Journal of Information Technology Education: Innovations in Practice

An Official Publication of the Informing Science Institute
InformingScience.org

JITEiip.org

Volume 23, 2024

FLIPGRID: UNLOCKING THE ENGLISH SPEAKING POTENTIAL OF JORDANIAN ADOLESCENT EFL LEARNERS

Wejdan Mohammad Zghoul*	Yarmouk University, Irbid, Jordan	2019230061@ses.yu.edu.jo
Ruba Fahmi Bataineh	Yarmouk University, Irbid, Jordan	rubab@yu.edu.jo

* Corresponding author

ABSTRACT

Aim/Purpose	This study investigated the effect of using Flipgrid, an application through which teachers gather learners in virtual classrooms to allow interaction through video and audio sharing, on Jordanian EFL seventh-grade students' speaking performance (along with the features of fluency, pronunciation, grammar, and vocabulary).
Background	Speaking is a fundamental skill in language acquisition, yet it constitutes a challenge to many EFL learners due to limited opportunities for practice. With the integration of digital tools in language teaching and learning, platforms, of which Flipgrid is one, have emerged as innovative conduits for self-paced learning, active engagement, personalized feedback, and a low-pressure environment for practice.
Methodology	A quasi-experimental design was used, as two intact seventh-grade sections of 25 students each were drawn from Al Morooj Secondary School for Girls (Amman, Jordan) in the first semester of the academic year 2023/2024. The speaking activities of Modules 1, 2, and 3 of the prescribed textbook, *Action Pack 7*, were redesigned into a 10-week Flipgrid-based instructional program to teach the experimental group, whereas the control group was taught following the guidelines of the Teacher's Book of *Action Pack 7*. The instrument used was a speaking pre-/post-test.
Contribution	The study provides empirical evidence that Flipgrid significantly improves EFL learners' speaking performance in terms of fluency, vocabulary, pronunciation, and grammar. By providing evidence for the effectiveness of a structured, technology-

Accepting Editor Keith A. Willoughby | Received: August 11, 2024 | Revised: November 27, 2024 | Accepted: November 29, 2024.
Cite as: Zghoul, W. M., & Bataineh, R. F. (2024). Flipgrid: Unlocking the English speaking potential of Jordanian adolescent EFL learners. *Journal of Information Technology Education: Innovations in Practice, 23,* Article 17. https://doi.org/10.28945/5407

	based instructional program, this study demonstrates how digital tools can transform traditional language instruction into more interactive, engaging, and learner-centered.
Findings	The results revealed that the Flipgrid-instructed group outperformed the control group in speaking overall and along the features of fluency, pronunciation, grammar, and vocabulary.
Recommendations for Practitioners	Language instructors should consider integrating Flipgrid (and similar digital platforms) into their instruction to create an environment conducive to engaging speaking practice. Flipgrid can also be used to conduct formative self- and peer-assessment, which fosters both autonomy and a sense of community. Curriculum designers are called upon to integrate digital platforms into language materials to develop speaking in an interactive and student-centered manner and promote reflective practice and ownership among learners. Policymakers are also called upon to allocate resources to ensure equitable access to digital tools in classrooms to address infrastructure challenges and reduce the digital divide, not to mention support technology-based teacher training initiatives for innovative teaching practice.
Recommendations for Researchers	Researchers may compare the effectiveness of Flipgrid with other digital tools (e.g., Padlet, Edmodo, Seesaw, Voki, Loom, Kahoot!) in speaking and other language skills (viz., listening, reading, and writing).
Impact on Society	This research underscores the transformative potential of integrating digital tools into language education, allowing for more effective and equitable learning experiences that benefit both the individual learner and the community at large.
Future Research	Future research may investigate the long-term effects of Flipgrid on learners' speaking performance or its effectiveness across diverse age groups, proficiency levels, or cultural contexts.
Keywords	EFL, Flipgrid, fluency, grammar, Jordan, pronunciation, speaking, vocabulary

INTRODUCTION

Picture a classroom where students no longer shy away from speaking English, where they confidently share their thoughts, practice pronunciation, and refine grammar without the fear of judgment. This vision is no longer a distant ideal, thanks to the integration of digital tools. As technology continues to shape education, the quest to improve speaking skills – a cornerstone of effective communication in a globalized world – has found a promising ally in interactive, student-centered platforms, one of which is Flipgrid.

Technology has become an essential component of education since it affects both how teachers teach and how students learn (Wells et al., 2008). Since students are the next generation of digital natives, technology integration enables teachers to build a more dynamic and engaging learning environment for them to engage in rich learning experiences (Basal, 2015).

By providing users with creative, self-paced learning opportunities, technology promotes learning (Fisher et al., 2006). In response to the present revolution in educational technology, creative models, strategies, and instructional techniques have evolved (Baniabdelrahman et al., 2007; Bataineh & Baniabdelrahman, 2006; Fisher et al., 2006; Harris et al., 2009). However, although technology facilitates online self-learning, it does not guarantee skill integration. For instance, students can learn a language more easily online than in a traditional classroom, but they still need to interact with others to learn how to speak (Días et al., 2021).

Language is a tool for oral communication, which mostly takes place during talk-exchange interactions in which meaningful messages are sent, received, and processed. Nonetheless, mastery of the four language skills (speaking, listening, reading, and writing) is fundamental for effective communication. While the receptive skills of reading and listening are required to comprehend language input, the productive skills of speaking and writing allow learners to produce language (Harmer, 2007). Hence, as speaking is one of the key goals of teaching/learning a foreign language, finding creative and interesting ways to support students in communicating in English is essential (Brown, 2000; Burns & Hill, 2013; Srivastava, 2014).

Speaking enables students to express their thoughts, sentiments, and emotions (Richards, 2008). To communicate appropriately and get past communication breakdowns, fluency, which enables learners to interact successfully in a foreign language, is essential (Nematovna, 2016). Fluent speakers who make fewer errors in vocabulary, grammar, cohesion, and coherence are most likely successful foreign language learners (Brown, 2000; Kumar, 2013). Some foreign language learners acquire exceptional proficiency, accuracy, and fluency in a foreign language (Nishanthi, 2018).

When learners of English as a foreign language (henceforth, EFL) attempt to speak, they face obstacles, both linguistically (in vocabulary, grammar, and pronunciation) and psychologically (in self-assurance and anxiety), as English becomes more a tool than a goal of communication (Fitriani et al., 2015). Due to the learners' lack of participation in the EFL classroom, where linguistic competence rather than communicative competence is prioritized, teachers and students are unhappy with the methods of instruction used (Al-Jamal, 2007).

