Students' Perceptions of a Student-Produced Video Project in the General English Language Course at Srinakharinwirot University, Thailand

Supanit Kulsiri

Language and Academic Services Centre
International College for Sustainability Studies
Srinakharinwirot University, Bangkok, Thailand

Abstract
The research was conducted to study students' perceptions of a student-produced video project (SPV project) in the context of the General English Language Course at Srinakharinwirot University in Thailand. First year students with a pre-intermediate level of English language proficiency, who were enrolled in the General English Language course, were assigned to work on a SPV project that required them to make a short video related to content learnt in class. There were four main objectives of the SPV project which were: (1) to provide an environment that allows students to grasp a deeper understanding of the topic learnt in class; (2) to enhance English language proficiency as well as creativity and problem-solving skills; (3) to promote the use of Information and communication technology (ICT) in language teaching and learning and (4) to provide a collaborative working environment among students. There were 450 students who participated in this project. A questionnaire on the perceptions of the SPV project was administered to 107 students. It covered three aspects (1) the improvement of students' English language proficiency and life skills, (2) the use of technological tools and (3) collaboration among peers. Questionnaires results were statistically analyzed and reported in descriptive statistics. Findings indicated that students had positive perceptions toward the SPV projects in all three aspects. The aspect that received the highest mean value was that of collaboration among peers. This paper advocates the use of SPV projects as feasible and adaptable language projects suitable for the language learning in the 21st century.

Keywords: classroom collaboration, English language teaching, student-produced video, technologies in language teaching

Introduction
In the era of information technology, the application of technology to the language classroom is becoming a common and indispensable practice. Sun (2014) affirms that the integration of technology is not an add-on but a must in teaching and learning (p.14). Additionally, Kumaravadivelu (2013) argues that the sensible use of technology has become a paradigmatic shift in our understanding of knowledge and learning (p.320). It provides a new platform to the organization of teaching and learning. As Lian & Sangarun (2017) emphasize, technology facilitates learner's autonomy and learners' freedom in choosing what, when, where and how to learn in intellectual and practical ways. This student-produced video (SPV) project incorporated this new platform and has challenged teachers and learners to go beyond their classroom boundary and exercise their freedom in choosing what, where and when to learn with the aid of technology.

The purpose of this paper is to identify the process of designing and introducing a SPV project into the language classroom. It is based on the premise that SPV project provides complex and flexible learning environment that is pertinent to the development of language proficiency, life skills and collaboration among learners. The project based its principle on the idea of the provision of complex learning environments with the aid of technology for learners to have the freedom to explore their learning on their own according to their preference and learning pace either as individuals or as a group. This kind of project is one representative of a shift in language teaching practice in the Thai classroom that should be discussed and considered. Additionally, this paper reports the findings of the study on the students' perceptions of their improvement in English language proficiency after participating in the SPV project, the students' perceptions of the use of technological tools in the SPV project and the students' perceptions of collaboration among peers while working on the SPV project. As Lui (2006) points out, student perceptions are an influential factor in the successful adoption of educational technology (p. 233). This research's report will allow for more consideration in assigning project work to learners and may lead to future research on implementation aspects of using technological tools in language teaching and learning.

Literature Review
English Language Learning Environment
With the change of our perception toward ELT since entering the 21st century, language learning is not merely a simple step of providing grammar and vocabulary or chunks of phrases but it is a complex practice that has as its goal to create language learners with critical minds and social interaction abilities (Crystal, 2003; Sun, 2014). How to provide a learning environment that cultivates learners with such abilities becomes central discussion among language educators (Lian & Sangarun, 2017). Freire (1998) argues that most of all for critical learning to occur, learning is not for teaching to transfer knowledge but to create possibilities for the production or construction of knowledge. Lian & Pineda (2014) point out it is important to develop language learning environments that consist of adaptable, flexible, yet intellectually coherent learning frameworks. As Lian & Sangarun (2017) add, learning environments that are pertinent to learners' development of language are environments where they are allowed to perform complex communicative tasks that can draw simultaneously on a multiplicity of linguistic, cultural and other communicative skills (p.5).

Additionally, according to Vygotsky's view, learning best occurs in a collaborative environment where it is the interaction that can enhance the knowledge and shape what learners will be and become rather than simply focusing on the individual through language (Vygotsky, 1986). Sociocultural theory also supports the view that language learning is about developing an ability to engage and participate in particular environments both in the classroom and other cultural settings (Lantolf, 2000). Researchers and practitioners have found that students working in small cooperative groups can develop the type of intellectual exchange that fosters creative thinking and productive problem-solving (Motaei, 2014).

