



Developing Speaking with 21st Century Digital Tools in the English as a Foreign Language Classroom: New Literacies and Oral Skills in Primary Education

Cristina A. Huertas-Abril

University of Córdoba, Spain

mail: cristina.huertas@uco.es

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9057-5224>

ABSTRACT

In a changing, dynamic world increasingly dependent on technologies, it is necessary to educate children so that they can participate fully in today's and future society. Literacy thus needs much more than the traditional approaches to reading and writing in students' first language. After analyzing the concept and implications of new literacies in foreign language learning, a quantitative study was carried out to explore Spanish primary education students' perceptions ($n = 82$) on the development of new literacies in the English as a foreign language (EFL) lesson after using the online video discussion platform Flipgrid to practice their oral expression and create meanings in EFL during the COVID-19 pandemic. The analysis also aims to analyze whether there are differences based on gender, age and educational stage. The results show that the participants in this study were motivated to use this digital tool that enables them to make comments to their partners' videos, send messages about the oral texts, and include additional media, among many other options, going then beyond reading texts on a computer screen. This study concludes with a series of considerations for possible future implementations.

Key words: New Literacies, English as a Foreign Language, Oral Skills, Online Video Discussion, Primary Education.

El desarrollo de la expresión oral con herramientas digitales del siglo XXI en el aula de inglés como lengua extranjera: nuevas competencias y destrezas orales en Educación Primaria

RESUMEN

En un mundo cambiante y dinámico que depende cada vez más de las tecnologías, es necesario educar a los niños para que puedan participar plenamente en la sociedad actual y futura. Así, la alfabetización no debe limitarse a los enfoques tradicionales basados en la lectoescritura en la primera lengua del alumnado. Tras analizar el concepto y las implicaciones de las nuevas alfabetizaciones en el aprendizaje de lenguas extranjeras, se realizó un estudio cuantitativo para explorar las percepciones de los estudiantes españoles de Educación Primaria ($n = 82$) sobre el desarrollo de nuevas alfabetizaciones en la asignatura de inglés como lengua extranjera tras utilizar la plataforma de videodebates en línea Flipgrid para practicar su expresión oral durante la pandemia derivada de la COVID-19. Asimismo, se analiza si existen diferencias basadas en el género, la edad y la etapa educativa de los participantes. Los resultados muestran que los participantes estaban muy motivados a utilizar esta herramienta digital, que les permite hacer comentarios a los vídeos de sus compañeros, enviar mensajes e incluir ficheros multimedia adicionales, no limitándose así a la lectura de textos en la pantalla del ordenador. Este estudio concluye con una serie de consideraciones para posibles implementaciones en el futuro.

Palabras clave: Nuevas alfabetizaciones, Inglés como lengua extranjera, Destrezas orales, Videodebates en línea, Educación Primaria.



Introduction

The advances and continuous development of technologies have led to a notable increase of the necessity to educate children so that they can participate fully in today's and future society. Nowadays, there is no doubt that technology should be used as a tool to support educational objectives, including literacy. The impact of technology in education, however, has triggered the transition from text-based interactions to multimodal environments, and consequently, the concept of "literacy" has changed, now understood under the umbrella of "literacies," although its definition has always been a "challenging and controversial" task (Kinzer & Leu, 2017, p. 1559).

This is especially relevant in the case of language teachers and learners, who now do not only need the so-called 21st-century skills (Alexander et al., 2016; Dudeney et al., 2013;), but also these new literacies to support the teaching-learning process. It is necessary then to bear in mind that, in a world characterized by technology, language education should address both teachers' and students' literacies considering the role of technology to teach, learn and produce language adequately and efficiently.

While there are numerous studies on teaching English as a Foreign Language (EFL) in the field of Computer-Assisted Language Learning (CALL), there are relatively few studies that deal with EFL, CALL, and new literacies in Spanish Primary Education. Therefore, the main objective of this study is, after addressing the concept of "new literacies" in the context of foreign language education, to explore the potential of an online video discussion platform to develop new literacies and oral skills in EFL for Spanish Primary Education students. Finally, this paper also aims at presenting potential paths for future research on new literacies and foreign language education.

Theoretical Framework

In our changing, dynamic world increasingly dependent on technologies, literacy needs much more than the traditional approaches to reading and writing in students' first language, especially bearing in mind that "individuals no longer interact mainly with static print materials when reading and writing" (Kinzer & Leu, 2017, p. 1559). Education in general and language education in particular need then to take advantage of a pedagogy of multiliteracies, considering that "literacy teaching is not about skills and competence; it is aimed at creating a kind of person, an active designer of meaning, with a sensibility open to differences, change and innovation" (Cope & Kalantzis, 2009, p. 175). Consequently, new terms have appeared to respond to this new reality, including "multiliteracies" (Gee, 1992), "multimedia literacy" (New London Group, 1996), "technological literacies" (Lankshear et al., 1997), "electronic literacy" (Warschauer, 1999), "technoliteracy" (Erben, 1999), "new literacy/literacies" (Salaberry, 2000), "multiple literacies" (Kellner, 2002), "online literacy" (Snyder & Beavis, 2004), "digital literacy" (Dudeney et al., 2013), "CALL literacy" (Tafazoli, 2014, 2017), "digital literacies" (Brown 2017a, 2017b; Pegrum, 2019) or "new literacies and New Literacies" (Kinzer & Leu, 2017), among others. Moreover, it is worth highlighting that authors like Leu (2000) and Kinzer & Leu (2017) go a step further, emphasizing that "literacy" is a deictic term that changes continually depending on the frame of reference.