To effectively teach speaking, EFL teachers must foster a fun, cooperative learning environment and give students opportunities to practice speaking in personally relevant, real-world settings (Leong & Ahmadi, 2017; Nematovna, 2016). Students have been reported to "motivate themselves and internalize their learning goals when teachers create climates in their schools that support autonomy" (Dincer et al., 2012, p. 104).

One strategy for encouraging speaking and fostering students' engagement and interest in the EFL-speaking classroom is meaningful interactions in communicative activities (Oradee, 2012). Role-playing, games, conversations, simulations, and group projects, to name a few, help learners not only engage but also speak more effectively (Kayi, 2006; Klippel, 1984).

Flipgrid, a free learning application that offers interaction through video and audio sharing, enables teachers to share videotaped materials with their students in virtual classrooms and allows these students to videotape responses to questions raised by the teacher (MacIsaac, 2020a, 2020b). Teachers create and publish themes and questions in online class groups, called *grids*, for students to join sessions or submit text, drawings, and subtitles to videos from an Apple or Android smartphone. Teachers can create lesson plans, compile student responses, assist participants via video chat, and work together with students (Merrill, 2018).

Flipgrid may be beneficial for learners who find it difficult to practice speaking in class or in front of others, particularly if it helps them overcome feelings of shyness, insecurity, or fear of making mistakes (Tan, 2019). Flipgrid also offers a platform where students may share knowledge and be heard. Some students may become anxious when put 'on the spot,' and shy students may publish their work after gaining little experience from reading what their peers have uploaded (Khang & Tuyet, 2020).

Flipgrid is also reported to make learners feel self-assured and more at ease (Mango, 2019). Learners are offered opportunities to practice oral presentations, automatically accessing their video scripts and recording and checking their presentations before submitting them (Ahmad & Lidadun, 2017). Flipgrid, and its asynchronous videos, may constitute an effective tool that potentially helps students move from the back row to the front of the class and gives each a voice in a safe, non-threatening environment (McLain, 2018; Sun, 2009). Flipgrid further enables the teacher to conduct formative assessments and peers to give timely feedback (Difilippantonio-Pen, 2020), making language learning

more engaging and fun while helping keep students on-task and quickly resolving any emergent problems.

Problem, Purpose, and Significance

As EFL practitioners, the researchers have either faced or observed fellow teachers face challenges in teaching speaking. Regardless of the level of their linguistic competence, Jordanian EFL learners generally find it difficult to communicate orally in the target language. As they are exposed to English only in the classroom, albeit from the first grade, they prefer to communicate in their native Arabic. Previous research has pointed out problems related to lack of practice opportunities, inadequate vocabulary, and fear of making errors in English (e.g., Al-Masadeh & Al-Omari, 2014; Bataineh et al., 2020).

The researchers, in their attempt to improve student communication in English, have opted for Flipgrid, which promises to work on not only students' speaking skills but also their confidence and motivation (e.g., Al-Mallahi, 2023; Coello Vásquez et al., 2024; Rosita & Halimi, 2023). Probably one of the first in Jordan, the study examines the effect of using Flipgrid on Jordanian EFL seventh-grade students' speaking performance in terms of *fluency, grammar, vocabulary,* and *pronunciation* on questions along the literal, inferential, and critical levels. More specifically, the study attempts to answer the following questions:

1. Are there any statistically significant differences (at $\alpha = 0.05$) in Jordanian EFL students' overall speaking performance in response to literal, inferential, and critical questions, which can be attributed to the instructional modality (conventional vs. Flipgrid-based)?
2. Are there any statistically significant differences (at $\alpha = 0.05$) in Jordanian EFL students' speaking performance in the features of *grammar, pronunciation, fluency,* and *vocabulary* in response to literal, inferential, and critical questions, which can be attributed to the instructional modality (conventional vs. Flipgrid-based)?

The study hopes to lend insights into teaching speaking in Jordan and similar contexts and encourage EFL teachers to use innovative instructional tools in speaking lessons. It may also provide valuable insights to curriculum designers and decision-makers to plan and develop additional learner-centered activities, exercises, and assignments to improve speaking performance.

Overview of Existing Research

This section synthesizes key studies on the effect of Flipgrid on speaking skill development. Internationally, a plethora of research highlights the positive effect of Flipgrid on learners' speaking skills across various levels and contexts. Flipgrid has been identified as an effective tool for helping students develop public speaking skills in a low-pressure environment (McClure & McAndrews, 2016).

Flipgrid was reported to foster engagement and communication skills (Petersen et al., 2020), facilitate verbal interactions (Flanagan, 2019), improve pronunciation (Hanh & Huong, 2021), and reduce pronunciation errors (Coello Vásquez et al., 2024). It was found to significantly improve vocabulary, grammar, overall speaking abilities (Rosita & Halimi, 2023), both fundamental and advanced speaking skills (Coello Vásquez et al., 2024; Rosita & Halimi, 2023), overall English proficiency (Flanagan, 2019; Putri et al., 2022), and create a sense of class community (Flanagan, 2019).

Research also suggests that Flipgrid potentially helps learners overcome psychological barriers (e.g., anxiety, lack of confidence). For example, Flipgrid was reported to improve confidence in speaking (McLain, 2018) and motivation (Rosita & Halimi, 2023), as it provides a non-threatening environment in which learners practice speaking without apprehension (Pham & Duong, 2024) or fear of being judged (Tan, 2019), which potentially reduces speaking-related anxiety and increase self-assurance (Septianawati, 2024).

Research in the Arab region, albeit much less than that done internationally, supports similar findings. For example, Abu Eid (2022) reported that Flipgrid improved fluency, accuracy, and confidence among adolescent Palestinian learners. Similarly, Al-Mallahi (2023) found that it improved Jordanian adolescent learners' vocabulary, grammar, and overall speaking abilities.

This literature review underscores the effectiveness of Flipgrid in fostering speaking skills. The reported effectiveness of Flipgrid in diverse contexts highlights its potential to revolutionize EFL instruction by making speaking practice more accessible, engaging, and effective. However, the limited research in Arab contexts presents an opportunity for this study to contribute to the growing body of knowledge and provide localized insights into the use of Flipgrid as an instructional tool.

METHOD AND PROCEDURES

DESIGN, VARIABLES, AND PARTICIPANTS

This study adopted a quasi-experimental design (Campbell et al., 1963) with one experimental and one control group. The independent variable of the study was the use of Flipgrid, and the dependent variable comprised speaking, both overall and along the features of *pronunciation, vocabulary, grammar,* and *fluency*.