ELT Situation at Tertiary Level in Thailand
The development of English language education becomes a real challenge to Thai government. There has been an attempt to elevate the quality of English language education in Thailand for over a decade (Baker & Jarunthawatchai, 2017; Kaur, Young, & Kirkpatrick, 2016). However, as reported by the Education First English Language Proficiency Index (EF EPI) in 2016, from 80 countries around the world, Thailand ranked 53th, labelled "Low Proficiency". This sixth edition of the EF EPI ranks Thailand 15th out of 20 countries in Asia. When compared to countries with similar language policies, English is a foreign language, such as Vietnam, China and Japan, they all were in higher rank. Vietnam is at 34th. China is at 36th and Japan is at 37th (EducationFirst, 2017). Kaur et al. (2016) assert the development of language proficiency among Thais are still problematic, despite numerous of initiatives related to English Language Teaching (ELT) and language proficiency development such as the promotion of English program, Bilingual program, mini English program and the integration of Common European Framework of References for Languages (CEFR) in the assessment and classroom management system across educational level (Office of The Basic Education Commision, 2014). Most of the initiatives failed to meet their goals (Kaur et al., 2016; Todd, 2015). As pointed out by Chayunuvat (2017) on the nature of Thai learners, Thai students are unable to use English language to serve their own needs. Chayunuvat (2017) suggests that "Thai students studying English are still trapped" (p.48).

In 2016, the Office of the Higher Education Commission (OHEC) stated that all universities and educational institutions at the tertiary level need to promote the use of CEFR as a guideline to set individual learning priorities, track progress and assess students' language proficiency. It was an attempt to level up the English language proficiency level of Thai graduates to B2 level (according to the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages) (Office of the Higher Education Commission, 2016). This policy has provoked changes in English language provision in higher education across nation. However, the policy did not offer a set of recommendations to organize English language teaching and learning in order to meet the expected standards. The SPV project was introduced to the General English language course in the hope that it could not only provide a learning environment conducive to learner's own aspiration in learning but also serve the national and university policy in helping to meet the stated CEFR levels and achieve the necessary English language proficiency among Thai learners and graduates.

Student-Produced Video Project (SPVP)
Several attempts were made to introduce student-produced video project (SPVP) so as to create a learning environment that is both complex and real and able to respond to the change in ELT. Meyer & Forester (2015) assert that student-produced videos have provided excellent learning

opportunity. There are several research studies that indicate the benefit of having students produce their own videos. Sharndama & Jemofwu (2013) proposed that using a student-produced video assignment helped students develop a better grasp of the diversity and complication of organizational environments and management problems. Aksel & Gürman-Kahraman (2014) researched on the perception of the effectiveness of student video project assignments at a state university in Turkey. They found that students perceived the video project a useful and effective learning assignment in improving their foreign language skill. Hafner & Miller (2011) carried a research on how the students-produced digital video project and associated technological learning environment had promoted some form of learner autonomy. A group of three students of an English for Science and Technology (EST) course at an English-medium university in Hong Kong collaboratively created and shared a multimodal scientific documentary. The findings indicated that the project promoted motivation, authenticity, independent learning, teamwork, peer-teaching, and reflection on learning. It provided an opportunity to foster autonomy, and study collaboratively, reflect on their own learning and combine technology with language learning (p.75). Another study was carried by Akdeniz (2017), it was the research on the efficiency of using student-produced videos in language classrooms to increase students awareness towards real language use. Foss, Carney, McDonald, & Rooks (2007) carried out research on small-group video projects and whole-group video projects as a part of a short-term intensive English program for juniors in the science and technology division of a large Japanese University. They assigned four projects, and two out of the four were video-making projects. The results indicated that the projects enabled EFL students to connect the English of the classroom to their own real-life interests (pp.15-16). The research on students' perception on students-produced video project in a General English language course at University level in Thailand has been rarely investigated. One research project on video making project at university level was carried by Wanchid & Wattanasin (2015). Wanchid & Wattanasin (2015) investigated group of university students' attitudes as well as the relationship between students' attitudes and final language scores after taking part in a video project in an English language course carried at one university in Bangkok, Thailand. The findings yielded positive attitudes toward the project in providing students with opportunities to practice the target language in authentic situations, using the language needed in real life and becoming independent learners. Performing this kind of research at Srinakharinwirot University context will benefit the English language education at the university especially within the context of English for General Education.