As advanced above, new literacies go beyond static texts, and as Kinzer and Leu (2017) suggest, they may require different types of text processing, including to save the text if it is necessary to return to it, to highlight and insert comments, to add multimedia

files to the text based on someone else's suggestions or to post an excerpt of the text to a social network, among many other options.

While the actual processing of the alphabetic or image-related information on screen is not substantially different from its processing on paper, the new literacies required to find and use a text, to author multimedia documents, and to communicate about texts through online and digital tools is different from the literacies required in earlier times when copying parts of the message or communicating about it required a different set of literacies than needed in digital environments (Kinzer & Leu, 2017, p. 1559).

Among all the challenges of traditional literacy, one of the most important defies is the increasing multimodality of meaning. Technology allows mixing modes that were not culturally the norm or even technically possible some decades ago. Consequently, it is necessary to identify the different modalities of meaning that new literacies may address. Cope and Kalantzis (2009) identified eight modalities:

1. Written language: writing and reading (handwriting, printed page, screen).
2. Oral language: live or recorded speech and listening.
3. Visual representation: "still or moving image, sculpture, craft (representing meaning to another); view, vista, scene, perspective (representing meaning to oneself" (Cope & Kalantzis, 2009, p. 178).
4. Audio representation: music, sounds, noises, alerts; hearing and listening.
5. Tactile representation: forms of representation include kinesthesia, physical contact, skin sensations, manipulable objects, artefacts, aromas.
6. Gestural representation (understanding gesture broadly and metaphorically).
7. Representation to oneself.
8. Spatial representation.

In this light, and as can be inferred from above, while in traditional literacy learners were passive recipients, in new literacies, teachers are required to provide learners with "a more productive, relevant, innovative, creative and, even perhaps emancipatory, pedagogy" (Cope & Kalantzis, 2009, p. 175).

Several approaches have been used to study new literacies, including: (i) skills and dispositions required to understand, use, interact and produce messages mainly through the Internet (e.g., Castek et al., 2014; Coiro & Dobler, 2007), (ii) use of digital tools by different age or demographic groups (e.g., Black, 2005; Leu et al., 2015), (iii) different types of text genres (e.g., Kinzer et al., 2012) or (iv) new discourses or semiotic contexts (e.g., Abrams, 2015; Gee, 2007;). All these different approaches lead to the idea stated by Kinzer and Leu (2017, p. 1559) that "New literacies are, in a sense, unique to an individual."

Nevertheless, and despite the different individual practices, "new literacies" must be understood as the use of digital technologies and environments in general, and how technology has changed both individuals' lives and society, allowing them to do things in a way that was not possible before (Lankshear & Knobel, 2011). Furthermore, Leu et al. (2013) identified eight principles of New Literacies common across literature, namely: "1. The Internet is this generation's defining technology for literacy and learning within our global community", "2. The Internet and related technologies require additional new literacies to fully access their potential", "3. New literacies are deictic", "4. New literacies are multiple, multimodal, and multifaceted", "5. Critical literacies are central to new literacies", "6. New forms of strategic knowledge are

Table 1. Revised framework of digital literacies (Pegrum et al., 2018) (Adapted from Pegrum, 2019, p. 251)

Increasing complexity	First focus: Communication	Second focus: Information	Third focus: Collaboration	Fourth focus: (Re-)design
	Print literacy Texting literacy (+ predictive literacy)			
	Hypertext literacy	Tagging literacy (+ Hashtag literacy)		
	Multimodal literacy	Search literacy Information literacy (+ Data literacy) Filtering literacy	Personal literacy (+ Security literacy) Network literacy Participatory literacy	
	Gaming literacy (+ Gamification literacy) Spatial literacy Mobile literacy		Intercultural literacy	
	Code literacy (+ Technological literacy) (+ Robotic / AI literacy)		Ethical literacy	Critical literacy (+ Critical digital literacy) (+ Critical mobile literacy) (+ Critical material literacy) (+ Critical philosophical literacy) (+ Critical academic literacy) Remix literacy

required with new literacies”, “7. New social practices are a central element of New Literacies”, and “8. Teachers become more important, though their role changes, within new literacy classrooms.”

Considering their changing nature, teachers willing to include new literacies in their lessons must be prepared “to handle diversity, unpredictability, and change” (Hauck & Kureck, 2017, p. 9). In the specific case of language educators, moreover, they should be to open up their students’ exposure to diversity, supporting them in developing literacies to engage positively with current “multilingual, multicultural, multimodal, multi-genre, and multiuser contexts” (Kurek & Hauck, 2014, p. 123). According to Pegrum et al. (2018) and Pegrum (2019), all this can, and must, take place alongside traditional language and literacy teaching and learning.

To facilitate the implementation of new literacies in language education, a number of frameworks have been developed and continue to appear recurrently, and they can be adapted to different contexts and aimed at serving certain purposes. Among these frameworks, Dudeney et al.’s (2013) Framework of Digital Literacies can be highlighted, as it was particularly designed for language educators and has informed several initiatives and investigations (e.g., Allen, 2015; Ware, 2017). In 2018 and considering both the technological and sociopolitical developments that may have affected its different components, a revised, updated version of this framework was published (see Table 1) (Pegrum, 2019).