The participants, two intact seventh-grade sections of 25 students each, were randomly chosen from the three sections of the purposefully selected Al-Murooj Secondary School for Girls, a public school in the Second Directorate of Education, Amman (Jordan). They were randomly assigned to one control and one experimental group. The former was taught conventionally using the guidelines of the prescribed Teacher's Book and the latter through Flipgrid during the first semester of the academic year 2023/ 2024. One teacher, who was trained to implement the treatment by the first researcher, taught both the experimental and the control groups.

INSTRUMENTS

To achieve the purpose of the study, a speaking pre-/post-test was designed. The test consists of four sections, instructions, and three different tasks (viz., *talk about a job, describe a place,* and *discuss global warming).* The three tasks, involving a set of questions at the literal, inferential, and/or critical levels, were allotted 15 minutes each. A scoring rubric was used to assess students' overall speaking performance along the four features of *grammar*, *pronunciation*, *vocabulary*, and *fluency*.

To establish the validity of the instructional treatment and pre-/post-test, a jury of experts in curriculum and instruction and linguistics assessed them for content, procedural, and linguistic appropriateness. The jury's feedback was used to prepare the final version of the treatment and pre-/post-test. The test was also piloted on 20 students, excluded from the sample pool at a two-week interval. Pearson correlation coefficients were calculated and deemed appropriate for the purpose of the research (Leach et al., 2008).

TEACHING THE TWO GROUPS

Throughout the Flipgrid-based instructional treatment, the experimental group participants were taught how to use Flipgrid at the onset of the treatment. In every session, the teacher introduced the lesson and invited students to join a grid to work on the topic of the lesson. The participants watched the videos posted by the teacher and responded in their own videos. They watched their classmates' videos and offered feedback. At the end of each lesson, the teacher gave feedback on the uploaded student videos discussing the four speaking features of *grammar*, *pronunciation*, *vocabulary,* and *fluency*. The teacher modeled reflection for the participants to reflect on their experience using Flipgrid and the challenges they faced after each lesson.

The control group, on the other hand, was taught using the guidelines of the Teacher's Book of the Ministry prescribed textbook, *Action Pack 7*. The teacher usually began with a warm-up activity to

check the students' background knowledge on the topic. The *Before You Start* activity in the textbook drew the students' attention to the topic of the lesson and started the discussion (often in pairs or groups) under the watchful eye of the teacher. The teacher focused on accurate pronunciation, correct grammar, and active participation per the outcomes outlined in the Teacher's Book.

RESULTS

To answer the first research question, are there any statistically significant differences (at $\alpha = 0.05$) in Jordanian EFL students' overall speaking performance in response to literal, inferential, and critical questions, which can be attributed to the instructional modality (conventional vs. Flipgrid-based), the means and standard deviations of the control and experimental groups' performance on the pre-/post-test were calculated, as shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Means and standard deviations of the two groups on the pre-/post-test

Group	Pre-test		Post-test	
	*Mean	SD	*Mean	SD
Experimental	25.52	6.64	47.40	9.07
Control	26.44	7.10	34.16	10.25

*Maximum score is 60

Table 1 shows that the experimental group's performance on the post-test (mean = 47.40) was better than that of the control group (mean = 34.16). To examine whether there was a statistically significant effect for the instructional modality (conventional vs. Flipgrid) on speaking (after controlling the effect of the pre-test scores), a one-way analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) was used, as shown in Table 2.

Table 2. One-way ANCOVA for the effect of the instructional modality on speaking

Source	Type III sum of squares	Df	Mean square	F	Sig.	η^2
Pre-test (Covariate)	670.84	1	670.84	8.24	0.006	0.15
Instructional Modality	2349.06	1	2349.06	28.87	0.000	0.38
Error	3824.52	47	81.37			
Total	89837.00	50				
Corrected Total	6686.58	49				

Table 2 shows a statistically significant difference between the two groups in overall speaking (after controlling the effect of the pre-test), in favor of the experimental group. The partial eta squared value of 0.38 shows that the instructional modality explained 38% of the variance in speaking. The means, standard errors, and standard deviations of the two groups before and after controlling the overall pre-test scores were also calculated, as shown in Table 3.

Table 3. Unadjusted and adjusted means of the two groups in overall speaking

Group	Unadjusted mean		Adjusted mean	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SE
Experimental	47.40	9.07	47.65	1.806
Control	34.16	10.25	33.91	1.806

Table 3 shows statistically significant differences between the two groups in overall speaking on the post-test after controlling the difference in pre-test scores. As such, using Flipgrid positively affected the experimental group's overall speaking performance on the post-test.

To answer the second research question, are there any statistically significant differences (at $\alpha = 0.05$) in Jordanian EFL students' speaking performance in the features of *grammar, pronunciation, fluency,* and *vocabulary* in response to literal, inferential, and critical questions, which can be attributed to the instructional modality (conventional vs. Flipgrid-based), the means and standard deviations of the two groups' performance on the pre-/post-test per the three types of speaking questions (i.e., literal, inferential, and critical) were calculated, as shown in Table 4.

Table 4. Means and standard deviations of the two groups' performance on the pre-/post-test per speaking question type

Type of questions	Group	Pre-test		Post-test	
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Literal	Experimental	8.24	2.18	15.04	4.18
	Control	8.96	2.79	11.56	4.24
Inferential	Experimental	8.64	2.25	16.08	4.58
	Control	8.12	2.73	11.20	4.30
Critical	Experimental	8.64	3.11	16.28	3.46
	Control	9.36	2.61	11.40	3.45

Maximum score = 20

Table 4 shows that the experimental group outperformed the control group on the post-test in all three types of speaking questions. To examine the effect of the instructional modality (conventional vs. Flipgrid) on the linear combination of the three types of speaking questions (after controlling the effect of the pre-test), a one-way multivariate analysis of covariance (MANCOVA) through Hoteling's Trace multivariate test (Rencher, 2005) was used, as shown in Table 5.

Table 5. One-way MANCOVA for the effect of the instructional modality on the linear combination of the speaking questions

Effect	Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.	η^2
Instructional Modality	0.65	9.30	3.00	43.00	0.00	0.39

Table 5 shows that the effect of the instructional modality (conventional vs. Flipgrid) was statistically significant, indicating that the participants' performance on the combination of the three types of questions on the post-test differed across the two groups. The partial eta square value of 0.39 indicates that 39% of the variance can be attributed to the instructional modality. Since the effect of the instructional modality was significant, a follow-up ANCOVA was used to establish the direction of this significance, as shown in Table 6.

