

WEEKLY PAIRED CONVERSATION PRACTICE IN A 4-SKILL INTEGRATED ENGLISH COURSE

Richard C. H. Cheng

Center for English Language Teaching, Wenzao Ursuline University of Languages, 900,
Mintsu 1st Rd., San-Ming Dist., Kaohsiung, Taiwan, R.O.C. 807

ABSTRACT: *This paper reports a pilot study aimed to investigate the effects of weekly paired conversation practice on 20 sophomore university students' conversation performance and foreign language anxiety. The results of the study indicated that the participating students benefited from their weekly conversation practice, and they made significant improvement in their conversation performance at the end of the study although their foreign language anxiety did not decrease significantly. Also, their conversation performance significantly and negatively correlated with their foreign language anxiety, which means the students with less foreign language anxiety performed better in their English conversations. Based on the findings of the study, suggestions for output performance instruction, dealing with foreign language anxiety, and future research will be made.*

KEYWORDS: EFL, Output, Conversation Practice, Language Anxiety, Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale

INTRODUCTION

Students in Taiwan start to learn English in elementary school, and by the time they start going to university, they have already studied English for ten years. However, many students study English merely for the purpose of getting high scores on tests in school or national standardized exams, which results in the fact that many Taiwanese students are able to read, write, and listen to English for the purpose of passing a test but not conversing in English for authentic communication. This is one major reason why some Taiwanese students with high scores on international proficiency tests such as TOEFL and IELTS have difficulty expressing their opinions or participating in class discussions when they pursue a higher education in an English-speaking country. In addition, as EFL students in Taiwan, most Taiwanese students do not have chance to use or speak English after leaving the classroom, and this further adds to Taiwanese students' inability, or unwillingness, to speak English. Due to the two factors mentioned above as well as affective factors such as introvert personality and peer pressure, many Taiwanese students are generally weak in their speaking ability and they tend to have anxiety when they are required to perform speaking tasks.

In the field of Second Language Acquisition (SLA), researchers have different beliefs, or theories, with regard to how ESL/EFL students can build their output skills, namely speaking

and writing. Some researchers (Krashen, 1992; Lee, 2017; Mason & Krashen, 1997; Poorsofi & Asl, 2016) argue that extensive reading and comprehensible input are the most contributing factors in ESL/EFL students' language development, and they need to be exposed to substantial amounts of input in order to effectively develop their language competence. ESL/EFL students' output performance is best seen as a manifestation of what they have already acquired about the target language, and their output does not clearly help with their language development. As one strong advocate of this stance towards second language acquisition, Krashen (2002) claims that speaking, an output skill, does not promote language acquisition and "the ability to speak is a result of language acquisition, not a cause" (p. 5). In contrast, while acknowledging the importance of input, researchers (Ernst, 1994; Mir, 2006; Murphy, 1991; Stephens, 2015; Swain, 1995; Taguchi & Iwasaki, 2008; Taylor & Wolfson, 1978; Yang & Chang, 2008; Zhang, 2009) argue that students' output not only represents their current knowledge of the target language but also allows students to test their assumptions about the target language and to find out what they know or don't know, which in turn could facilitate and improve their learning process. In the backdrop of this view on the role students' output plays in their ESL/EFL learning, this paper discusses the results and implications of a pilot study conducted to explore the effects of weekly in-class conversation practice on students' conversation performance and the relationship between students' foreign language anxiety and ability to converse in English.

The overarching research questions of the study included:

1. Can the students' conversation performance be improved through the weekly in-class conversation practice?
2. How will the weekly in-class conversation practice affect the students' foreign language anxiety?
3. What is the relationship between the students' foreign language anxiety level and conversation performance?

LITERATURE REVIEW

In her elaboration of her output hypothesis, Swain (1995) asserted that there are three main functions that output serves: "the noticing function," "the hypothesis-testing function," and "metalinguistic function" (p. 128). The first function is that output allows learners to find their problems when they try to express their ideas in the target language. When learners have difficulty saying or writing what they intend to express, they will realize that there is a gap between their utterance and intended message and have a chance to advance in their learning process by closing that gap. Second, while learning the target language, learners may form their own hypotheses about the target language, and they put their hypotheses to the test through the production of output. Learners will then modify or fine-tune their hypotheses on

the basis of feedbacks they receive and thus improve their understanding and competence of the target language. The third function relates to the reflection learners do while generating their output. When learners reflect on their output, they will make use of their metacognition, which helps them consolidate what they have learned and further enhance their automaticity.