Pegrum et al.’s (2018) updated version of the Framework of Digital Literacies does not aim at presenting an exhausting catalogue of all literacies but to draw both language educators’ and learners’ attention to key points within the overall landscape of literacies. As can be seen in Table 1, the framework divides literacies into four focus areas (communication, information, collaboration, and re-design), with a progression within each area. Moreover, it shows macro-literacies in bold, while subliteracies are shown in brackets.

Today’s language educators should be committed to going beyond the “traditional” teaching of language, cultural and intercultural skills in order to incorporate new literacies into their teaching and learning process.

Method

Research Design

The design of this study was developed under an approach of quantitative and quasi-experimental research and a method that was both descriptive and correlational.

Participants

A non-probabilistic sample based on convenience was used for the selection of the participants ($n = 100$). More specifically, the results were obtained from a questionnaire designed for Primary Education students regarding the use of Flipgrid (Microsoft, 2020) to develop new literacies and oral skills in English as a Foreign Language in Spain.

All the participants were selected through criterion-referenced (purposive) sampling techniques (Mertens, 2014). Eligibility criteria were based on proximity and participation in a teaching experience based on the use of Flipgrid (Microsoft, 2020) for tasks in the course “English as a First Foreign Language”, a compulsory subject in Spanish Primary Education, carried out by students of a semipublic school located in the south of the province of Córdoba (Spain) from Year 3 to Year 6 (8-11 years old) during the lockdown derived from the global pandemic caused by COVID-19. Flipgrid is an online free video discussion platform that allows educators to create “grids” to host and facilitate video discussions, which can hold an unlimited number of topics and responses. This tool, with customizable security settings to be used with students of all ages, is especially interesting in the case of multiliteracies and language learning and teaching, as topics and responses can be text-based or include different types of resources and media, such as images, videos, emojis or attachment. According to Microsoft (2020, par. 2), Flipgrid “helps educators see and hear from every student in the class and foster fun and supportive social learning. In Flipgrid,

educators post discussion prompts, and students respond with short videos, whether they are learning in class or at home."

The total sample of participants was 82. The mean age of the participants was 9.48 years old ($SD = 1.114$), with a range from 8 to 11 years (8 = 24.4%, 9 = 28.0%, 10 = 23.2%, 11 = 24.4%). Moreover, 54.9% ($n = 45$) of the participants were female and 45.1% ($n = 37$). Finally, regarding the educational stage, 52.4% of the participants were in the second cycle of Primary Education (Years 3 and 4), and 47.6% were in the third cycle of Primary Education (Years 5 and 6).

Instrument and procedure

A questionnaire was designed for Primary Education students regarding the use of Flipgrid (Microsoft, 2020) to develop new literacies and oral skills in EFL in Spain. The literature review carried out in the field of CALL generated a list of 12 items. Secondly, a group of experts was selected (two experts in CALL and one expert in Psychopedagogy) to carry out the validation using the Delphi method (Reguant-Álvarez & Torrado-Fonseca, 2016). After their discussion, the list was reduced to 10 items. The items were rated by using a 4-point Likert-type scale (1 = "not at all", 2 = "very little", 3 = "fairly much", 4 = "a lot"), except for Q04 (1 = "Yes, and I could not solve the technical issues", 2 = "Yes, but I managed to solve the technical issues", 3 = "No, I could use Flipgrid with no technical issues, but it was difficult to use", 4 = "No, Flipgrid is very easy to use") and Q10 (1 = "No, I would not like to use Flipgrid again", 2 = "Yes, I would like to use Flipgrid for other tasks, but not for EFL", 3 = "Yes, I would like to use Flipgrid for other tasks, but only in the EFL course", 4 = "Yes, I would like to use Flipgrid for other tasks and not only for the EFL course"). Moreover, the first part of the questionnaire was used to obtain participants' demographic information (gender, age, educational stage).

To reduce potential difficulty in comprehension, the questionnaire was administered in Spanish. Moreover, and due to the lockdown derived from the COVID-19 international crisis, the questionnaire was distributed online in April and May 2020 via Google Forms, considering the advantages of this type of instrument stated by Phellas et al. (2011).

Using the IBM SPSS Statistics V24.0 for MacOS, the internal reliability coefficient for the instrument was tested. The inverse items were recodified in direct format (Q05, Q06, and Q07). The Cronbach's alpha coefficient of the resulting questionnaire was .757, confirming good internal reliability. The internal reliability statistics through Cronbach's alpha, if the item is dropped is presented in Table 2.

Table 2. Cronbach's Alpha if Item Is Dropped

Item	Cronbach's α if Item Is Dropped
Q01	.751
Q02	.733
Q03	.738
Q04	.725
Q05	.748
Q06	.745
Q07	.760
Q08	.727
Q09	.732
Q10	.704

To analyze students' attitudes and perceptions regarding the use of Flipgrid to develop new literacies and oral skills in EFL, mean comparisons between groups have been analyzed through ANOVA and parametric Student's *t*-test for independent samples. To determine significant differences among participants in relation to their gender and educational step, Student's *t*-test for independent samples has been applied. Regarding the age, ANOVA has been performed to test whether one or more of three or more groups show significant different results. Statistical mean values were accepted whenever $p < .05$ (Sokal & Rohlf, 1995).

