observational learning: Okada, Sawaumi, & Ito (2014)

- Japanese university students (N = 29) in an EFL context
- Compared between high and low English proficiency groups.
- Model video clips were selected from video-recorded presentations of students.
- Successful model videos were shown to both groups.
Observational learning (cont’d)

- Observing model video was effective for high proficiency group, but intimidated low proficiency learners.
- There was a large gap of English ability between the model video and their own.
Aptitude Treatment Interaction (ATI)

- A pedagogical concept proposed by Cronbach & Snow (1977)
- Interaction effects between teaching methods and learners’ aptitudes on maximizing instructional effect.
- Research of ATI is not robust (Namiki, 1993).
Research Aims

1. To investigate an interaction effect between types of model video presentations (successful vs. average) and levels of English proficiency (high vs. low) using self- and peer-evaluation.

2. To examine whether not only successful model videos but also average presentations enable students to develop their cognitive skills.
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Participants

- Twenty-seven Japanese university students.
- Enrolled in 2 classes of English communication in Spring 2015.
- All were freshmen majoring in economics.
Two Classes

- Class A: 12 students
- Class B: 15 students
- Placed into each class based on their scores of TOEIC Bridge test.
- Class size & Student test scores: No significant difference
- Taught by the same instructor (the first author).
Data Collection Procedures

- Three oral presentations were administered.
- Memorized each topic
- 180-200 words
- Taught how to maintain good posture, eye contact, as well as English pronunciation, rhythm, and intonation.
Research Design

• Quasi-experimental design

• Revised nonequivalent groups pretest-posttest design

  O: Evaluation (first, second, third self- & peer-evaluation)
  X: Treatment (successful model video vs. average model video)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O₁</th>
<th>X₁</th>
<th>O₂</th>
<th>X₂</th>
<th>O₃</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O₁</td>
<td>X₂</td>
<td>O₂</td>
<td>X₁</td>
<td>O₃</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Presentation Cycle

Oral Presentation
(video-recorded)

Model Video Observation
(Class A: 1. successful, 2. average; Class B: 1. average, 2. successful)

Self- & Peer-Evaluation
(while watching recorded-performance)
Instruments: Quantitative Data

- Evaluation Form in Japanese
  - Items 1-4: Voice Control
  - Item 5-8: Body Language
  - Items 9-11: Effectiveness
- 4-point Likert-type scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>Spoke loud enough for the audience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>Spoke at a good rate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>Put appropriate stress and pausing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>Spoke clearly. (Did not mumble; Did not use inappropriate stress.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>Stood straight.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>Placed the foot shoulder width apart and set the hands together, keeping around waist high.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>Looked at the audience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>Showed a relaxed facial expression.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>Selected an interesting topic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>Used simple sentence structures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>Used only vocabulary words.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Please comment on the overall performance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Instruments (Quantitative & Qualitative Data)

- Model Video Review
- Student Performance Reflection
- Video observation reflection
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Data Analysis Scheme

- English proficiency group as an independent variable.
- Repeated measures ANOVA
- Class (Class A vs. Class B) and Proficiency (high vs. low) as between-participants factors.
- Time of presentation (first vs. second vs. third) as a within-participant factor.
- 3 subscales were used: voice control, body language, effectiveness
- IBM SPSS 22.0 was used.
Results of ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Self-evaluation</th>
<th>Peer-evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>voice control</td>
<td>body language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time (within)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class (between)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proficiency (between)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time × Class</td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class × Proficiency</td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time × Proficiency</td>
<td></td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time × Class × Proficiency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. * $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. 
Overall Peer-Evaluation as a Function of Time & Class

![Graph showing overall peer-evaluation over time for Class A and Class B. Class B shows a slight increase over time, while Class A remains relatively stable.](image-url)
Text Mining & Content Analyses

- Text Mining Studio 5.1 by NTT Data Mathematical Systems Inc. was used.
- The two classes were compared.
- Student performance & video observation reflections were analyzed.
- Word frequency analysis
2nd Presentation Performance Reflection

- **Class A**
  - “What I had learned from the (successful) model videos was to make an oral presentation with a smile.”

- **Class B**
  - “From watching the (average) model video presentations, I learned that posture and eye contact were also the important factors to make the presentation impressive. Therefore, I practiced for my presentation, focusing on these aspects in addition to speaking volume.”
3rd Presentation Performance Reflection

- **Class A**
  - “Although I paid attention to eye contact, I became lost when I didn’t know what to say. I could only look up the ceiling.”

- **Class B**
  - “After watching the successful model videos, I worked hard to make my pronunciation better. At the presentation, I spoke as if I had been a native speaker of English.”
Video Observation Reflection
Video Observation Reflection (cont’d)

- Class A

  “Since there was something I wanted to imitate in the first model videos, I focused on it when practicing my presentation. The first model video presentations were very effective... For the second model videos, I could observe what I needed to improve and keep to practice for my oral presentation, paying attention to it.”
Video Observation Reflection (cont’d)

Class B

• “It was very good because I observed the video as a model when I felt I was missing something but I didn’t know how to improve it. In addition, I found a difference of my own presentations before and after model video observations.”
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Discussion

➢ The study failed to show the interaction effect between teaching methods (successful vs. average model videos) and students’ language proficiency (high vs. low)

➢ However, it successfully showed interaction effects of teaching methods and class (Class A vs. Class B).

➢ Successful and average model video presentations affected students’ performance differently.
Discussion (cont’d)

- Successful model video presentations was effective for students to increase their motivation.

- Average model videos help enhance students’ awareness of incomplete aspects of the skills and attempt to bring out positive effects instead of imitating the average model videos.

- Average model videos first and successful ones next would work better for learners.
Limitations

- Due to quasi-experimental design, there was not a large number of participants for the study.

- It would be necessary to investigate how students’ own recorded video affect their practice and presentations when used with model videos together.
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Conclusions

- Observational learning can be applicable for EFL learners to improve their language and presentation skills by observing model videos.
- Sequence of model observations may affect learners’ performance.
- Teaching students could benefit from observing both successful and average model presentations to develop their cognitive skills.
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