

Junaidi  
Faculty of Humanity of Universitas Lancang Kuning  
Jalan Yos Sudarso KM 8 Rumbai Pekanbaru-Riau, Indonesia  
drjunaidi@yahoo.com

10<sup>th</sup> February 2020

Dear Editor of International Journal of Advanced Science and Technology

I wish to submit an original research article entitled "Artificial Intelligence in EFL Context: Rising Students' Speaking Performance with Lyra Virtual Assistance".

I believe that this manuscript is appropriate for publication by International Journal of Advanced Science and Technology because it focus on the application of Artificial Intelligence.

This manuscript has not been published and is not under consideration for publication elsewhere. I have no conflicts of interest to disclose.

Please address all correspondence concerning this manuscript to me at [drjunaidi@yahoo.com](mailto:drjunaidi@yahoo.com)  
Thank you for your consideration of this manuscript.

Sincerely,

Junaidi



## Science & Engineering Research Support Society

Dear Author,

**Paper ID:** IJAST\_Submission\_852

**Paper Title:** Artificial Intelligence in EFL Context: Rising Students' Speaking Performance with Lyra Virtual Assistance

Congratulations! On behalf of Editorial Team of the "International Journal of Advanced Science and Technology", we are pleased to inform you that your Paper has been accepted publication in IJAST Current Issue of 2020 as per the recommendations given by the peer review group of experts.

We would like to further extend our congratulations to you that your paper is accepted for publication in upcoming issue of IJAST Journal. Kindly email us your final paper. The blind peer review process results are given below

----- REVIEW 1 -----

----- Overall evaluation -----

**Review Decision 1:** Accepted

---- TEXT:

1. Originality: 80%
2. SCOPE: 89%
3. Results: Satisfactory
4. References are Cited Properly

----- REVIEW 2 -----

**Review Decision 2:** Accepted

1. Originality: 82%
2. SCOPE: 86%
3. Results: Satisfactory
4. References are Cited Properly

**Final Decision:** Accepted

For any further query feel free to contact us.

Regards  
Editorial Team, IJAST  
SERSC Journals

# Artificial Intelligence in English as Foreign Language Context: Rising Students' Speaking Performance with Lyra Virtual Assistance in the University's Classroom

Junaidi<sup>1</sup>, Budianto Hamuddin<sup>2</sup>, Kenny Julita<sup>3</sup>, Fathu Rahman<sup>4</sup>, Tatum Derin<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1,2,3,5</sup>Universitas Lancang Kuning, Pekanbaru, 28265, Indonesia

<sup>2,4</sup>Universitas Hasanuddin, Makassar, South Sulawesi, 90245, Indonesia

Email : budihamuddin@gmail.com

**Abstract:** The aim of this study tries to measure the effectiveness of artificial intelligence apps in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) classroom environment. The Apps employed in this experimental study is Lyra Virtual Assistant (LVA) which was chosen with the line of thinking it can help the students improve their speaking performance. The sample in this study is selected secondary school recommended by the Ministry of Education due to the school's regulation in this school that allows students to bring a mobile phone in the classroom and its consistency of weakness in English speaking performance based on examination result. This study recorded 65 students from two different seventh grade classes who were grouped into experimental and control groups. A quasi-experimental was used as the research method with pre-test and post-test, focused on the four components in speaking skill i.e., pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary, and fluency. The results showed a significant result means LVA is an effective AI apps for EFL students

**Keywords:** Artificial intelligence (AI), Lyra Virtual Assistant (LVA). English as Foreign Language (EFL), Speaking skill.

## 1. Introduction

AI is designed as virtual assistance in executing and easing human tasks (Russell & Norvig, 2016). When this idea is brought into an educational setting, it can help both teacher and students in teaching and learning process. Powered by IT such as AI systems, software, and supports, location and presence is no longer a hindrance in a learner's quest to access course content and interact with instructors and colleagues at any time they wish (Cavus & Ibrahim, 2009; Hamuddin, 2016; Kukulska-Hulme & Shield, 2008; Richardson & Lenarcic, 2008; Shih & Mills, 2007). Educational programs driven by AI has been helping students to learn many skills considering AI offers students a much wider range of services, improves learners' motivation, broadens the audience's frame of conventional-based learning onto the digital world which is essential in the 21<sup>st</sup> century (Wekke, Yandra, & Hamuddin, 2017), and in the past few years, provides positive effect in language learning activity such as English as a Foreign Language (EFL) (Gric-coast et al., 2000; Hamuddin & Dahler, 2018).