Taylor and Wolfson (1978) emphasized the importance of allowing students time to speak the target language in the classroom. However, they pointed out that rather than just letting students do free, unstructured conversation or speaking exercise, ESL/EFL teachers have to plan and prepare activities with clear goals or functions for their students. As Taylor and Wolfson (1978) argued, “free and unstructured conversation classes designed to get students simply to “talk” are incompatible with the belief that students should learn through goal-oriented activities” (p. 33). Only when students are given such activities can they learn the necessary linguistic, strategic, discourse, and socio-cultural competences to perform real-life speaking tasks in different contexts. In particular, conversation class teachers need to “construct a speech situation ... and then to give assignments to different dyads of students such that each is engaged in a realistic speech event. The student, to perform correctly, must practice not only the syntax and vocabulary appropriate to the language, but also the specific sociolinguistic rule appropriate to the speech situation, event, and act” (Taylor and Wolfson, 1978, p. 38).

Echoing Taylor and Wolfson’s suggestion about oral classroom activities, Ernst (1994) conducted a study investigating the effects of a classroom activity – talking circle – on ten limited English proficient students in an American elementary in Florida. The study focused on “three interrelated and interdependent aspects: topic development, social demands, and communicative functions of message units” (Ernst, 1994, p. 300). Based on the findings, Ernst (1994) suggested that “students need ample opportunities to hear and practice the new language” and “they need to be in classroom environments where conversation and negotiation are not only encouraged but carefully orchestrated, supported, and monitored by the teacher” (p. 315). In addition, language teachers should allow their students control over what they discuss or talk about, which gives the students motivation, or opportunities, to employ various communicative strategies in order to express their ideas and thoughts with limited target language.

Zhang (2009) examined the roles of input, interaction, and output in EFL learners’ oral fluency development by testing and interviewing two Chinese EFL learners aged 9 and 13 respectively. Informed by her study, Zhang (2009) pointed out that EFL learners could achieve native-like oral fluency provided that they have sufficient input, interaction, and out practice in their learning, and that speaking practice is as crucial as exposure to input for EFL learners to develop their English oral fluency. Also, she suggested that students benefit from engaging in conversation with native-speakers or teachers with native-like fluency, so it is desirable that EFL learners be given such conversational interaction.

MacIntyre and Gardner (1994) defined language anxiety as “the feeling of tension and apprehension specifically associated with second language contexts, including speaking,

listening, and learning” (p. 284), and Horwitz et al. (1991) proposed “communication apprehension”, “test anxiety”, and “fear of negative evaluation” (p. 30) as three composing factors conceptually associated with foreign language anxiety. In terms of its effects on language learning, foreign language anxiety tends to cause cognitive and emotional burden on language learners and hence negatively interfere with the language learning process while in a few studies foreign language anxiety has been found to have facilitating effects on language learning (Cheng et al., 1999; MacIntyre & Gardner, 1994; Horwitz et al., 1991; Scovel, 1991; Wang, 2010).

To explore Chinese EFL learners’ unwillingness to communicate in English and their anxiety in English classrooms, Liu and Jackson (2008) conducted a survey of seventy items at Tsinghua University in China among 547 freshmen majoring in subjects other than English. The results indicated that there were significant and positive correlations between the students’ unwillingness to communicate in English and their anxiety in English classrooms, and that the students’ unwillingness and anxiety significantly and negatively correlated with their self-rated English proficiency.

In light of the literature reviewed above, the study of this paper was carried out to investigate the extent to which output practice in the classroom allows students to improve their ability in conversation and the relationship between students’ anxiety and conversational competence.

METHODOLOGY AND METHODS

This study was carried out in a university of languages in southern Taiwan, and the participants were 26 non-English-major sophomore students in a four-skill integrated course at first. This course is a 4-credit (depending on the year) compulsory course which all non-English major students have to take every year throughout their four years of study at the school. There are 9 course levels, in which students are placed based on the results of the College Student English Proficiency Test (CSEPT), administered by the Language Training and Testing Center (LTTC) in Taipei. The participants in this study were in Level 4, and their CSEPT scores ranged from 160 to 200 (out of 360). The researcher was the instructor of this course, and he has been teaching this course for three consecutive years.

To investigate the effects of weekly conversation practice on the students’ conversation performance and the relationship between their foreign language anxiety and weekly conversation practice, the study deployed both quantitative and qualitative methodologies. The quantitative data consisted of the participants’ pre- and post-test conversation scores and the results of the 36-item, 5-Likert Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale (FLCAS), developed by Horwitz et al (1991) and adapted by Liu and Jackson (2008). Each item on the 5-point scale, ranging from *strongly agree* to *strongly disagree*, was stated in both English and Chinese in the hope of reducing the students’ cognitive

load and ensuring students' understanding of the items (see Appendix 1). As claimed by Miller and Endo (2004), teachers should strive to reduce the cognitive load of students by allowing "students to draw on their prior knowledge and life experiences" (p. 789). Preceded by the 36 items of the FLCAS, 4 open-ended questions were added to the survey the students completed in the post-test to gain qualitative data in relation to their opinions and thoughts about their challenges or difficulty in speaking English.