Table 6. The effect of the instructional modality on the three types of questions (after controlling the effect of pre-test scores)

Source	Dependent variable	Type III sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	Sig.	η^2
Covariate-1	Literal	0.71	1	0.71	0.04	0.835	0.001
Covariate-2	Inferential	12.83	1	12.83	0.69	0.411	0.015
Covariate-3	Critical	22.09	1	22.09	1.86	0.179	0.040
Instructional Modality	Literal	152.55	1	152.55	9.41	0.004	0.173
	Inferential	285.37	1	285.37	15.32	0.000	0.254
	Critical	278.36	1	278.36	23.46	0.000	0.343
Error	Literal	729.53	45	16.21			
	Inferential	838.02	45	18.62			
	Critical	534.02	45	11.87			

Source	Dependent variable	Type III sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	Sig.	η^2
Corrected Total	Literal	1002.50	49				
	Inferential	1245.52	49				
	Critical	870.72	49				

Table 6 shows statistically significant differences between the two groups' performance on the post-test in the three types of speaking questions in favor of the experimental group. The partial eta squared values of 0.173, 0.254, and 0.343 indicate that the instructional modality explained a little more than 17%, 25%, and 34% of the variance in literal, inferential, and critical questions, respectively. As such, the highest effect size of the instructional modality was in critical questions, followed by inferential and literal ones. Additionally, the means, standard errors, and standard deviations of the two groups' performance on the post-test in the three types of questions (before and after controlling the pre-test scores) were calculated, as shown in Table 7.

Table 7. Unadjusted and adjusted means of the three types of questions (before and after controlling the pre-test scores)

Type of questions	Group	Unadjusted mean		Adjusted mean	
		Mean	SD	Mean	SE
Literal	Experimental	15.04	4.18	15.13	0.82
	Control	11.56	4.24	11.47	0.82
Inferential	Experimental	16.08	4.58	16.14	0.88
	Control	11.20	4.30	11.14	0.88
Critical	Experimental	16.28	3.46	16.31	0.71
	Control	11.40	3.45	11.37	0.71

Table 7 shows that there were statistically significant differences between the performance of the two groups on the post-test in the three types of speaking questions after controlling the differences in pre-test scores. Using the instructional modality improved students' performance in the three types of questions. The means and standard deviations of the experimental and control groups' pre-/post-test scores in literal questions were calculated in combination with *grammar, pronunciation, vocabulary,* and *fluency*, as shown in Table 8.

Table 8. Means and standard deviations of the two groups' responses to literal questions per the four features

Literal questions	Group	Pre-test*		Post-test*	
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Grammar	Experimental	1.92	0.70	3.92	1.04
	Control	1.96	0.79	2.96	1.59
Pronunciation	Experimental	2.28	1.02	3.80	1.12
	Control	2.40	0.91	3.08	1.04
Fluency	Experimental	1.96	0.79	3.60	1.29
	Control	2.24	0.93	2.72	1.24
Vocabulary	Experimental	2.08	0.70	3.72	1.31
	Control	2.36	0.99	2.80	1.32

Maximum score = 5

Table 8 shows that the post-test scores of the experimental group in literal questions are higher than those of the control group in *grammar*, *pronunciation*, *vocabulary*, and *fluency*. To determine the effect of

the instructional modality on the linear combination of literal questions and the *grammar*, *pronunciation*, *vocabulary*, and *fluency* (after controlling the effect of pre-test scores), one-way multivariate analysis of covariance (MANCOVA) using Hoteling's Trace multivariate test was used, as shown in Table 9.

Table 9. Hoteling's trace multivariate test for the effect of instructional modality on students' responses to literal questions

Effect	Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.	η^2
Instructional Modality	0.26	2.62	4.00	41.00	0.05	0.20

Table 9 shows that the effect of the instructional modality was statistically significant, which indicates that the participants' performance in response to literal questions differed across the two groups. The partial eta square value of 0.20 indicates that 20% of the variance is attributed to the instructional modality.

Since the effect of the instructional modality on participants' responses to literal questions was statistically significant, a follow-up univariate analysis (ANCOVA) was used, as shown in Table 10

Table 10. Effect of the instructional modality on literal questions (after controlling the effect of pre-test scores)

Source	Dependent variable	Type III sum of squares	Df	Mean square	F	Sig.	η^2
Covariate- S1	Grammar	1.21	1	1.21	0.64	0.43	0.01
Covariate- S2	Pronunciation	3.81	1	3.81	3.28	0.08	0.07
Covariate- S4	Fluency	0.55	1	0.55	0.37	0.55	0.01
Covariate-S5	Vocabulary	8.14	1	8.14	5.44	0.02	0.11
Instructional Modality	Grammar	11.30	1	11.30	5.97	0.02	0.12
	Pronunciation	6.93	1	6.93	5.96	0.02	0.12
	Fluency	12.43	1	12.43	8.28	0.01	0.16
	Vocabulary	15.11	1	15.11	10.09	0.00	0.19
Error	Grammar	83.22	44	1.89			
	Pronunciation	51.12	44	1.16			
	Fluency	66.05	44	1.50			
	Vocabulary	65.89	44	1.49			
Corrected Total	Grammar	98.32	49				
	Pronunciation	62.32	49				
	Fluency	86.72	49				
	Vocabulary	93.62	49				

Table 10 shows statistically significant differences between the two groups' responses to literal questions in favor of the experimental group. The partial eta squared values of 0.12, 0.12, 0.16, and 0.19 indicate that the instructional modality explained 12%, 12%, 16%, and 19% of the variance in *grammar, pronunciation, fluency,* and *vocabulary,* respectively. Thus, the highest effect size of the instructional modality was in *vocabulary*, followed by *fluency, pronunciation,* and *grammar*, respectively.

The means, standard errors, and standard deviations of the responses of the two groups to literal questions (before and after controlling the pre-test scores) were calculated, as shown in Table 11.

Table 11. Unadjusted and adjusted means of the two groups' responses to literal questions

Literal questions	Group	Unadjusted mean		Adjusted mean	
		Mean	SD	Mean	SE
Grammar	Experimental	3.92	1.04	3.92	0.28
	Control	2.96	1.59	2.96	0.28
Pronunciation	Experimental	3.80	1.12	3.82	0.22
	Control	3.08	1.04	3.06	0.22
Fluency	Experimental	3.60	1.29	3.67	0.25
	Control	2.72	1.24	2.65	0.25
Vocabulary	Experimental	3.72	1.31	3.82	0.25
	Control	2.80	1.32	2.70	0.25

Table 11 shows statistically significant differences between the two groups' responses to literal questions on the post-test (after controlling the differences in pre-test scores). As such, using Flipgrid improved students' performance in literal questions. The means and standard deviations of the participants' responses to inferential questions on the pre-/post-test per the four features of speaking were calculated, as shown in Table 12.