Education in a foreign language usually has a heavy focus on grammar, syntax, and spelling (Chomsky & Halle, 1965), but in the early 1980s, the grammar-based approach has been acknowledged to have largely failed in producing fluent speakers of foreign languages as the communication-based

**Comment [svs1]:** Artificial Intelligence in English as Foreign Language Context: Rising Students' Speaking Performance with Lyra Virtual Assistance in the University's Classroom

The title need to be adjusted ... the words is too many. Keep it simple and sweet

**Comment [svs2]:** More reasons why this apps being chosen in this study, why not Alexa or google assistance ?

**Comment [svs3]:** The author needs to add more key points on the results. Used number to share the result

**Comment [svs4]:** The intro need to be adjusted

approach to learning foreign language reached its peak (Canale & Swain, 1980). Nowadays, the trend of learning foreign language is primarily driven by the motivation to be fluent in speaking the target language (Wiranti, 2013). Spoken language often involves false starts, omissions, hesitations, and errors (Castillo, 2009) which contribute to imperfect speaking performance (Allerton, 1991), and studies to improve English speaking ability is abundant. With the increased affordability and reliability of AI technologies, the use of AI in teaching EFL has become a practical choice (Abad, 2013).

When students speak to an AI, its Automatic Speech Recognition (ASR) recognizes their speech and voice in a sequence (Keshet & Bengio, 2009; Li, Deng, Hach-Umbach, & Gong, 2016) that is similar to how humans recognize speech, otherwise known as Human Speech Recognition (HSR) (Allen, 1994). AI for this purpose is actually still at its infancy because it is only when computers began to understand what words mean and the endless variability of expression in how language is spoken (Hill, Randolph Ford, & Ferreras, 2015) in the early 2010s did AI started to be successful in recognizing speech automatically (Lewis Johnson & Valente, 2009). This study contributes to the fresh field of using AI in improving EFL speaking performance.

The students tested in this study are from a selected secondary school. The few studies that investigated the effects of educational technology such as AI on EFL performance have only tested primary and higher education students (Aditya, 2016; Aust, Kelley, & Roby, 1993; Brett, 1998; Davis & Lyman-Hager, 1997; Maftoon, Hamidi, & Sarem, 2012; Plass, Chun, Mayer, & Leutner, 1998; Solano, Cabrera, Ulehlova, & Espinoza, 2017; Underwood, 2017). On the one hand, with the popularity of Amazon's *Alexa*, Apple's *Siri*, and Google assistant, the majority of higher education students are already familiar with using AI to improve their mastery in a foreign language. On the other hand, primary school students are essentially "blank slates" who have just begun to familiarize themselves with IT. The selected secondary school chosen in this study has a regulation that allows the selected secondary students to bring IT such as mobile phones in the classroom, but have yet to use an AI's ASR feature as educational technology. Using selected secondary students as the sample of the study gives insight into how EFL speaking performance will be affected when the use of mobile phones in the classroom is changed from merely being a tool to instantly access information from the internet to a device that can recognize and respond to speech. Moreover, the selected secondary school was recommended by the Ministry of Education because the students' English speaking performance have been consistently weak, and such has been confirmed by way of observation. It was in high hopes that this study will significantly improve the students EFL speaking ability with the use of AI.

**Comment [svs5]:** The opening first two paragraph its too wide. The author needs to highlights the grow of IT as its gap and come out with the uniqueness of this present study

**Comment [svs6]:** Emphasize this context

**Comment [svs7]:** I did not see this in the reference list

**Comment [svs8]:** I did not see this in the reference list

**Comment [svs9]:** This paragraph its too long and has too many ideas you can divided into 2 or three

Specifically, the AI this study selected is *Lyra* Virtual Assistant (LVA). The application uses natural language understanding to answer a user's questions on a variety of topics, make recommendations, and operate the user's device. LVA is unique amongst many other AIs because it can also be the user's "talking friend" for it has distinct features including searching for YouTube videos, tell jokes, find directions, manage a diary, set alarms, and some other features such as chat, question-answer interaction, and many others, yet it is simple to use and appropriate for secondary school students. These features make *Lyra* able to serve as excellent conversation partner to improve EFL speaking ability, and because it can be downloaded from Play store for free and is ranked as one of the best virtual assistance for Android in 2018, this study chose LVA as the AI technology that will improve the selected secondary school students' EFL speaking ability.