Results

Data were gathered from Primary students from a semipublic school located in the south of the province of Córdoba (Spain). The response rate of adequately filled questionnaires was 82% ($N = 82$). The mean age of the participants was 9.48 years old ($SD = 1.114$), with a range from 8 to 11 years (8 = 24.4%, 9 = 28.0%, 10 = 23.2%, 11 = 24.4%). Moreover, 54.9% ($n = 45$) of the participants were female and 45.1% ($n = 37$). Finally, regarding the educational stage, 52.4% of the participants were in the second cycle of Primary Education (Years 3 and 4), and 47.6% were in the third cycle of Primary Education (Years 5 and 6).

Participants' Attitudes and Perceptions Regarding the Use of Flipgrid to Develop New Literacies and Oral Skills in EFL

Table 3 presents the descriptive statistical data considering the different items.

Table 3. Descriptive Statistics per Item

Item	N	%				M	SD
		1	2	3	4		
Q01	82	0	2.4	29.3	68.3	3.66	.526
Q02	82	1.2	6.1	41.5	51.2	3.43	.667
Q03	82	6.1	13.4	28.0	52.4	3.27	.917
Q04	82	14.6	30.5	13.4	41.5	2.82	1.135
Q05	82	9.8	6.1	29.3	54.9	3.29	.962
Q06	82	4.9	2.4	32.9	59.8	3.48	.773
Q07	82	20.7	26.8	34.1	18.3	2.50	1.021
Q08	82	3.7	6.1	35.4	54.9	3.41	.769
Q09	82	1.2	8.5	35.4	54.9	3.44	.704
Q10	82	15.9	2.4	29.3	52.4	3.18	1.079

As shown in the descriptive statistics per item, it should be highlighted that, in global terms, all the participants show a remarkable positive interest in learning English (Q01), and also have a good predisposition to speaking in the foreign language (Q02). This attitude is also reflected in recorded themselves in English using Flipgrid, where 80.4% of the participants liked the experience (Q03). Regarding the technical issues found when using Flipgrid (Q04), the answers are less homogeneous, with

a certain balance between those who had problems using the digital tool (45.1%) and those who could use it with no major difficulties (54.9%).

Special attention should be paid to the following three questions, as the answers to Q05, Q06 and Q07 had to be recoded to assure that positive attitudes were expressed by high values on the Likert scale and negative attitude by low values. This way, in Q05 (“Was it difficult to record the video?”) and Q06 (“Was it difficult to record yourself speaking English?”), the higher the value, the easier the participants found the process of recording the video (in English). Similarly, in Q07 (“How much has your family (your father, your mother, your siblings...) helped you to make the video?”), the higher the value of the response, the less help needed by the participant.

Q08 has very positive responses by the participants, as 90.3% of the students answered that they liked/would like to watch their partners’ videos. Finally, the two last questions refer to technology-enhanced English language learning in general, “How much do you like learning English from home (with the computer, with the tablet...)?” (Q09), and using Flipgrid specifically “Would you like to use Flipgrid again and for other tasks?” (Q10). Regarding learning English from home, 90.3% of the students show a positive attitude, which is also reflected in the use of Flipgrid (84.1%).

Differences regarding gender

Student’s *t*-test for independent samples was performed to analyze whether there is any statistically significant difference among the students’ attitudes and perceptions regarding the use of Flipgrid to develop new literacies and oral skills in EFL with regard to their gender. Table 4 shows that only Q09 has statistically significant differences ($p < .05$) between groups. Moreover, and as can be seen in Table 4 below, girls scored higher in all the items except for Q04.

Table 4. Student’s *t*-test for independent samples (gender)

Item	Gender	N	M	SD	t	p*
Q1	Male	37	3.59	.551	-.998	.322
	Female	45	3.71	.506		
Q02	Male	37	3.27	.732	-1.960	.053
	Female	45	3.56	.586		
Q03	Male	37	3.22	.854	-.464	.644
	Female	45	3.31	.973		
Q04	Male	37	2.86	1.058	.344	.732
	Female	45	2.78	1.204		
Q05	Male	37	3.24	.955	-.420	.676
	Female	45	3.33	.977		
Q06	Male	37	3.41	.798	-.743	.459
	Female	45	3.53	.757		
Q07	Male	37	2.46	1.016	-.324	.747
	Female	45	2.53	1.036		
Q08	Male	37	3.32	.818	-.964	.338
	Female	45	3.49	.727		
Q09	Male	37	3.24	.760	-2.345	.022
	Female	45	3.60	.618		
Q10	Male	37	3.00	1.179	-1.401	.165
	Female	45	3.33	.977		

* $p < .05$ is recognized as statistically significant.

Differences regarding age

One-way (parametric) ANOVA was performed to find out if there is any statistically significant difference among the students’ attitudes and perceptions regarding the use of Flipgrid to develop new literacies and oral skills in EFL with regard to their age. The post hoc Games-Howell test, as shown in Table 5 below, results demonstrated that only Q07 and Q10 present statistically significant differences ($p < .05$) depending on the age of the participants, marked in bold.