Table 12. Means and standard deviations of the two groups' responses to inferential questions per the four features of speaking

Inferential questions	Group	Maximum score	Pre-test		Post-test	
			Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Grammar	Experimental	5	2.00	0.65	4.08	1.12
	Control		1.67	0.64	2.79	1.28
Pronunciation	Experimental	5	2.28	0.84	4.00	1.15
	Control		2.13	0.74	3.00	1.02
Fluency	Experimental	5	2.12	0.78	3.92	1.38
	Control		2.08	0.93	2.67	1.24
Vocabulary	Experimental	5	2.24	0.88	4.08	1.29
	Control		2.13	0.99	2.71	1.33

Table 12 shows that the experimental groups' post-test scores in inferential questions per the four features of *grammar, pronunciation, vocabulary,* and *fluency* were higher than those of the control group.

To determine the effect of the instructional modality on the linear combination of inferential questions and *grammar, pronunciation, vocabulary,* and *fluency* (after controlling the effects of pre-test scores), a one-way multivariate analysis of covariance (MANCOVA) using Hoteling's Trace multivariate test was used, as shown in Table 13.

Table 13. Hoteling's trace multivariate test for the effect of instructional modality on students' responses to inferential questions

Effect	Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.	Partial eta Squared
Instructional modality	0.36	3.56	4.00	40.00	0.01	0.26

Table 13 shows that the effect of the instructional modality was statistically significant. This indicates that the students' performance in the linear combination of inferential questions with the four features differed in favor of the experimental group. The partial eta square value of 0.262 indicates that 26.2% of the variance is attributed to the instructional modality. Once the effect of the instructional modality was significant, a follow-up univariate analysis (ANCOVA) was used, as shown in Table 14.

Table 14. The effect of the instructional modality on inferential questions after controlling the effect of pre-test scores

Source	Dependent variable	Type III sum of squares	Df	Mean square	F	Sig.	η^2
Covariate- S1	Grammar	1.18	1	1.19	0.81	0.372	0.02
Covariate- S2	Pronunciation	0.13	1	0.13	0.11	0.744	0.00
Covariate- S4	Fluency	8.35	1	8.35	5.37	0.025	0.11
Covariate-S5	Vocabulary	0.01	1	0.01	0.01	0.927	0.00
Instructional Modality	Grammar	16.10	1	16.10	11.07	0.002	0.21
	Pronunciation	11.01	1	11.01	9.17	0.004	0.18
	Fluency	18.61	1	18.61	11.97	0.001	0.22
	Vocabulary	21.03	1	21.03	14.83	0.000	0.26
Error	Grammar	62.55	43	1.46			
	Pronunciation	51.62	43	1.20			
	Fluency	66.86	43	1.56			
	Vocabulary	60.97	43	1.42			
Corrected Total	Grammar	88.12	48				
	Pronunciation	68.25	48				
	Fluency	100.41	48				
	Vocabulary	103.84	48				

Table 14 reveals statistically significant differences between the two groups in their responses to inferential questions in favor of the experimental group. The partial eta squared values of 0.21, 0.18, 0.22, and 0.26 showed that the instructional modality explained 21%, 18%, 22%, and 26% of the variance in *grammar, pronunciation, fluency,* and *vocabulary*, respectively. The highest effect size of the instructional modality was in *vocabulary*, followed by *fluency, grammar,* and *pronunciation.*

The means, standard errors, and standard deviations of the two groups' responses to inferential questions in the post-test (before and after controlling the pre-test scores) were calculated, as shown in Table 15.

Table 15. Unadjusted and adjusted means of the two groups' responses to inferential questions

Inferential questions	Group	Unadjusted mean		Adjusted mean	
		Mean	SD	Mean	SE
Grammar	Experimental	4.08	1.12	4.03	0.25
	Control	2.79	1.28	2.84	0.25
Pronunciation	Experimental	4.00	1.15	3.99	0.22
	Control	3.00	1.02	3.01	0.23
Fluency	Experimental	3.92	1.38	3.94	0.26
	Control	2.67	1.24	2.65	0.26
Vocabulary	Experimental	4.08	1.29	4.08	0.24
	Control	2.71	1.33	2.71	0.25

Table 15 indicates that, after controlling the differences in pre-test scores, the two groups' responses to the inferential questions in the post-test differed in favor of the experimental group. As such, using Flipgrid improved students' responses to inferential questions. The means and standard deviations of the scores of the two groups' responses to the critical questions on the pre-/post-test were also calculated, as shown in Table 16.

Table 16. Means and standard deviations of the two groups' responses to critical questions per the four features of speaking

Critical questions	Group	Maximum score	Pre-test		Post-test	
			Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Grammar	Experimental	5	2.12	0.78	4.04	0.98
	Control		2.04	0.73	2.76	1.05
Pronunciation	Experimental	5	2.20	1.00	4.20	0.87
	Control		2.40	0.87	3.12	0.83
Fluency	Experimental	5	2.08	1.00	3.96	1.02
	Control		2.40	0.87	2.76	0.97
Vocabulary	Experimental	5	2.24	0.93	4.08	0.95
	Control		2.52	0.92	2.76	1.05

Table 16 indicates that the post-test scores of the experimental group are higher than those of the control group when it comes to their responses to critical questions in terms of *grammar, pronunciation, vocabulary,* and *fluency*.

To investigate the effect of the instructional modality on the linear combination of critical questions and the four features *of grammar, pronunciation, vocabulary,* and *fluency*, a one-way multivariate analysis of covariance (one-way MANCOVA) was used through Hoteling's Trace multivariate test after controlling the effects of pre-test scores, as shown in Table 17.

Table 17. Results of the multivariate test (hoteling's trace) for the effect of instructional modality on students' responses to critical questions

Effect	Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.	η^2
Instructional Modality	0.675	6.915	4.000	41.000	0.00	0.40

Table 17 indicates that the instructional modality significantly affected the students' responses to critical questions. The partial eta square value of 0.40 indicates that 40% of the variance in the linear combination of the critical questions across the four features can be attributed to the instructional modality.

Since the effect of the instructional modality is significant, a follow-up ANCOVA univariate analysis was used, as shown in Table 18.