Conducting the Student-Produced Video Project (SPV) at Srinakharinwirot University
Providing the General English Language Course at Srinakharinwirot University is challenging as it has distinctive characteristics. The class is large in its size, made up of students of different levels of proficiency and different educational background and interests. These characteristics challenge the ability to provide effective ELT. Taking the issue of large classroom size for example, there are about 45-60 students in General English classes. This is a barrier to quality language provision (Wadesango, Hove, & Kurebwa, 2016). As Sharndama & Jemofwu (2013) add, there is no specific number of students to determine class size but a class of more than fifty is considered large and that number of students can bring numerous problems to teaching and learning. Teachers need to take extra steps in order to achieve quality education (C. Sharndama & IJemofwu, 2013). Kettanun (2015) also analyzed that most Thai students prefer to remain within the comfort zone of the traditional EFL classroom, where the teacher's intense guidance is dominant and appreciated. This

SPV project demonstrated how to handle large classes with mixed interests and disciplines and how to lessen teacher's authorities in class and increase learner's opportunities to independently learn and acquire the language.

The SPV project was one of the tasks undertaken within a General English Language course. There were 450 first year student participants with intermediate- level proficiency from nine classes (approximately 50 students per class) at Srinakharinwirot University, Thailand, nine instructors cooperatively designed and administered the project. Within each class, students were asked to work in small groups of 4-5 and cooperated with team members in making a video. They were responsible for information-gathering and video-recording processes. Students carried on a search for information on the chosen topics from websites or any relevant sources of information according to their preference. Students were expected to film and edit, and all students had to be involved in every stage of making the video. On completion of all projects, students were asked to show the video during the last week of the course in class. The videos were then assessed by two lecturers.

The Objective of the SPV Project
The ultimate goal of this project was to create an opportunity for students to learn language in a meaningful way. A meaningful way, in this context, means that students are introduced to tasks that challenge their ability to learn. Learners can collaboratively work, socialize outside the classroom with intellectual purpose, exercise their freedom in thinking, choose what is of importance to them in learning and face unpredictable circumstances. There were four main objectives of the SPV project which were: (1) to provide an environment that allows students to grasp a deeper understanding of the topic learnt in class and to increase their vocabulary; (2) to enhance English language proficiency as well as promote creativity and problem-solving skills; (3) to promote the use of Information and communication technology (ICT) in language and (4) to provide a collaborative working environment.

The Role of Instructors in the SPV Project
As the General English language course is a shared course, instructors had to collaboratively design course syllabus, teaching materials, student evaluation and project work. For the SPV project, all instructors organized meetings together in order to design the project and ensure that the project could help develop learner's language proficiency and interactions. Instructors also designed the length of the video to be prepared, the scope of the video, the criteria and rubric for project evaluation together with instructor and student roles. Clarifying teaching and learning process and project specification is a crucial process that lead to an effective project implementation.

In class, at the beginning of the project, instructors guided students in practicing writing a video script, training how to find relevant information, introducing ICT to support learning and video making, as described in the SPV project specifications and evaluation to which students would also agree upon before continuing on the project on their own.

During the project, instructors did not take an active role in the making of the videos. They monitored the collaboration process, provided feedback to help students with the project, and

encouraged students to work independently and collaboratively. The support from teachers came in many forms such as group meeting after class, outside class appointment and Line group discussions. Instructors worked a great deal with students only during the draft submission process. Instructors edited, checked language use, gave comments on information gathered and finally checked all content before students continued to their video recording process. Instructors and students exchanged ideas and learnt from each other. The atmosphere of learning and exchanging ideas between instructors and students were stressed. As Freire (1998) asserts teachers are not just knowers, for teachers are learning as well as learners and they can swap roles (Freire, 2004).

The Role of SPV Project Participants
Students chose partners that they preferred to work with and brainstormed ideas. The rules imposed by the instructors were that all members of the group needed to be present and speak in the video. They had to distribute work evenly among group member and collaboratively search for information and write a script for the video. Thus, they had to reach an agreement on how to design the video, how to search for information, how to delineate the work, how to use technological tools, and how creative they would like the video to be as a group.