Table 5. ANOVA (age)

	N	M	F	p*	Comparison	Mean difference	p*
Q01			.294	.830			
8 years old	20	3.75			9 years old	.098	.927
					10 years old	.118	.894
					11 years old	.150	.842
9 years old	23	3.65			8 years old	-.098	.927
					10 years old	.021	.999
					11 years old	.052	.989
10 years old	19	3.63			8 years old	-.118	.894
					9 years old	-.021	.999
					11 years old	.032	.998
11 years old	20	3.60			8 years old	-.150	.842
					9 years old	-.052	.989
					10 years old	-.032	.998
Q02			.682	.566			
8 years old	20	3.30			9 years old	-.265	.517
					10 years old	-.174	.828
					11 years old	-.050	.996
9 years old	23	3.57			8 years old	.265	.517
					10 years old	.092	.961
					11 years old	.215	.761
10 years old	19	3.47			8 years old	.174	.828
					9 years old	-.092	.961
					11 years old	.124	.949
11 years old	20	3.35			8 years old	.050	.996
					9 years old	-.215	.761
					10 years old	-.124	.949
Q03			.643	.590			
8 years old	20	3.05			9 years old	-.254	.852
					10 years old	-.213	.912
					11 years old	-.400	.610
9 years old	23	3.30			8 years old	.254	.852
					10 years old	.041	.998
					11 years old	-.146	.938
10 years old	19	3.26			8 years old	.213	.912
					9 years old	-.041	.998
					11 years old	-.187	.890
11 years old	20	3.45			8 years old	.400	.610
					9 years old	.146	.938
					10 years old	.187	.890
Q04			2.058	.113			
8 years old	20	2.30			9 years old	-.570	.391
					10 years old	-.700	.220
					11 years old	-.800	.152
9 years old	23	2.87			8 years old	.570	.391
					10 years old	-.130	.978
					11 years old	-.230	.905

	N	M	F	p*	Comparison	Mean difference	p*
10 years old	19	3.00			8 years old 9 years old 11 years old	.700 .130 -.100	.220 .978 .991
11 years old	20	3.10			8 years old 9 years old 10 years old	.800 .230 .100	.152 .905 .991
Q05			.387	.762			
8 years old	20	3.15			9 years old 10 years old 11 years old	-.198 -.061 -.300	.885 .997 .789
9 years old	23	3.35			8 years old 10 years old 11 years old	.198 .137 -.102	.885 .966 .986
10 years old	19	3.21			8 years old 9 years old 11 years old	.061 -.137 -.239	.997 .966 .896
11 years old	20	3.45			8 years old 9 years old 10 years old	.300 .102 .239	.789 .986 .896
Q06			.212	.888			
8 years old	20	3.45			9 years old 10 years old 11 years old	-.072 .082 -.100	.986 .989 .983
9 years old	23	3.52			8 years old 10 years old 11 years old	.072 .153 -.028	.986 .906 .999
10 years old	19	3.37			8 years old 9 years old 11 years old	-.082 -.153 -.182	.989 .906 .919
11 years old	20	3.55			8 years old 9 years old 10 years old	.100 .028 .182	.983 .999 .919
Q07			2.925	.039			
8 years old	20	2.30			9 years old 10 years old 11 years old	.170 -.647 -.400	.935 .183 .573
9 years old	23	2.13			8 years old 10 years old 11 years old	-.170 -.817 -.570	.935 .056 .262
10 years old	19	2.95			8 years old 9 years old 11 years old	.647 .817 .247	.183 .056 .876
11 years old	20	2.70			8 years old 9 years old 10 years old	.400 .570 -.247	.573 .262 .876
Q08			2.498	.066			
8 years old	20	3.05			9 years old 10 years old 11 years old	-.602 -.476 -.350	.037 .225 .599
9 years old	23	3.65			8 years old 10 years old 11 years old	.602 .126 .252	.037 .910 .704
10 years old	19	3.53			8 years old 9 years old 11 years old	.476 -.126 .126	.225 .910 .963
11 years old	20	3.40			8 years old 9 years old 10 years old	.350 -.252 -.126	.599 .704 .963

	N	M	F	p*	Comparison	Mean difference	p*
Q09			2.519	.064			
8 years old	20	3.10			9 years old 10 years old 11 years old	-.378 -.584 -.400	.297 .025 .373
9 years old	23	3.48			8 years old 10 years old 11 years old	.378 -.206 -.022	.297 .652 1.000
10 years old	19	3.68			8 years old 9 years old 11 years old	.584 .206 .184	.025 .652 .827
11 years old	20	3.50			8 years old 9 years old 10 years old	.400 .022 -.184	.373 1.000 .827
Q10			3.501	.019			
8 years old	20	2.55			9 years old 10 years old 11 years old	-.928 -.871 -.700	.040 .093 .254
9 years old	23	3.48			8 years old 10 years old 11 years old	.928 .057 .228	.040 .997 .860
10 years old	19	3.42			8 years old 9 years old 11 years old	.871 -.057 .171	.093 .997 .952
11 years old	20	3.25			8 years old 9 years old 10 years old	.700 -.228 -.171	.254 .860 .952

$p < .05$ is recognized as statistically significant.