Comment [svs10]: More information regarding the apps

## 2. Method

This research is designed as quasi-experimental research which is intended to find out the effect of using *Lyra* Virtual Assistant in students' speaking performance. In conducting this research, the researchers used two groups. One class is used as an experimental group (X) which is treated by using LVA and another class as a control group (Y) which is treated without using LVA. Both groups were given pre-test and post-test. This research is conducted in the second semester which started from February 15th, 2018 until March 12th, 2018 in academic year 2017/2018.

The population of this research is the seventh-grade students of SMP-TBPekanbaru. There are three classes of the seventh grade of SMP-TBPekanbaru. The sample of this research is VII.1 as the control group that consists of 33 students and VII.3 as the experimental group that consists of 32 students. Based on observation, this class has equal English ability and English speaking skill. This research used a test as the research instrument to see the effectiveness of using *Lyra* Virtual Assistant in speaking. Oral test was used in the pre-test and the post-test at the first meeting and the last meeting respectively. The oral test was designed to focus on the four components of speaking skill, i.e., pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary and fluency with the maximum score was 4 and the highest total score was 16.

Comment [svs11]: This study need reason why this being selected

To achieve the main objective of this study, first, the subjects were divided into control and experimental groups. The control group consisted of 33 students, and experimental group consisted of 32 students. For both groups, two 40-minute sessions were held in every meeting for a period of four weeks. The classes were held in the same school where the subjects attended their ordinary school classes. Before teaching the material, researchers did a pre-test in both classes. A pre-test is done in accordance with the

material in the syllabus which is about oral and written text encouraging the test takers to state and ask the nature of people, animals, and objects. The researchers asked students one by one to identify and/or describe animals. The average student identified and/or described as many as three until five sentences and talked with incorrect intonation and pronunciation.

After conducting the pre-test, researchers began teaching in the control and experimental groups. In the control group, researchers taught selected lesson materials and also explained the vocabulary used to identify it. In addition, researchers also taught the pronunciation of the vocabulary provided. In the experimental group, the researchers also taught the same material, except that after the students created some sentences that identify and/or describe the animals, the students practiced to pronounce it using *Lyra* Virtual Assistant application. If the pronunciation spoken by the student is incorrect, the sentence or word that is written by LVA would be different. These treatments conducted in four meetings then, the researchers did post-test. To analyze the data statistically, first the scores of the subjects on the post-test were summarized as descriptive statistics; namely, mean and standard deviations

**Comment [svs12]:** More explanation on the steps on analyzing the data

### 3. Results and Discussion

#### 4.1 Results of the pre-test

To start the data analysis, first, the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test was run to determine whether the data distribution was normal or not. The results showed that the significance level observed for the experimental group and control group was 0.110 and 0.508 respectively, both higher than the  $p$ -value 0.05. Thus, it was concluded that the data distribution in classes was normal. Table 1 presents the results of the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test:

**Table 1.** The result of Normality Test

		Experimental	Control
N		32	31
Normal Parameters <sup>a,b</sup>	Mean	54,1659	54,233
	Std.	9,39229	11,925
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	,213	,148
	Positive	,085	,096
	Negative	-,213	-,148

**Comment [svs13]:** Check how to presenting a good table in a scientific article

Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z	1,204	,823
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	,110	,508
a. Test distribution is Normal.		
b. Calculated from data.		

Next, the pre-test of both groups is calculated with a homogeneity test. It is done to determine the homogeneity of the sample, acquired by comparing the value based on trimmed mean which is calculated by Levene Formula. The result on the pre-test of both groups was 0.478, meaning the data was homogenous. Table 2 presents the results of the Homogeneity test:

Comment [svs14]: Prove it

Table 2. The result of Homogeneity Test

	Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.	
	Based on Mean	,531	1	61	,469
	Based on Median	,572	1	61	,452
PreTest	Based on Median and with adjusted df	,572	1	56,850	,453
	Based on trimmed mean	,510	1	61	,478

Because the data distribution of pre-test was normal and homogenous, the researchers used a t-test to determine if the difference was significant. If the data value of Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) > 0.05, the difference was not significant. The result of t-test on pre-test was 0.980, meaning the difference of data on pre-test was not significant.