The 26 participating students filled out the FLCAS survey and did the paired conversation pre-test in the third week of the fall semester. For the paired conversation pre-test, the students were put into pairs, and each pair randomly drew a topic out of six (see Appendix 2). After drawing the topic, the pair of students went outside the classroom and they were given ten minutes to prepare a conversation lasting two minutes to two minutes and thirty seconds. After ten minutes of preparation, the pair of students presented their conversation in front of the instructor and the other classmates. Following the third week, as the treatment of this study, the students practiced having a conversation related to a topic discussed in class with their partners once a week. In the fifteenth week of the semester, the students completed the FLCAS survey and the paired conversation, using the same six topics used in the pre-test, again as the post-test. However, due to the fact that two students dropped the course before the post-test and that one was absent on the day of the post-test, only the conversations of ten pairs of the students were used for the study. Each conversation was recorded and later graded by two other teachers who also taught the same level of the course. The two raters were given clearly specified grading criteria (see Appendix 3), and prior to their grading the participants' conversations, they graded two conversations made by the researcher's previous students as rater training.

Following the completion of data collection, statistical analyses were conducted on the students' quantitative data, and the students' responses to the 4 open-ended questions were examined to gain in-depth understanding of the participants' opinions about the conversation practice they did in class, anxiety in the foreign language classroom and attitudes toward conversing in English.

RESULTS

To determine the reliability of the grading criteria, a reliability analysis was conducted on the students' paired conversation pre- and post-test conversation scores given by the two raters. The results of the reliability analysis indicate that the grading criteria were highly reliable with a Cronbach's Alpha value of .87 (see Table 1).

Table 1 Reliability Analysis of the Students' Paired Conversation Scores

Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items	<i>N</i>
.87	.87	4

Pearson's correlation analysis was performed to examine the degree of inter-rater reliability of the two raters, and Table 2 shows the results. There was a significant correlation between the scores given by the two raters, and the correlation coefficient is .67 ($p = .00^{**}$) for the 2 raters' pre-test conversation scores and .81 ($p = .00^{**}$) for their post-test conversation scores.

Table 2 Correlations between the Two Raters

	Rater 1 Pre-test	Rater 1 Post-test
Rater 2 Pre-test	.67**	
Rater 2 Post-test		.81**

** $p < .01$.

In order to determine if the students had made progress in their conversation performance, the paired samples *t*-test was used to examine their pre- and post-test conversation scores given by the two raters. The results (see Table 3) show that, for both raters, there was significant difference between the students' pre- and post-test conversation scores ($t = -3.961$ & $p = .00^{**}$ for Rater 1; $t = -6.07$ & $p = .00^{**}$ for Rater 2), which indicates that the students had significantly improved their conversation performance over the course of the study.

Table 3 Paired Samples *t*-test Analysis of the Pre- and Post-test Conversation Scores Given by the Two Raters

		<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Pair 1	Rater 1 Pre-test	67.20	5.11	19	-3.96	.00**
	Rater 1 Post-test	72.50	4.57			
Pair 2	Rater 2 Pre-test	68.50	7.59	19	-6.07	.00**
	Rater 2 Post-test	73.70	7.33			

** $p < .01$.

The FLCAS measures the students' foreign language class anxiety, and there are 36 items with a possible FLCAS score range of 36 to 180. A paired samples *t*-test analysis (see Table 4) shows that the difference between the students' pre- and post-test FLCAS scores is not significant ($p = .34$). However, the students' post-test FLCAS score mean is slightly higher than that of their pre-test FLCAS score.

Table 4 Paired Samples *t*-test Analysis of the Students' Pre- and Post-FLCAS Scores

		<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Pair 1	Pre-FLCAS Scores	118.00	19.44	19	-.98	.34
	Post- FLCAS Scores	120.00	16.68			

** $p < .01$.

Table 5 Correlations among the Participants' Pre- and Post-test Paired Conversation Scores and FLCAS Scores

	PreConScore	PostConScore
PreSurvey	.70(**)	
PostSurvey		.75(**)

** $p < .01$.

Note. PreSurvey = Pre-FLCAS scores; PostSurvey1 = Post-FLCAS score; PreConScore = Pre-test conversation scores; PostConScore = Post-test conversation scores.