Differences regarding educational stage

Student's *t*-test for independent samples was performed to analyze whether there is any statistically significant difference among the students' attitudes and perceptions regarding the use of Flipgrid to develop new literacies and oral skills in EFL with regard to their educational stage. Table 6 shows that only Q07 has statistically significant differences ($p < .05$) between groups. Furthermore, and as can be seen in Table 6 below, students from Cycle 3 score higher in most of the questions, while students from Cycle 2 score higher in Q01, Q02, Q06, although without statistically significant differences.

Table 6. Student's *t*-test for independent samples (educational stage)

Item	Educ. Stage	N	M	SD	t	p*
Q01	Cycle 2	43	3.70	.513	.705	.483
	Cycle 3	39	3.62	.544		
Q02	Cycle 2	43	3.44	.629	.213	.832
	Cycle 3	39	3.41	.715		
Q03	Cycle 2	43	3.19	1.006	-0.851	.397
	Cycle 3	39	3.36	.811		
Q04	Cycle 2	43	2.60	1.178	-1.805	.075
	Cycle 3	39	3.05	1.050		
Q05	Cycle 2	43	3.26	.875	-0.362	.718
	Cycle 3	39	3.33	1.060		

Item	Educ. Stage	N	M	SD	t	p*
Q06	Cycle 2	43	3.49	.668	.156	.876
	Cycle 3	39	3.46	.884		
Q07	Cycle 2	43	2.21	.940	-2.820	.006
	Cycle 3	39	2.82	1.023		
Q08	Cycle 2	43	3.37	.725	-.524	.602
	Cycle 3	39	3.46	.822		
Q09	Cycle 2	43	3.30	.708	-1.874	.065
	Cycle 3	39	3.59	.677		
Q10	Cycle 2	43	3.05	1.133	-1.206	.231
	Cycle 3	39	3.33	1.009		

(*) $p < .05$ is recognized as statistically significant.

Discussion and Conclusion

While bearing in mind the non-probabilistic scope and nature of this study, from the findings obtained, a series of exploratory conclusions are possible. Firstly, one of the surprising findings of this study lies in the positive attitude of the participants to learn English, and particularly to speak in the target language. Teachers are aware that language learning, and especially the development of oral skills, can be a potentially stressful situation for some students (Tsiplakides & Keramida, 2009), and in this sense, specific anxiety-coping strategies should be introduced in the EFL lessons, like those suggested by Akkakoson (2016) or Suchona and Shorna (2019). Possible explanations behind this attitude could lie in a possible sense of security due to a friendly atmosphere in the EFL classroom.

Focusing specifically on new literacies, in terms of the use of the online video platform Flipgrid, the participants value the tool positively for the improvement of their oral production in the target language. This is especially relevant as Flipgrid allows to combine videos with different types of multimedia files and adds text captions, also supporting the written skills, as well as the viewers can include their responses, both in text and video. Nevertheless, one of the problems that can be highlighted is that not all schools can offer adequate infrastructure and support for the integration of technology in Primary Education, and not all families have access to these resources.

In relation to the activities developed in Flipgrid, students' opinions about their work and final result are interesting. Together with the creativity and innovation needed for the creation of the video tasks, other two of the 21st-century skills identified by Dudeney et al. (2013), problem-solving and autonomy have been developed, as despite the possible technical issues found, only a limited number of the students were not able to use Flipgrid – but in those cases, they even found an alternative tool to produce their video tasks. Despite the age of the participants, more than half of the students surveyed (52.4%) needed very little or no help from relatives when recording their videos at home. Collaboration, or in this context telecollaboration, and the development of interpersonal relations are other skills with an extremely positive impact on the participants, as the vast majority (90.3%) responded that they had liked –or they would have liked– to watch their partners' videos. It should be mentioned, however, that the conditional tense had to be used in Q08 due to families' restrictions and per-

missions regarding the visualization of their children's videos by their schoolmates.

It is noteworthy to say that our findings also show that the vast majority of the participants (90.3%) like to study EFL from home despite being an unexpected circumstance and unplanned learning environment derived from the outbreak of the COVID-19 pandemic. In this line, research provides practical suggestions to support students' EFL by promoting students' self-concept and creating a quality home EFL environment (Rosyada, 2020).

Whether the use of CALL and new literacies in EFL within CALL "may benefit every individual language teacher and learner, the relationship between attitude and gender, age groups and educational levels is vague" (Tafazoli et al., 2019, p. 23). Our findings regarding gender indicate that girls have a more positive attitude towards new literacies and EFL, showing significant differences in their attitude towards learning English from home. These results are in line with Öz (2015) but in contrast with cross-cultural studies (Tafazoli et al., 2019). Regarding age and educational stage, significant differences were found in the help needed by the students from their family members, as the younger the students and the lower the educational stage, the more help needed. However, in the case of the use of Flipgrid for different tasks and subjects, significant differences are only found when considering the age of the students: the older the students, the more interest in using Flipgrid for both EFL courses and other subjects.

This study has also allowed us to observe that the implementation of Flipgrid in EFL contexts is completely in line with the eight principles of New Literacies identified by Leu et al. (2013), as it is an Internet-based platform within a global or learning community, which is deictic and adaptable to different profiles of students. It also allows multiple, multimodal, multifaceted, and multilingual tasks, with new social practices that require strategic knowledge and critical thinking. Finally, the teachers' role is essential, as they have to work as facilitators, mentors, guides, lecturers, assistants, motivators, planners, monitors, technical supporters, evaluators, resources developers, creators of a friendly social environment, and language role models (Podgoršek et al., 2019).