The Delineation of the SPV Project Score
The summative assessment scores devoted to several learning outcomes conformed to the project objective as mentioned above. Table 1 shows the delineation of the SPV project score.

Table 1. *The Delineation of SPV Project Scores*

Criteria	Details
Video Script (20 %)	- Complete script on time - Show evidence of planning through all parts of the production
Story Line (20%)	- The video tells a compelling story or has a compelling structure and is expressed creatively. - All content relates to the storyline.
Subject Content (20%)	- Subject knowledge is evident throughout the video. - All information is clear, appropriate, and correct. - Uses at least 15 words from the selected unit.
Production and Creativity (20%)	- Video is edited. Video runs smoothly from shot to shot. - Thorough evidence of imagination, creativity, or thoughtfulness. - Style or mood which suits the content is evident - Creative and original
Group Collaboration (20%)	- All students contributed equally to the video. Students worked with each other in a friendly manner. Each video was marked by two lecturers. - A score difference of 1 % was acceptable. However, if the difference was more than 1%, the markers would discuss together and find a mark they would both agree on.

It can be seen that the score was devoted to language accuracy and the transfer of knowledge, four skills development and life skills, the application of technological tools, and collaboration among peers. This is the stage where learning assessment coheres with the expected learning outcomes.

SPV Project Specifications
Video Topics/Suggested Types of Presentation/ Length of the Video
The topic used in the video were taken from the students' textbook which were A global language/ Open learning/ Testing and Evaluation/ Food and health/ Different ways of life / Different cultures/ Living abroad/ First impressions/ Crime and punishment. Students chose the topic that they wanted to work on. The presentation could be in the following form/type: talk show, documentary, interview, news talk, news clip, reality show, TV drama, role play, panel discussion, etc. There were creativity scores for those who put creativity in presenting the chosen topic. The video length was 5-7 minutes. The minimum length was 5 minutes. 10 points were to be deducted when the video exceeded the maximum length of time or failed to meet the minimum length.

Technological Tools
Students could use either digital camcorders or mobile phone with video function to create videos. They found their own Editing Application or programs that were openly free for download such as Microsoft Movie Maker or some application depending on their selections. Video presentations were recorded on a CD/DVD.

Submission of Presentation Draft and Video
A script of the presentation was expected. The script or the draft of the presentation contained the information for the presentation in full detail. Students had to submit the draft before starting to create a video.

The Research Project at Srinakharinwirot University
Research Objectives
The objectives of the study were to investigate students' perceptions of the SPV project in three aspects: (1) English language proficiency improvement (2) the use of technological tools in the project and (3) collaboration among peers.

Research Questions
1. What is the students' perceptions of their improvement in English language proficiency after participating in the SPV project?
2. What is the students' perceptions of the use of technological tools in the SPV project?
3. What is the students' perceptions of collaboration among peers while working on the SPV project?

Research Methodology
Samples
The sample in this study were 107 first year students, who were enrolled for a 3-credit General English Language course as part of a compulsory English language course under the General Education Curriculum at Srinakharinwirot University. They were non-English major students from different faculties such as the Faculty of Medicine, the Faculty of Dentistry, the Faculty of Humanities and the Faculty of Education. They were randomly selected in questionnaire distribution.

Instruments
This research used questionnaires to elicit learner's perception. As Gu (2016) points out, questionnaires are often used to examine people's attitudes, beliefs and behaviors in language learning and teaching. The perception questionnaire was developed by the researcher and was designed to elicit project participants' perceptions in three aspects which are: (1) language proficiency; (2) usage of technological tools in the project; and (3) collaboration among peers. The questionnaire had four Likert-scale. While Likert (1932) scales often use a five-point scale, the deletion of the neutral response was acceptable. The scale ranged in values from strongly disagree, disagree, agree, to strongly agree. The questionnaires consisted of 18 items related to three different aspects as mentioned. The questionnaire was piloted with 40 students different from the selected sample for the study proper and the reliability of the research instrument was tested. Cronbach's alpha value was found as α =.76, which means the reliability is acceptable for the research.

Data Analysis
The data obtained from questionnaires were calculated using SPSS. Data results were statistically analyzed and reported in the form of descriptive statistics: Percentage, Mean and SD.

Findings and Discussion
The findings and discussion are divided into four sections. The analysis result of the average level of students' perceptions of the three aspects was as follows.

