# PRISMA 2020 Main Checklist

| **Topic** | **No.** | **Item** | **Location where item is reported** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **TITLE** |  |  |  |
| **Title** | 1 | Identify the report as a systematic review. | -How Watching Subtitled YouTube Videos Can Affect EFL Listening and Reading Abilities |
| **ABSTRACT** |  |  |  |
| **Abstract** | 2 | See the PRISMA 2020 for Abstracts checklist |  |
| **INTRODUCTION** |  |  |  |
| **Rationale** | 3 | Describe the rationale for the review in the context of existing knowledge. | - |
| **Objectives** | 4 | Provide an explicit statement of the objective(s) or question(s) the review addresses. | -1) Can watching YouTube videos help L1 Japanese EFL learners to improve their listening comprehension, reading comprehension or reading speed?  2) Are enjoyment, the amount of time spent watching videos, or the number of re watches associated with more improvement in listening or reading ability? |
| **METHODS** |  |  |  |
| **Eligibility criteria** | 5 | Specify the inclusion and exclusion criteria for the review and how studies were grouped for the syntheses. | -page 6 |
| **Information sources** | 6 | Specify all databases, registers, websites, organisations, reference lists and other sources searched or consulted to identify studies. Specify the date when each source was last searched or consulted. | - |
| **Search strategy** | 7 | Present the full search strategies for all databases, registers and websites, including any filters and limits used. | - |
| **Selection process** | 8 | Specify the methods used to decide whether a study met the inclusion criteria of the review, including how many reviewers screened each record and each report retrieved, whether they worked independently, and if applicable, details of automation tools used in the process. | - |
| **Data collection process** | 9 | Specify the methods used to collect data from reports, including how many reviewers collected data from each report, whether they worked independently, any processes for obtaining or confirming data from study investigators, and if applicable, details of automation tools used in the process. | - page 7-8 |
| **Data items** | 10a | List and define all outcomes for which data were sought. Specify whether all results that were compatible with each outcome domain in each study were sought (e.g. for all measures, time points, analyses), and if not, the methods used to decide which results to collect. | - |
|  | 10b | List and define all other variables for which data were sought (e.g. participant and intervention characteristics, funding sources). Describe any assumptions made about any missing or unclear information. | - |
| **Study risk of bias assessment** | 11 | Specify the methods used to assess risk of bias in the included studies, including details of the tool(s) used, how many reviewers assessed each study and whether they worked independently, and if applicable, details of automation tools used in the process. | - |
| **Effect measures** | 12 | Specify for each outcome the effect measure(s) (e.g. risk ratio, mean difference) used in the synthesis or presentation of results. | - |
| **Synthesis methods** | 13a | Describe the processes used to decide which studies were eligible for each synthesis (e.g. tabulating the study intervention characteristics and comparing against the planned groups for each synthesis (item 5)). | -page 8 |
|  | 13b | Describe any methods required to prepare the data for presentation or synthesis, such as handling of missing summary statistics, or data conversions. | -page 8 |
| 13c | Describe any methods used to tabulate or visually display results of individual studies and syntheses. | -page 8 |
| 13d | Describe any methods used to synthesize results and provide a rationale for the choice(s). If meta-analysis was performed, describe the model(s), method(s) to identify the presence and extent of statistical heterogeneity, and software package(s) used. | -page 8 |
| 13e | Describe any methods used to explore possible causes of heterogeneity among study results (e.g. subgroup analysis, meta-regression). | - |
| 13f | Describe any sensitivity analyses conducted to assess robustness of the synthesized results. | - |
| **Reporting bias assessment** | 14 | Describe any methods used to assess risk of bias due to missing results in a synthesis (arising from reporting biases). | - |
| **Certainty assessment** | 15 | Describe any methods used to assess certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for an outcome. | - |
| **RESULTS** |  |  |  |
| **Study selection** | 16a | Describe the results of the search and selection process, from the number of records identified in the search to the number of studies included in the review, ideally using a flow diagram. | -page 9-12 |
|  | 16b | Cite studies that might appear to meet the inclusion criteria, but which were excluded, and explain why they were excluded. | - |
| **Study characteristics** | 17 | Cite each included study and present its characteristics. | - |
| **Risk of bias in studies** | 18 | Present assessments of risk of bias for each included study. | - |