Nonetheless, the findings presented in this paper should be interpreted in the context of four limitations. First, due to the nature of an exploratory study, as a starting point, only Primary students from a school located in Spain were considered as the target population, and therefore the findings may not be applicable to other participants from different backgrounds or contexts. Future research should consider recruiting participants from different institutions and sociocultural backgrounds so comparisons with the current research could be carried out. Second, the study is only quantitative, and qualitative data could complement the quantitative results, as it may warrant more potential independent variables especially considering affective and cognitive factors. Third, the quantitative findings were only based on self-reported data, so they may be affected by respondents' subjective opinions about the phenomena studied. For this reason, future studies should also consider obtaining data through additional sources (e.g., interviews, focus groups, observations) in order to obtain more reliable data. Finally, and considering the deep impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on education, it is possible that students' attitudes on new literacies in EFL may change. Further studies should replicate this study after the COVID-19 pandemic to evaluate its effect.

Conflict of Interest

The author declares no conflict of interest. The author testifies that the content of this paper presents an accurate account of the work performed as well as an objective discussion of its

significance. Authors designed the materials for data collection, and informed consent was obtained from the participants after informing the school administrators and families, and their responses were collected on a strictly voluntary and anonymous basis.

References

- Abrams, S. S. (2015). Historical trends and contemporary practices. In J. Rowsell & K. Pahl (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of literacy studies* (pp. 354-368). Routledge.
- Akkakoson, S. (2016). Reflections from teachers and students on speaking anxiety in an EFL classroom. *Journal of Language and Cultural Education*, 4(3), 46-70. <https://doi.org/10.1515/jolace-2016-0025>
- Alexander, B., Adams, S., & Cummins, M. (2016). *Digital literacy: An NMC Horizon Project strategic brief* (Vol. 3.3). The New Media Consortium. <https://www.learntechlib.org/p/182085/>
- Allen, C. (2015). Marriages of convenience? Teachers and course-books in the digital age. *ELT Journal*, 69, 249-263. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccv005>
- Black, R. W. (2005). Access and affiliation: The literacy and composition practices of English-language learners in an online fanfiction community. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 49(2), 118-128. <https://doi.org/10.1598/JAAL.49.2.4>
- Brown, M. (2017a, October 5). A critical review of frameworks for digital literacy: Beyond the flashy, flimsy and faddish – Part 1. *ASCILITE TELall blog*. <https://bit.ly/3pxCU48>
- Brown, M. (2017b, October 12). A critical review of frameworks for digital literacy: Beyond the flashy, flimsy and faddish – Part 2. *ASCILITE TELall blog*. <https://bit.ly/3hs0Xyv>
- Castek, J., Beach, R., Cotanch, H., & Scott, J. (2014). Examining middle-school students' uses of Diigo annotations to engage in collaborative argumentative writing. In R. S. Anderson & C. Mimms (Eds.), *Handbook of research on digital tools for writing instruction in K-12 settings* (pp. 80-101). IGI Global.
- Coiro, J., & Dobler, E. (2007). Exploring the online reading comprehension strategies used by sixth-grade skilled readers to search for and locate information on the internet. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 42(2), 214-257. <https://doi.org/10.1598/RRQ.42.2.2>
- Cope, B., & Kalantzis, M. (2009). "Multiliteracies": New literacies, new learning. *Pedagogies: An International Journal*, 4(3), 164-195. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15544800903076044>
- Dudeney, G., Hockly, N., & Pegrum, M. (2013). *Digital literacies*. Pearson.
- Erben, T. (1999). Constructing learning in a virtual immersion bath: LOTE teacher education through audiographics. In R. Debski & M. Levy (Eds.), *WORLDCALL: Global perspectives on computer-assisted language learning* (pp. 229-248). Swets & Zeitlinger.
- Gee, J. (1992). *The social mind: Language, ideology, and social practice*. Bergin and Garvey.
- Gee, J. P. (2007). *What video games have to teach us about learning and literacy* (2nd ed.). Macmillan.
- Hauck, M., & Kurek, M. (2017). Digital literacies in teacher preparation. In S. Thorne & S. May (Eds.), *Language, education and technology, encyclopedia of language and education* (3rd ed.). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-02237-6_22
- Kellner, D. (2002). Technological revolution, multiple literacies, and the restructuring of education. In I. Snyder (Ed.), *Silicon literacies* (pp. 154-169). Routledge.
- Kinzer, C. K. & Leu, D. J. (2017). new literacies, New Literacies. In M. A Peters (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of educational philosophy and theory* (pp. 1559-1565). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-287-588-4_111
- Kinzer, C. K., Turkay, S., Hoffman, D. L., Gunbas, N., Chantes, P., Chaiwinij, A., & Dvorkin, T. (2012). Examining the effects of text and images on story comprehension: An eye-tracking study of reading in a video game and comic book. In P. J. Dunston, S. K. Fullerton, C. C. Bates, K. Headley, & P. M. Stecker (Eds.), *Literacy Research Association Yearbook 61* (pp. 259-275). LRA.
- Kurek, M., & Hauck, M. (2014). Closing the digital divide – A framework for multiliteracy training. In J. Pettes Guikema & L. Williams (Eds.), *Digital literacies in foreign and second language education: Research, perspectives, and best practice* (pp. 119-140). CALICO.
- Lankshear, C., Gee, J. P., Knobel, M., & Searle, C. (1997). *Changing literacies*. Open University Press.
- Lankshear, C., & Knobel, M. (2011). *New literacies*. McGraw-Hill Education.
- Leu, D. J. (2000). Literacy and technology: Deictic consequences for literacy education in an information age. In M. L. Kamil, P. Mosenthal, P. D. Pearson, & R. Barr (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research* (Vol. 3, pp. 743-770). Erlbaum.
- Leu, D. J., Forzani, E., Timbrell, N., & Maykel, C. (2015). Seeing the forest, not the trees: Essential technologies for literacy in the primary-grade and upper elementary- grade classroom. *The Reading Teacher*, 69(2), 139-145. <https://doi.org/10.1002/trtr.1406>
- Leu, D. J., Kinzer, C. K., Coiro, J., Castek, J., & Henry, L. A. (2013). New Literacies: A dual-level theory of the changing nature of literacy, instruction, and assessment. In D. Alvermann, N. Unruh, & R. B. Ruddell (Eds.), *Theoretical models and processes of reading* (pp. 1150-1181). International Reading Association.
- Mertens, D. M. (2014). *Research and evaluation in education and psychology: integrating diversity with quantitative, qualitative, and mixed methods*. SAGE.
- Microsoft. (2020). *Flipgrid*. <https://info.flipgrid.com/>
- New London Group. (1996). A pedagogy of multiliteracies: Designing social futures. *Harvard Educational Review*, 66(1), 60-92. <https://bit.ly/3aO7W2D>
- Öz, H. (2015). Investigating the relationship between foreign language learning and call attitudes among EFL freshman students. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 176, 1041-1049. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.01.576>
- Salaberry, M. R. (2000). Pedagogical design of computer mediated communication tasks: Learning objectives and technological capabilities. *The Modern Language Journal*, 84(1), 28-37. <https://doi.org/10.1111/0026-7902.00050>
- Snyder, I., & Beavis, C. (Eds.). (2004). *Doing literacy online: Teaching, learning and playing in an electronic world*. Hampton Press.
- Pegrum, M., Dudeney, G., & Hockly, N. (2018). Digital literacies revisited. *The European Journal of Applied Linguistics and TEFL*, 7(2), 3-24. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315832913>
- Pegrum, M. (2019). Digital Literacies as Lenses. In M. Pegrum (Ed.), *Mobile lenses on learning. Languages and literacies on the move* (pp. 249-274). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-15-1240-7_7
- Phellas, C. N., Bloch, A., & Seale, C. (2011). Structured methods: Interviews, questionnaires and observation. In C. Seale (Ed.), *Research society and culture* (3rd ed.) (pp. 181-205). SAGE.
- Podgoršek, S., Starčič, A. I., & Kacjan, B. (2019). The foreign language teacher's role in ICT-supported instruction. *Journal of Contemporary Educational Studies/Sodobna Pedagogika*, 70(1), 175-190. <https://bit.ly/2R6Mhf1>