Table 2: *The Analysis Result of the Average Level of Students' Perceptions of the Three Aspects*

Average	Level of Perception
3.26 – 4.00	Strongly Agree
2.51 – 3.25	Agree
1.76 – 2.50	Disagree
1.00 – 1.75	Strongly Disagree

Section 1: Analysis of students' perceptions of the overall SPV project
The overall analysis of students' perceptions indicates that students believed that SPV project enhanced their English language proficiency, created positive attitudes toward the usage of technological tools in language learning and showed that they preferred to work collaboratively with peers. The overall mean value of the students' perceived success in promoting the three mentioned aspect was $\overline{x}$ = 2.90 (SD = .627) (See Table 2).

Table 3. *Mean and SD of Students' Perceptions of the Overall Aspect of the SPV Project*

Students' perceptions of the overall SPV project	N	Mean $\overline{X}$	SD.	Perception Scale
English Language Proficiency	107	2.84	.521	Agree
The Usage of Technological Tools	107	2.97	.755	Agree
Collaboration Among Peers	107	3.04	.599	Agree
Overall score	**107**	**2.90**	**.627**	Agree

According to Table 3, the results indicated that students are in favor of collaborative work with peers the most with a mean score $\bar{x}$ = 3.04 (SD = .599). Students agreed to use technological tools in the SPV project with a mean score $\bar{x}$ = 2.97 (SD = .755) and agreed that the video project improved their language proficiency with a mean score of 2.84 (SD = .521) respectively.

Section 2: Analysis of the students' perceptions of English language proficiency improvements and life skills
The participants were questioned to evaluate their four language skills along with their vocabulary development, their confidence in using the language, the promotion of creativity and also problem-solving skills. The overall mean values of the participant's perceived success in these areas was $\bar{x}$ = 2.84 (SD =.521). When analyzing by items, Item 6 reveals that students agreed that the project increased their vocabulary the most with the highest mean value ($\bar{x}$= 3.00, SD = .700). Item 7 and Item 8 were taken into consideration as the second and third highest mean values with $\bar{x}$ = 2.97 (SD = .867) and $\bar{x}$ = 2.92 (SD = .754) respectively. When considering items related to English language skills, students agreed that they had improved in speaking skill, reading skill and writing skill, but not in the listening skill. Among the three skills, students thought that the SPV project helped to improve their reading skill the most and then their writing. Students disagreed that the SPV project helped improve listening skill with the lowest mean value ($\bar{x}$ = 2.50, SD = .620). This result was opposite to the findings of Aksel & Gürman-Kahraman (2014, p. 320), that their research results yielded the improvement of listening and speaking but reading and writing skills. The differences of the findings could possibly derive from the different project design and objectives. As one of the SPV project objectives was to reinforce the content learnt in class, and to focus on the content of the video and the writing document in the form of script before students continued the video recording. It could be said two projects with the same technological tools but different design project design and focus yield different results.

Table 4. *Students' Perceptions of English Language proficiency and Life Skills*

Students' perceptions of English language proficiency	N	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Mean ($\bar{X}$)	SD.
1. This project helped improve my language ability.	107	4 (3.70%)	8 (7.50%)	91 (85.00%)	4 (3.70%)	2.89	.501
2. My listening skill improved after completing the project.	107	5 (4.70%)	45 (42.10%)	55 (51.40%)	2 (1.90%)	2.50	.620
3. My reading skill improved after completing the project.	107	8 (7.50%)	14 (13.10%)	72 (67.30%)	13 (12.10%)	2.84	.729
4. My speaking skill improved after completing the project.	107	5 (4.70%)	18 (16.80%)	79 (73.80%)	5 (4.70%)	2.79	.599
5. My writing skill improved after completing the project.	107	15 (14.00%)	21 (19.60%)	62 (57.90%)	9 (8.40%)	2.61	.833

Students' perceptions of English language proficiency	N	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Mean)$\overline{X}$)	SD.
6. I understand vocabulary better after completing the project.	107	4 (3.70%)	14 (13.10%)	67 (62.60%)	22 (20.60%)	3.00	.700
7. I gained more confidence in using the language after completing the project.	107	8 (7.50%)	17 (15.90%)	51 (47.70%)	30 (28.00%)	2.97	.867
8. I analyze and solve problems better after completing the project.	107	6 (5.60%)	17 (15.90%)	64 (59.80%)	20 (18.70%)	2.92	.754
Overall Score						**2.84**	**.521**

From Table 4, it can be said that the project promoted learners in all aspect of language learning especially in the building up of learner's confidence and problem-solving skills. In term of language proficiency, the analysis revealed that the SPV project helped them read better. Thus, it can be concluded that making video recordings has a facilitative effect on L2 language learners.