| **Results of individual studies** | 19 | For all outcomes, present, for each study: (a) summary statistics for each group (where appropriate) and (b) an effect estimate and its precision (e.g. confidence/credible interval), ideally using structured tables or plots. | -page 12 |
| **Results of syntheses** | 20a | For each synthesis, briefly summarise the characteristics and risk of bias among contributing studies. | - |
|  | 20b | Present results of all statistical syntheses conducted. If meta-analysis was done, present for each the summary estimate and its precision (e.g. confidence/credible interval) and measures of statistical heterogeneity. If comparing groups, describe the direction of the effect. | - |
| 20c | Present results of all investigations of possible causes of heterogeneity among study results. | - |
| 20d | Present results of all sensitivity analyses conducted to assess the robustness of the synthesized results. | -- |
| **Reporting biases** | 21 | Present assessments of risk of bias due to missing results (arising from reporting biases) for each synthesis assessed. | - |
| **Certainty of evidence** | 22 | Present assessments of certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for each outcome assessed. | - |
| **DISCUSSION** |  |  |  |
| **Discussion** | 23a | Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence. | - page 12-14 The study found that students' reading comprehension and speed improved, possibly due in part to watching YouTube videos. Enjoyment and frequency of watching were associated with larger gains in reading comprehension. Listening comprehension scores were not bolstered by the class or YouTube watching activity, possibly due to test difficulty and lack of focus on listening in the class. Re-watching videos without subtitles might have contributed to improvement, and students enjoying the linguistic or educational aspects of the videos improved more. Despite some limitations, including a small sample size and lack of participation from some students, the study suggests a potential benefit of watching YouTube videos with subtitles for language learning. However, future research with larger sample sizes and different sets of listening questions is needed to confirm these findings. |
|  | 23b | Discuss any limitations of the evidence included in the review. | - |
| 23c | Discuss any limitations of the review processes used. | - |
| 23d | Discuss implications of the results for practice, policy, and future research. | - Furthermore, our study suggests that learners who both enjoy watching the videos and tend to watch for longer periods of time and/or re-watch videos are more likely to improve these skills by watching YouTube videos. Finally, it seems that the reasons for having enjoyed videos will also affect how beneficial watching them will be to improvement. |
| **OTHER INFORMATION** |  |  |  |
| **Registration and protocol** | 24a | Provide registration information for the review, including register name and registration number, or state that the review was not registered. | - |
|  | 24b | Indicate where the review protocol can be accessed, or state that a protocol was not prepared. | - |
| 24c | Describe and explain any amendments to information provided at registration or in the protocol. | - |
| **Support** | 25 | Describe sources of financial or non-financial support for the review, and the role of the funders or sponsors in the review. | - |
| **Competing interests** | 26 | Declare any competing interests of review authors. | - |
| **Availability of data, code and other materials** | 27 | Report which of the following are publicly available and where they can be found: template data collection forms; data extracted from included studies; data used for all analyses; analytic code; any other materials used in the review. | - |

This paper presents the results of a study that examined whether or not (1) watching English subtitled YouTube videos could help L1 Japanese EFL learners to improve on measures of listening comprehension, reading comprehension or reading speed, and (2) enjoyment, amount of time spent watching or tendency to re-watch videos affected improvement in any of these areas. The results suggest that (1) some gains were made in reading comprehension and speed, but not listening comprehension, although it is not clear how much of this is due to the class and how much is due solely to watching YouTube videos, and that (2) if students tended to watch more videos or exhibit a tendency to re-watch videos and also enjoyed them for linguistic reasons (rather than preference or content-based reasons), they tended to show more improvement in reading comprehension. Though it is unclear how successfully improvement in listening comprehension was able to be measured in this study, the results suggest that watching subtitled videos can be helpful to EFL learners’ general language improvement, such as reading ability, not only listening ability, as previously thought. Furthermore, th ey suggest that students can enhance the benefits of watching subtitled videos by re-watching them and focusing on the language being used in them.
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