**Table 3. Result of T-test**

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
	F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
								Lower	Upper
Equal variances assumed	.531	.469	-.025	61	.980	-.06761	2,69980	-5,46619	5,33097
PreTest Equal variances not assumed			-.025	56,977	.980	-.06761	2,71002	-5,49439	5,35916

#### 4.2 Results of the post-test

After acquiring the results of pre-test, the researchers used the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test again to determine the data distribution of the post-test data. The result of using normality test on the post-test data was 0.448 for the experimental group and 0.291 for the control group. It showed that the significance level observed for both groups was higher than the p-value 0.05. Thus, it was concluded that the data distribution in classes was normal. Table 4 presents the results of the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test:

**Table 4. The result of Normality Test**

		Experimental	Control
N		32	30
Normal Parameters <sup>ab</sup>	Mean	69,5969	63,6110
	Std.	7,86408	5,57193

**Comment [svs15]:** Check how to presenting a good table in a scientific article



		Deviation	
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	,152	,179
	Positive	,152	,179
	Negative	-,125	-,154
Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z		,861	,981
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		,448	,291
a. Test distribution is Normal.			
b. Calculated from data.			

After data was normal, the researchers used homogeneity test. The result of post-test of both groups was 0.257, meaning the data was homogenous because of Sig. > p (0.05). Table 5 presents the results of the Homogeneity test:

**Table 5. The result of Homogeneity Test**

		Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
PostTest	Based on Mean	1,304	1	60	,258
	Based on Median	1,240	1	60	,270
	Based on Median and with adjusted df	1,240	1	52,683	,271
	Based on trimmed mean	1,308	1	60	,257

**Comment [svs16]:** Check how to presenting a good table in a scientific article  
 ... check an example in this journal archive

Based on tables 5 and 6, the data distribution was normal and homogenous. So, the researchers used a t-test to know if the difference is significant between the experimental group and control group or not. The Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) of t-test was 0.001. It meant the Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) < 0.05. The conclusion is there was a significant difference between both groups.

**Table 6. Result of T-test: Independent Samples Test**

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
	F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
								Lower	Upper
Equal variances assumed	1.304	.258	3.437	60	.001	5.98588	1.74147	2.50241	9.46934
PostTest Equal variances not assumed			3.475	55.942	.001	5.98588	1.72264	2.53493	9.43682

After acquiring the analysis results of the pre-test and post-test, the researchers used N-Gain to determine the effect size of the treatment that is given to the experimental group. The result was N-Gain average value of experimental group was 0.33. It can be seen as follow.

**Table 7. N-Gain Score of Experimental Class**

Test	N	N-Gain			Average N-Gain
		Score Ideal	Min. Score	Max. Score	
Pre-Test	32	100	33.33	70.83	0.33
Post-Test	32	100	50.00	89.58	

Based on the table above, the average of N-Gain is 0.33, meaning the sign of strategy that used in the experimental class is considered Middle. In the criteria of achievement, N-Gain score can be said Middle if score  $0.3 < g < 0.7$ . It can be concluded that using Lyra Virtual Assistant on students' speaking performance at the seventh grade of SMP TBPekanbaru has a positive effect.

#### 4. Conclusions

The purpose of this research is to find out the effectiveness of *Lyra* Virtual Assistant application on improving students' speaking performance at the seventh grade of SMP TBPekanbaru. The research question: "Is there any significant difference on students' speaking performance that uses *Lyra* Virtual Assistant than those who use other conventional methods in practicing the speaking skill at the seventh

**Comment [svs17]:** Check how to presenting a good table in a scientific article

**Comment [018]:** Okay this section covers what this study all about. Keep it this way.

grade of SMP TB Pekanbaru?" has been successfully answered, based on the average of post-test experimental and control group analysis results. Experimental group's average post-test result is 69.59 and control group's average post-test result is 63.61. In conclusion, students taught by using *Lyra* Virtual Assistant in speaking achieve better than students who were taught without using *Lyra* Virtual Assistant in practicing speaking. *Lyra* Virtual Assistant is effective in practicing speaking. *Lyra* Virtual Assistant contributes to students' achievement in speaking skill.

## 5. References

- [1] Abad, J. V. (2013). Pedagogical Factors that Influence EFL Teaching: Some Considerations for Teachers' Professional Development. *Profile Issues in Teachers' Professional Development*.
- [2] Aditya, D. S. (2016). "Speak App" Android Application Model to Improve the Midwifery Students' Speaking Competence. *Doctoral Dissertation Santa Dharma University*.
- [3] Allerton, D. J. (1991). The greater precision of spoken language: Four examples from English. *English Studies*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00138389108598774>
- [4] Aust, R., Kelley, M. J., & Roby, W. (1993). The use of hyper-reference and conventional dictionaries. *Educational Technology Research and Development*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02297512>
- [5] Brett, P. (1998). Using multimedia: A descriptive investigation of incidental language learning. *International Journal of Phytoremediation*. <https://doi.org/10.1076/call.11.2.179.5684>
- [6] Budzinski, O., Noskova, V., & xijie, zhang. (2019). The Brave New World of Digital Personal Assistants: Benefits and Challenges from an Economic Perspective. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3306169>
- [7] Canale, M., & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics*. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/1.1.1>
- [8] Castillo, C. Y. P. (2009). Improving Eleventh Graders' Oral Production in English Class through Cooperative Learning Strategies. *PROFILE Issues in Teachers' Professional Development*.
- [9] Cavus, N., & Ibrahim, D. (2009). M-Learning: An experiment in using SMS to support learning new English language words. *British Journal of Educational Technology*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8535.2007.00801.x>
- [10] Chomsky, N., & Halle, M. (1965). Some controversial questions in phonological theory.