Section 3: Analysis of the students' perceptions of the uses of technological tools

The participants were asked to indicate their preferences in using technological tools while working on the project. The use of technological tools in the SPV project was, overall, an enjoyable experience for students. The overall mean score for this aspect was $\overline{x}$ = 2.97 (SD= .755). Students perceived that technology can be used efficiently while working on a project and it was fun to use.

Table 5. *Students' Perceptions of the Use of Technological Tools*

Students' perceptions of the use of technological tools	N	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Mean)$\overline{X}$)	SD.
1. I like to use technological tools in doing the project.	107	5 (4.70%)	28 (26.20%)	50 (46.70%)	24 (22.40%)	2.87	.814
2. I prefer video recording my presentation to face to face classroom presentation.	107	11 (10.30%)	15 (14.00%)	55 (51.40%)	26 (24.30%)	2.90	.890
3. Using technological tools makes learning language more fun.	107	8 (7.50%)	11 (10.30%)	61 (57.00%)	27 (25.20%)	3.00	.813
4. My life was easier because of the use of technology in the presentation.	107	3 (2.80%)	15 (14.00%)	57 (53.30%)	32 (29.90%)	3.10	.739

Students' perceptions of the use of technological tools	N	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Mean $\overline{X}$	SD.
5. Making a short video is an interesting activity for promoting language learning.	107	9 (8.40%)	17 (15.90%)	50 (46.70%)	31 (29.00%)	2.96	.889
6. I had no problem in creating a video.	107	7 (6.50%)	24 (22.40%)	51 (47.70%)	25 (23.40%)	2.88	.844
Overall Score						2.97	.755

It can be concluded from Table 5 that the mean score of Item 4 ($\overline{x}$ = 3.10 (SD. = .739) demonstrated the importance of technological tools in English language classroom. Some students perceived the language class with the use of technology more fun that the class with no technology ($\overline{x}$= 3.00, SD = .813).

However, there were some students that did not prefer using technological tools in doing the project. When studying percentages, it is interesting to point out that approximately 33% of students reported strongly disagreeing and disagreeing on item 1. This issue should be explored in the next research.

Section 4: Analysis of the students' perceptions of collaboration among peers
The participants' opinions toward collaboration among peers were questioned. The overall mean score of this aspect was $\overline{x}$ = 3.01 (SD=.599). This means students agreed that the SPV project helped students work more closely with friends and it was a preferred learning environment in language learning.

Table 6. *Students' Perceptions of Collaboration among Peers*

Students' perceptions of collaboration among peers	N	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Mean $\overline{X}$	SD.
1. I like to work on a project as a group.	107	7 (6.50%)	21 (19.60%)	53 (49.50%)	26 (24.30%)	2.92	.837
2. Creating a video makes me work more closely with friends.	107	5 (4.70%)	11 (10.30%)	50 (46.70%)	41 (38.30%)	3.19	.802
3. My friend helps me a lot when it comes to technological issues.	107	1 (.90%)	19 (17.80%)	59 (55.10%)	28 (26.20%)	3.07	.691
4. I like it when work has been distributed evenly.	107	4 (3.70%)	8 (7.50%)	64 (59.80%)	31 (29.00%)	3.14	.706
Overall Score						3.01	.599

From Table 6, it can be said that students believed that working on a group project with the aid of technology was suitable for foreign language learning. Item 4 received the highest mean score ($\overline{x}$ = 3.14, SD = .706). Students preferred a fair distribution of work among member of the group. The results indicated, the mean value of the item 2 ($\overline{x}$ = 3.19, SD = .802) showed that students felt that the SPV really promoted collaboration among peers as the item received the highest mean value among 18 items in the questionnaire.

Implications
Overall, the findings indicated that all three aspects of the project received positive feedback. This implied that it is possible for the SPV project, supported by group collaboration and a variety of technological tools, to create a meaningful learning environment where students explored and sought knowledge according to their needs and interests without having to depend on the instructor to provide them with that knowledge. The findings also implied that the SPV project is a practical and effective alternative activity to the traditional teaching of the General English language course that is large in size whose learners come from different disciplines and interests. Additionally, the project was carried by at least 9 instructors, to about 10 groups of students, it implied that a clear statement on project objectives, role of teachers and learners, project evaluation and project specification guided both learners and teachers toward an expected learning outcome. Additionally, the clear statement also guides researcher.