Table 18. Effect of the instructional modality on critical questions after controlling the effect of pre-test scores

Source	Dependent variable	Type III sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	Sig.	η^2
Covariate- S1	Grammar	5.92	1	5.92	6.42	0.02	0.13
Covariate- S2	Pronunciation	1.16	1	1.16	1.58	0.22	0.04
Covariate- S4	Fluency	0.57	1	0.57	0.65	0.42	0.02
Covariate-S5	Vocabulary	5.19	1	5.19	6.52	0.01	0.13

Source	Dependent variable	Type III sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	Sig.	η^2
Instructional Modality	Grammar	17.93	1	17.93	19.46	0.00	0.31
	Pronunciation	13.82	1	13.82	18.87	0.00	0.30
	Fluency	17.67	1	17.67	20.25	0.00	0.32
	Vocabulary	21.95	1	21.95	27.56	0.00	0.39
Error	Grammar	40.55	44	0.92			
	Pronunciation	32.23	44	0.73			
	Fluency	38.40	44	0.87			
	Vocabulary	35.04	44	0.80			
Corrected Total	Grammar	70.00	49				
	Pronunciation	49.22	49				
	Fluency	65.52	49				
	Vocabulary	70.18	49				

Table 18 shows statistically significant differences between the two groups in their responses to critical questions in favor of the experimental group. The partial eta squared values of 0.31, 0.30, 0.32, and 0.39 indicated that the instructional modality explained 31%, 30%, 32%, and 39% of the variance in *grammar, pronunciation, fluency,* and *vocabulary*, respectively. This means that the highest effect size of the instructional modality was in *vocabulary*, followed by *fluency, grammar,* and *pronunciation.*

Furthermore, Table 19 presents the means, standard deviations, and standard errors of the two groups in their responses to critical questions both before and after controlling the pre-test scores.

Table 19. Unadjusted and adjusted means of the two groups' responses to critical questions

Critical questions	Group	Unadjusted mean		Adjusted mean	
		Mean	SD	Mean	SE
Grammar	Experimental	4.04	0.98	4.02	0.20
	Control	2.76	1.05	2.78	0.20
Pronunciation	Experimental	4.20	0.87	4.20	0.17
	Control	3.12	0.83	3.12	0.17
Fluency	Experimental	3.96	1.02	3.97	0.19
	Control	2.76	0.97	2.75	0.19
Vocabulary	Experimental	4.08	0.95	4.10	0.18
	Control	2.76	1.05	2.74	0.18

Table 19 indicates that even after controlling the differences in the pre-test scores, there were differences between the two groups' responses to critical questions on the post-test. Therefore, the students' performance in the four features of *grammar, pronunciation, fluency,* and *vocabulary* while answering critical questions improved with Flipgrid.

DISCUSSION

The findings revealed that the experimental group outperformed the control group in overall speaking and along the four features of *fluency, vocabulary, pronunciation,* and *grammar* across literal, inferential, and critical questions. These findings highlight the potential of Flipgrid as an effective instructional modality for improving speaking performance. The findings are consistent with those of previous

research on the effect of the Flipgrid on speaking. More specifically, the current findings intersect with those of Petersen et al. (2020), Hanh and Huong (2021), and Abu Eid (2022), who attested to the positive effect of Flipgrid on students' oral communication.

The researchers attribute the improvement in the participants' overall speaking performance and the features of *fluency, vocabulary, pronunciation,* and *grammar* in response to literal, inferential, and critical questions to several factors, most important amongst which are the meticulous design of the instructional treatment, the conducive learning environment, and the collaborative and reflective practice provided in the study.

The Flipgrid-based instructional program was carefully designed to address specific speaking objectives, targeting *fluency, vocabulary, pronunciation,* and *grammar* across the literal, inferential, and critical levels. Activities such as *responding to prompts, watching and commenting on videos,* and *reflecting on challenges* were strategically implemented to promote comprehensive skill development.

Responding to prompts encouraged students to practice linguistic structures and critical thinking, progressing through literal, inferential, and critical question types. Watching and commenting on videos fostered active listening, collaborative learning, and constructive peer feedback. Reflection activities, guided by the teacher, helped students identify challenges, set goals, and monitor their progress.

Furthermore, the iterative process of recording, receiving feedback, and revising responses allowed students to both refine their speaking skills and build confidence. *Pronunciation, fluency, grammar,* and *vocabulary* were seamlessly integrated into tasks, ensuring a holistic approach to language improvement. Furthermore, the adaptability of the program to students' needs enhanced its effectiveness, creating an engaging and supportive environment for meaningful speaking practice.

The Flipgrid-based treatment encouraged learner-centeredness, active participation and reduced student anxiety. The interactive nature of Flipgrid allowed students to express themselves without the pressure of speaking in front of a live audience, promoting confidence and reducing apprehension. Collaborative activities fostered peer support and mutual encouragement, encouraged both curiosity and engagement with the material, and fostered a sense of community.

The peer and teacher feedback, coupled with self-assessment, enabled students to identify areas for improvement and refine their speaking skills. The collaborative tasks promoted confidence and encouraged the use of accurate language. Students engaged in peer discussions, group activities, and shared reflections, fostering a sense of teamwork and mutual support, which further encouraged participants to exchange ideas, provide constructive feedback, and learn from one another.

IMPLICATIONS

Language instructors should consider integrating Flipgrid (and similar digital platforms) into their instruction to create an environment conducive to engaging speaking practice. Flipgrid can also be used to conduct formative self- and peer-assessment, which fosters both autonomy and a sense of community. Curriculum designers are called upon to integrate digital platforms into language materials to develop speaking in an interactive and student-centered manner and promote reflective practice and ownership among learners. Policymakers are also called upon to allocate resources to ensure equitable access to digital tools in classrooms to address infrastructure challenges and reduce the digital divide, not to mention support technology-based teacher training initiatives for innovative teaching practice.

This research underscores the transformative potential of integrating digital tools into language education, allowing for more effective and equitable learning experiences that benefit both the individual learner and the community at large.

CONCLUSIONS, LIMITATIONS, AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

The purpose of this study was to examine the effect of using Flipgrid on Jordanian EFL seventh-grade students' speaking performance. Flipgrid improved the participants' speaking performance when answering literal, inferential, and critical questions in the four features of *vocabulary*, *grammar*, *fluency*, and *pronunciation*. It also motivated the students to actively participate, express themselves confidently, and adopt multiple roles (e.g., observers, problem solvers, thinkers, decision-makers, and communicators with Flipgrid). As they uploaded their videos, they became more engaged and self-reliant in their endeavor to develop their speaking skills.

However, even though the research is sound in method and design, it has several limitations that may affect the generalizability and scope of its findings. To begin with, the small sample size from a single public school in Jordan may limit applicability to broader populations. Second, the relatively short duration of the study may not have captured the potential long-term effects of Flipgrid use. Third, the focus on the four speaking features potentially overlooks other features (e.g., intonation, spontaneity). Finally, the exclusive focus on speaking, without integrating other language skills, and Flipgrid as the sole intervention may further narrow the scope of research.