- Reguant-Álvarez, M., & Torrado-Fonseca, M. (2016). El método Delphi. *REIRE, Revista d'Innovació i Recerca en Educació*, 9(1), 87-102.
- Rosyada, A. (2020). Promoting learning from home environments through Google Classroom application for EFL undergraduates. *DEIKSIS*, 12(3), 229-238. <https://bit.ly/3t0cCsA>
- Sokal, R., & Rohlf, F. J. (1995). *Biometric* (3rd ed.). W. H. Freeman.
- Suchona, I. J., & Shorna, S. A. (2019). Speaking problems in English and solutions: Scrutinizing students' perspective. *International Journal of English*, 8(1), 34-41. <https://doi.org/10.34293/english.v8i1.661>
- Tafazoli, D. (2014, September 9-11). *Computer-Assisted Language Learning literacy* [Paper presentation]. 7th International Biannual Conference on Issues in English Language Teaching in Iran. University of Tehran, Tehran, Iran.
- Tafazoli, D. (2017, December 28). *CALL Literacy. A series of workshops on Computer-Assisted Language Learning*. Islamic Azad University – South Tehran Branch.
- Tafazoli, D., Gómez-Parra, M. E., & Huertas-Abril, C. A. (2019). Attitude towards computer-assisted language learning: Do gender, age and educational level matter? *Teaching English with Technology*, 19(3), 22-39. <https://bit.ly/3vzeWIN>
- Tsiplakides, I., & Keramida, A. (2009). Helping students overcome foreign language speaking anxiety in the English classroom: Theoretical issues and practical recommendations. *International Education Studies*, 2(4), 39-44. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1065743>
- Ware, P. (2017). Technology, new literacies, and language learners. In C. A. Chapelle & S. Sauro (Eds.), *The handbook of technology and second language teaching and learning* (pp. 265-277). Wiley Blackwell. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118914069.ch18>
- Warschauer, M. (1999). *Electronic literacies: Language, culture, and power in online education*. Lawrence Erlbaum.