It is also worth noting that, several projects similarly in its nature to SVP project demonstrated the change of listening and speaking skill in learners. But participants of the SVP projects believed that their reading skill improved the most while listening skill not. It implied that the design of the project and clearly statement of project objectives influence greatly the change in learners and learning outcomes. Implementing the same technological tools with the same nature of participants does not yield the same results. The application of technological tools in promoting language proficiency and life skills and other facet of human development is contextual not generalized.

Conclusion and Recommendations
The study on students' perceptions of the SPV project had as its aim to investigate students' perceptions of three items: (1) the improvement of students' English language proficiency and life skills, (2) the use of technological tools and (3) the state of collaboration among peers. The objective of the SPV project was to create an opportunity for students to learn language in a meaningful way. A "meaningful way" means that students are introduced to tasks that challenge their ability to learn. Learners can collaboratively work, socialize outside the classroom with intellectual purpose, exercise their freedom in thinking, choose whatever is of importance to them in learning and face unpredictable circumstances. The main objectives of SPV project were to provide complex and flexible learning environment that is pertinent to the development of language proficiency, life skills and collaboration among learners and to provide an environment that allowed students to grasp a deeper understanding of the topic learnt in class, increase their repertoire of vocabulary and be able to use language in real situations

The quantitative analysis of the data showed that the students perceived the SPV project as a language activity that enhanced their English language proficiency, supported the use of technological tools in learning and promoted collaboration among peers. Approximately 91 % of

students agreed and strongly agreed that the SPV project made them work more closely with friends. The only item students felt that they did not gain improvement after participating in the project was the development of listening skill. Among the four basic language skills, approximately 85 % of students perceived that their reading skills improved more than the other three skills.

The pedagogical implications for EFL teachers, learners, curriculum designers and material developer are that the integration of ICT depends on the design of the task and project objectives. Sharndama & Jemofwu (2013) concluded that it's appropriate utilizations or manipulation of technology by the teacher that will transform their teaching methods/strategies. And this appears to be the case here. Designing and specifying the learning outcomes, types of activities, specifications of task and project and aligning with learners' assessment are key factors for success in cultivating language learners in the 21st century. As emphasized by Stroupe (2017, p. 33), the nature of the language classroom is changing with an emphasis on the broader role of the language classroom and language educator in preparing graduates to enter a global workforce. Teachers should carefully plan and reflect on curriculum design and instructional strategies and indicators that suggest possible directions for further exploration.

About the Author

Dr. Supanit Kulsiri is currently a Chair of B.A. in Language and Intercultural Communication at International College for Sustainability Studies, Srinakharinwirot University, Thailand where she works to develop courses, administer curriculum and deliver professional development. Her area of expertise is English language curriculum development and ELT policy.
ORCID**:** https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5724-8264

References

Akdeniz, N. Ö. (2017). Use of Student-Produced Videos to Develop Oral Skills in EFL Classrooms. *International Journal on Language, Literature and Culture in Education, 4,* (1), 43-53.

Aksel, A., & Gürman-Kahraman, F. (2014). Video Project Assignments and their Effectiveness on Foreign Language Learning. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 141*, 319-324. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.05.055

Baker, W., & Jarunthawatchai, W. (2017). English Language Policy in Thailand. *European Journal of Language Policy, 9,* (1). doi: https://doi.org/10.3828/ejlp.2017.3

C. Sharndama, E., & IJemofwu, D. I. A. (2013). Application of ICTs in Teaching and Learning English (ELT) in Large Classes. *Journal of Arts and Humanities, 2,* (6), 34-39.

Chayunuvat, A. (2017). Managing Learning English in a Thai Context: A Big Challenge for Thai. *ThaiTESOL, 30,* (2), 61-83.

Crystal, D. (2003). *English as a Global Language* (2nd ed.). Cambridge Cambridge University Press.

EducationFirst. (2017). EF EPI Reports Seventh Edition. Retrieved January 25, 2017 from https://www.ef.co.th//www.ef.com/__/~/media/centralefcom/epi/downloads/full-reports/v7/ef-epi-2017-english.pdf

Foss, P., Carney, N., McDonald, K., & Rooks, M. (2007). Project-Based Learning Activities for Short-Term Intensive English Programs. *Asian EFL Journal, 23,* (2), 1-19.