The current findings highlighted the positive effect of Flipgrid on EFL speaking skills, including *vocabulary, grammar, fluency,* and *pronunciation,* and emphasized the value of integrating technology to foster skill development and learner autonomy in foreign language education. To maximize these benefits, teachers are encouraged to incorporate Flipgrid into their teaching practices. By designing activities suited to students' proficiency levels, providing constructive feedback, and fostering a supportive environment, educators can help students gain confidence and refine their speaking abilities.

Future research may explore the long-term effects of Flipgrid on speaking skills across different age groups and proficiency levels. Comparative studies with other digital tools might provide insights into the most effective platforms for language learning. Furthermore, examining the potential effect of Flipgrid on other language skills (e.g., listening, writing) could broaden its pedagogical applications.

In practice, educators should experiment with integrating Flipgrid into broader curricula, focusing on interdisciplinary tasks and real-world applications. Exploring its potential for fostering collaboration among diverse student groups can further enrich its role in language education.

REFERENCES

Abu Eid, N. (2022). *faʕilijja tuˈwðˤiːf manˈsˤatˤ "flip grid" liˈtˤahsiːn maˈhaːrat ətˤˈtahəddʊð fiː alˈluɣa alʔingliˈziːja lada: ˈtˤalabat asˤˈsˤaff asˤˈsˤabiʕ* [The effectiveness of employing Flipgrid platform to improve English speaking skills for seventh graders] [Master's thesis, Islamic University of Gaza].

Ahmad, N., & Lidadun, B. (2017). Enhancing oral presentation skills through video presentation. *PEOPLE: International Journal of Social Sciences, 3*(2), 385–397. https://doi.org/10.20319/pijss.2017.32.385397

Al-Jamal, D. (2007). English teaching and learning experiences in Jordan: Attitudes and views. *Umm Al-Qura University Journal of Educational and Social Sciences and Humanities, 19*(1), 29–55.

Al-Mallahi, G. (2023). *ʔaθar ʔistixdaːm tatˤbiːq atˤtaʕallum fiː alʕilæb fiː tatˤbiːq flipgrid fiː maˈhaːrat ətˤˈtahəddʊð lada: mutaʕalliːmiː alˈluɣa alʔingliːziːja luɣaʔ ʔadʒnabijja fiː asˤˈsˤaff atˤˈtʕaːmin waʔittidʒaːhaːtˤihim nahwahu fiː alˈʔurdʊn* [The effect of using game-based learning in Flipgrid application on 8th grade EFL students' speaking skill and their attitudes towards it in Jordan] [Master's thesis, AL al-Bayt University].

Al-Masadeh, A., & Al-Omari, H. (2014). The effectiveness of a proposed project-based program for teaching oral skills to tenth grade EFL learners in Jordan and their attitudes towards these skills. *Journal of Education and Practice*, *5*, 133–148.

Baniabdelrahman, A., Bataineh, R., & Bataineh, R. (2007). Jordanian EFL students' perceptions of their use of the Internet. *Teaching English with Technology, 7*(3). https://bibliotekanauki.pl/articles/569283.pdf

Basal, A. (2015). The implementation of a flipped classroom in foreign language teaching. *Turkish Online Journal of Distance Education, 16*(4), 28–37. https://doi.org/10.17718/tojde.72185

Bataineh, R., & Baniabdelrahman, A. (2006). Jordanian EFL students' perceptions of their computer literacy. *International Journal of Education and Development Using Information and Communication Technology, 2*(2), 35–50. https://www.learntechlib.org/p/42187/

Bataineh, R., Migdadi, A., & Al-Alawneh, M. (2020). Does Web 2.0-supported project-based instruction improve Jordanian EFL learners' speaking performance? *Teaching English with Technology, 20*(3), 25–39.

Brown, H. D. (2000). *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy* (2nd ed.). Longman.

Burns, A., & Hill, D. (2013). Teaching speaking in a second language. In B. Tomlinson (Ed.), *Applied linguistic materials development* (pp. 231–251). Bloomsbury.

Campbell, D. T., Stanley, J. C., & Gage, N. L. (1963). *Experimental and quasi-experimental designs for research.* Houghton, Mifflin and Company.

Coello Vásquez, J., Castañeda Junco, R., Tapia Lemos, J., Monroy Barragán, G. G., & Gortaire Díaz, D. (2024). Using Flipgrid to enhance oral production and pronunciation in English language learning: A case study. *Revista InveCom, 4*(2). https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.10558652

Días, D., Pumalema, S., Herrera, S., & López, D. (2021). Promoting speaking skills in online environments. *ConcienciaDigital, 4*(1.1), 241–249. https://doi.org/10.33262/concienciadigital.v4i1.1.1556

Difilippantonio-Pen, A. (2020). *Flipgrid and second language acquisition using Flipgrid to promote speaking skills for English language learners* [Master's thesis, Bridgewater State University]. https://vc.bridgew.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1075&context=theses

Dincer, A., Yesilyurt, S., & Goksu, A. (2012). Promoting speaking accuracy and fluency in foreign language classrooms: A closer look at English speaking classrooms. *Erzincan Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 14*(1), 97–108.

Fisher, T., Higgins, C., & Loveless, A. (2006). *Teachers learning with digital technologies: A review of research and projects.* Futurelab.

Fitriani, D., Apriliaswati, R., & Wardah, W. (2015). A study on student's English speaking problems in speaking performance. *Jurnal Pendidikan dan Pembelajaran Untan, 4*(9). https://doi.org/10.26418/jppk.v4i9.11345

Flanagan, B. (2019). Creating community, enhancing engagement, and fostering verbal expression through a video discussion platform. *International Universal Design for Learning Implementation and Research Network Summit, USA.* http://bit.ly/GrowEngagedLearners

Hanh, L. T. T., & Huong, T. T. B. (2021). Applying Flipgrid-based portfolio to improve Vietnamese EFL high school students' speaking scores. *The Southeast Asian Journal of English Language Studies, 27*(4), 85–100. https://doi.org/10.17576/3L-2021-2704-07.

Harmer, J. (2007). *The practice of English language teaching* (4th ed.). Pearson Education.