**Comment [svs19]:** Check the format references this journal used APA citation style

*Journal of Linguistics*. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022226700001134>

- [11] Davis, J. N., & Lyman-Hager, M. A. (1997). Computers and L2 Reading: Student Performance, Student Attitudes 1. *Foreign Language Annals*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/fj.1944-9720.1997.tb01317.x>
- [12] Gric-coast, M. B., Lyon, U. L., & Cedex, B. (2000). The roles of models in Artificial Intelligence and Education research: a prospective view. *International Journal of Artificial Intelligence in Education*.
- [13] Hamuddin, B. (2016). Using blog to Promote English Skills for EFL Students: The Students' Perception. *ELT-Lectura*. <https://doi.org/10.31849/elt-lectura.v3i2.481>
- [14] Hamuddin, B., & Dahler. (2018). Blogs as Powerful Learning Tools: The Perception from EFL Students in Riau Main Island Indonesia. *IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science*. <https://doi.org/10.1088/1755-1315/156/1/012060>
- [15] Hill, J., Randolph Ford, W., & Farreras, I. G. (2015). Real conversations with artificial intelligence: A comparison between human-human online conversations and human-chatbot conversations. *Computers in Human Behavior*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2015.02.026>
- [16] Keshet, J., & Bengio, S. (2009). Automatic Speech and Speaker Recognition: Large Margin and Kernel Methods. In *Automatic Speech and Speaker Recognition: Large Margin and Kernel Methods*. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470742044>
- [17] Kukulka-Hulme, A., & Shield, L. (2008). An overview of mobile assisted language learning: From content delivery to supported collaboration and interaction. *ReCALL*. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0958344008000335>
- [18] Li, J., Deng, L., Haeb-Umbach, R., & Gong, Y. (2016). Fundamentals of speech recognition. In *Robust Automatic Speech Recognition*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/b978-0-12-802398-3.00002-7>
- [19] Maftoon, P., Hamidi, H., & Sarem, S. N. (2012). The Effects of CALL on Vocabulary Learning: A Case of Iranian Intermediate EFL Learners. *BRAIN. Broad Research in Artificial Intelligence and Neuroscience*.
- [20] Plass, J. L., Chun, D. M., Mayer, R. E., & Leutner, D. (1998). Supporting Visual and Verbal Learning Preferences in a Second-Language Multimedia Learning Environment. *Journal of Educational Psychology*. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.90.1.25>
- [21] Richardson, J., & Lenarcic, J. (2008). Text messaging as a catalyst for mobile student administration: The "Trigger" experience. *Australian Journal of Emerging Technologies and*

*Society.*

- [22] Russell, S., & Norvig, P. (2016). *Artificial Intelligence A Modern Approach Third Edition*. In *Pearson*. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0269888900007724>
- [23] Shih, Y. E., & Mills, D. (2007). Setting the new standard with mobile computing in online learning. *International Review of Research in Open and Distance Learning*.
- [24] Solano, L., Cabrera, P., Ulchlova, E., & Espinoza, V. (2017). Exploring the use of educational technology in efl teaching: A case study of primary education in the south region of ecuador. *Teaching English with Technology*.
- [25] Underwood, J. (2017). Exploring AI language assistants with primary EFL students. In *CALL in a climate of change: adapting to turbulent global conditions – short papers from EUROCALL 2017*. <https://doi.org/10.14705/rpnet.2017.eurocall2017.733>
- [26] Wekke, I. S., Yandra, A., & Hamuddin, B. (2017). Learning Strategy in Class Management: A Reflection from Manado Case. *IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science*. <https://doi.org/10.1088/1755-1315/97/1/012053>
- [27] Wiranti, N. A. (2013). Improving students' speaking competence by using jazz chants. *Doctoral Dissertation Universitas Sebelas Maret*.