Freire, P. (1998). *Pedagogy of Freedom: Ethics, Democracy and Civic Courage*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Freire, P. (2004). Pedagogy of oppressed. In D. J. Flinders & S. J. Thornton (Eds.), *The curriculum studies reader* (pp. 125-133). New York: Routledge Palmer.

Gu, P. Y. (2016). Questionaires in Language Teaching Research *Language Teaching Research, 20,* (5), 567-570.

Hafner, C., & Miller, L. (2011). Fostering Learner Autonomy in English for Science: A Collaborative Digital Video Project in a Technological Learning Environment. *Language, Learning and Technology, 15,* (3), 68-86.

Kaur, A., Young, D., & Kirkpatrick, R. (2016). English Education Policy in Thailand: Why the Poor Results? In R. Kirkpatrick (Ed.), *English Language Education Policy in Asia* (pp. 345-361). Switzerland: Springer International Publishing

Kettanun, C. (2015). Project-based Learning and Its Validity in a Thai EFL Classroom. *Procedia -Social and Behavioral Sciences, 192,* (24), 567-573.

Kumaravadivelu, B. (2013). Afterword: Rethinking Global Perspectives and Local Initiatives in Language Teaching. In S. B. Said & L. J. Zhang (Eds.), *Language Teachers and Teaching: Global Perspectives and Local Initiatives* (pp. 317-323). New York: Routledge.

Lantolf, J. P. (2000). *Sociocultural theory and second language learning*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.

Lian, A.-P., & Pineda, M. V. (2014). Rhizomatic Learning: "As… When… and If…" A Strategy for the ASEAN Community in the 21st Century. *Beyond Words, 1,* (2), 1-27.

Lian, A.-P., & Sangarun, P. (2017). Precision Language Education: A Glimpse Into a Possible Future. *GEMA Online Journal of Language Studies, 17,* (4), 1-15.

Likert, R. (1932). *A Technique for the Measurement of Attitudes*. New York University Achieves of Psychology.

Lui, A. K., Choy, S.-O., Cheung, Y. H. Y., & Li, S. C. (2006). A Study on the Perception of Students towards Educational Weblogs. *Informatics in Education, 5,* (2), 233-254.

Meyer, E., & Forester, L. (2015). Implementing Student-Produced Video Projects in Language Courses: Guidelines and Lessons Learned. *Die Unterrichtspraxis/Teaching German, 48,* (2), 192-210.

Motaei, B. (2014). On the Effect of Cooperative Learning on General English Achievement of Kermanshah Islamic Azad University Students. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 98,* (6), 1249-1254.

Office of The Basic Education Commision. (2014). *English Language Teaching and Learning Reform*. Thailand: Ministry of Education.

Office of the Higher Education Commission. (2016). *English Language Policy in Higher Education*. Bangkok: Office of the Higher Education Commission.

Schultz, P. L., & Quinn, A. S. (2013). Lights, Camera, Action! Learning About Management with Student-Produced Video Assignments. *Journal of Management Education, 38,* (2), 234-258.

Stroupe, R. (2017). The Langauge Education and Globalization: How Do We Best Prepare Our Learners? In K. Kimura & J. Middlecamp (Eds.), *Asian-Focused ELT Research and Practice: Voices from the Far Edge* (pp. 33-49). Phanom Penh IDP Education (Cambodia) Ltd.

Sun, Y. (2014). Major Trends in the Global ELT Field: A Non-Native English-Speaking Professional's Perspective. *Language Education in Asia, 5,* (1), 7-19.

Todd, R. W. (2015). National-Level Educational Innovations in Thailand. In P. Darasawang & H. Reinders (Eds.), *Innovation in Language Teaching and Learning: The Case of Thailand* (pp. 15-28). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1986). *Thought and language*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Wadesango, N., Hove, J., & Kurebwa, M. (2016). Effects of a Large Class Size on Effective Curriculum Implementation. *International Journal of Educational Sciences, 12,* (2), 173-183.

Wanchid, R., & Wattanasin, K. (2015). The Investigation of Students' Attitudes toward Project Work in Enhancing Independent Learning in English I at King Mongkut's University of Technology North Bangkok. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences, 6,* (5), 581-592.