Harris, J., Mishra, P., & Koehler, M. (2009). Teachers' technological pedagogical content knowledge and learning activity types: Curriculum-based technology integration reframed. *Research on Technology in Education, 41*(4), 393–416. https://doi.org/10.1080/15391523.2009.10782536

Kayi, H. (2006). Teaching speaking: Activities to promote speaking in a second language. *The Internet TESL Journal, 12*(11). http://iteslj.org/Techniques/Kayi-TeachingSpeaking.html

Khang, D., & Tuyet, T. (2020). The influences of the Flipgrid app on Vietnamese EFL high school learners' speaking anxiety. *European Journal of Foreign Language Teaching, 5*(1), 128–149. https://doi.org/10.46827/ejfl.v5i1.3264

Klippel, F. (1984). *Keep talking: Communicative fluency activities for language teaching.* Cambridge University Press.

Kumar, T. (2013). Teaching speaking: From fluency to accuracy. *Journal of English Language Teaching, 55*(6), 16–20.

Leach, C. W., van Zomeren, M., Zebel, S., Vliek, M. L. W., Pennekamp, S. F., Doosje, B., Ouwerkerk, J. W., & Spears, R. (2008). Group-level self-definition and self-investment: A hierarchical (multicomponent) model of in-group identification. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *95*(1), 144–165. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.95.1.144

Leong, L., & Ahmadi, S. (2017). An analysis of factors influencing learners' English speaking skills. *International Journal of Research in English Education, 2*, 34–41. https://doi.org/10.18869/acadpub.ijree.2.1.34

MacIsaac, D. (2020a). Practical online physics teaching productivity resources: CamScanner and Flipgrid. *The Physics Teacher, 58*(6), 447–447. https://doi.org/10.1119/10.0001856

MacIsaac, D. (2020b). Flipgrid.com – An easy-to-use free classroom student video site (website and smartphone app). *The Physics Teacher, 58*(4), 286–286. https://doi.org/10.1119/1.5145485

Mango, O. (2019). Students' perceptions and attitudes toward the use of Flipgrid in the language classroom. In K. Graziano (Ed.), *Proceedings of Society for Information Technology and Teacher Education International Conference* (pp. 1970–1973). Association for the Advancement of Computing in Education.

McClure, C., & McAndrews, L. (2016). Going native to reach the digital natives: New technologies for the classroom. *Proceedings of the International Textile and Apparel Association Annual Conference, 73*(1). https://doi.org/10.31274/itaa_proceedings-180814-1421

McLain, T. (2018). Integration of the video response app Flipgrid in the business writing classroom. *International Journal of Educational*, *4*(2), 68–75. https://doi.org/10.20448/2003.42.68.75

Merrill, J. (2018). Flipgrid: A social learning platform. *The Techie Teacher*. https://www.thetechie-teacher.net/2018/07/flipgrid-social-learning-platform.html

Nematovna, F. (2016). Activities to promote speaking in a second language. *Новейшие Научные Достижения, 1,* 1–8. https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/activities-to-promote-speaking-in-a-second-language.

Nishanthi, R. (2018). Importance of learning English in today's world. *International Journal of Trend in Scientific Research and Development, 3*(1), 871–874. https://doi.org/10.31142/ijtsrd19061

Oradee, T. (2012). Developing speaking skills using three communicative activities (discussion, problem-solving, and role-playing). *International Journal of Social Science and Humanity, 2*(6), 533–535. https://doi.org/10.7763/IJSSH.2012.V2.164

Petersen, J., Townsend, S., & Onaka, N. (2020). Utilizing Flipgrid application on student smartphones in a small-scale ESL study. *English Language Teaching*, *13*(5), 164-176. https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v13n5p164

Pham, H., & Duong, T. (2024). The application of Flipgrid in an EFL classroom: Insights from non-English majors. In T. Tran & T. Duong (Eds.), *Addressing issues of learner diversity in English language education* (pp. 163–177). IGI Global. https://doi.org/10.4018/979-8-3693-2623-7.ch010

Putri, N., Padmadewi, N., & Budiarta, L. (2022). Flipgrid: Video-based applications to improve English ability for junior high school students. *Jurnal Inovasi Teknologi Pendidikan, 9*(2), 170–182. https://doi.org/10.21831/jitp.v9i2.47095

Rencher, A. C. (2005). A review of "Methods of Multivariate Analysis, Second Edition." *IIE Transactions*, *37*(11), 1083–1085. https://doi.org/10.1080/07408170500232784

Richards, J. (2008). *Teaching listening and speaking: From theory to practice.* Cambridge University Press.

Rosita, E., & Halimi, S. (2023). The use of Flipgrid in improving secondary school teachers' motivation and confidence in speaking English. *Journal of English Education and Linguistics Studies, 10*(1), 27–55. https://doi.org/10.30762/jeels.v10i1.842

Septianawati, I. (2024). *The effect of Flipgrid application on secondary school students' narrative speaking skills and self-confidence* [Master's thesis, Universitas Muhammadiyah Purwokerto].

Srivastava, S. (2014). Accuracy vs. fluency in the English classroom. *New Man International Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies, 1*(4), 55–58.

Sun, Y. (2009). Voice blog: An exploratory study of language learning. *Language Learning & Technology, 14*(2), 88–103.

Tan, E. (2019). Bring the back-row students to the front of the class with Flipgrid. *Language Teacher, 43*(4), 22–24.

Wells, P., De Lange, P., & Fieger, P. (2008). Integrating a virtual learning environment into a second-year accounting course: Determinants of overall student perception. *Accounting & Finance, 48*(3), 503–518. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-629X.2007.00249.x

AUTHORS

Ms. Wejdan Mohammad Zghoul is currently an EFL teacher at Shafa Badran Mixed Primary School (Amman, Jordan) and a doctoral candidate in the TEFL Program at Yarmouk University (Irbid, Jordan). Under Prof. Bataineh's supervision, Ms. Al-Zghoul is expected to defend her dissertation by the end of the academic year 2024/2025. Her research interests include contrastive analysis, teacher education, and CALL.

Dr. Ruba Fahmi Bataineh is a professor of TESOL at the Department of Curriculum and Methods of Instruction at Yarmouk University, Jordan. Prof. Bataineh has been the dean of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences and the director of the Language Center at Al-Ahliyya Amman University 2022/2023 (on sabbatical leave from Yarmouk University). Formerly, Prof. Bataineh had been the founding executive director of the National Center for Curriculum Development, Jordan (2018-2020) and the director of Prince Salman Center for Research and Translation, Prince Sultan University, Saudi Arabia (2009-2013), where she won the Distinguished Researcher Award (2010).

Professor Bataineh has conducted workshops and seminars, delivered keynote speeches, done university program assessments, and served as a consultant for language teaching and teacher preparation both locally and internationally. She has also published extensively on pragmatics, literacy, CALL, and teacher education in renowned international and regional journals. She is also an affiliate of professional organizations and a member of the advisory, editorial and/or review boards of several regional and international journals.