All the pre- and post-test paired conversations were graded by the two raters, so there were two scores for each conversation. The means of the two raters' scores were used to determine the relationship between the students' conversation performance and anxiety level. Table 5 shows the results of Pearson's correlation analysis of the students' pre- and post-test FLCAS scores and conversation scores. There was significant positive correlation between the pre-test FLCAS scores and the pre-test conversation scores ($r = .70, p < .01^{**}$), and the post-test FLCAS scores also significantly and positively correlated with the post-test conversation scores ($r = .75, p < .01^{**}$).

In their answers to the first open-ended question added to post-test FLCAS survey, 14 (70%) of the 20 students mentioned that their major problem or difficulty when they had to speak English was the lack of necessary vocabulary while 9 (45%) considered that it was their poor grammar that stopped them from speaking fluently. With respect to the second question about what they had to do to improve their English speaking ability, 12 (60%) of them answered more oral practice in and outside the classroom, and 9 (45%) said watching English movies or TV shows. The third question asked the students specifically what classroom activities could help them improve their English speaking ability, and 12 (60%) of the students thought that the oral conversation practice they did in the classroom allowed them to improve their speaking. The final question aimed at gaining the students' attitudes toward and opinions of the conversation practice they did in the classroom, and 15 (75%) of the 20 students believed that the weekly conversation practice did promote their speaking ability while the other 5 (25%) stated that they were less certain about the positive effects of the conversation practice. In addition, of those who claimed that their speaking ability improved due to the conversation practice, 4 said that their fluency became better, 3 felt that they were less anxious when they spoke English, and another 3 mentioned that they benefited from the

interaction and discussion they had while preparing and planning the conversation.

DISCUSSIONS

To answer the first research question of the study, a paired samples *t*-test analysis was conducted to compare the students' pre- and post-test conversation scores, and the result indicates that the students benefited from the conversation practice they did in the classroom and were more able to perform the task of making a conversation with their partner. One could argue that the students' improvement in the ability to make conversations may have resulted from other activities the students did in or outside the classroom; nevertheless, the students' responses to the last open-ended question in the post-test FLCAS showed that the students believed that the paired conversation practice in class indeed helped them improve their ability in conversation. This finding is in accordance with what Ernst (1994) and Zhang (2009) found in their studies. Students require sufficient time and chance to practice speaking with their peers so that they could make use of what they have learned in class, discover their problems, and more effectively develop their target language competence through interaction with their peers. The interaction with their peers resembles what Vygotsky (as cited in Zhang, 2009) proposed as the zone of proximal development (ZPD), in which learners provide assistance, or scaffolding, for each other and fulfill tasks that each of them might not be able to accomplish alone. Similarly, Stephens (2015) suggests, in addition to extensive reading and listening to audio-books, EFL learners need to have opportunities to engage in interactive output activities to promote and support the development of their English abilities. The students in this study had to conduct a conversation with their partners. In this process, they brainstormed together what to say and how to organize the conversation and overcame the linguistic obstacles they encountered. Being in this ZPD, the students slowly bettered their knowledge and competence of the target language.

The second research question deals with the relationship between the students' foreign language class anxiety and the weekly conversation practice they did in class. The 5-point FLCAS, measuring the students' foreign language anxiety, ranges *strongly agree* to *strongly disagree*; thus, the lower a student's FLCAS score is, the higher his or her foreign language class anxiety is. The students' pre- and post-FLCAS score means are 118 and 120 respectively, which indicates that the students had only moderate to little foreign language anxiety. With respect to the effect of the conversation practice on the students' anxiety, the paired samples *t*-test analysis of the students' pre- and post-FLCAS scores showed no significant difference even though the mean of the post-FLCAS scores (mean = 120) was slightly higher than that of the pre-FLCAS scores (mean = 118), signifying a possible slight decrease in the students' foreign language anxiety. There could be several explanations for this result. First of all, the students did not experience much foreign language anxiety in the first place; therefore, anxiety was not the main concern when they did their conversation practice. The second possible explanation is the small sample size of the study participants,

which could have resulted in the insignificant difference between the pre- and post-test FLCAS scores. Next, the study participants were non-English major students and they generally lacked opportunities to speak English outside the English classroom. The limited amount of time for them to practice English conversation over the course of the study was obviously not enough to help significantly lower their foreign language class anxiety or change how they felt about the foreign language class. The final explanation is that foreign language anxiety is attributed to a number of variables. Daly (1991) asserts that communication apprehension is associated with “classroom, work, social settings, and personality” (p. 6). As a form of communication apprehension, the students’ foreign language anxiety could result from factors such as their past English learning experience, family background, attitudes toward English and its speakers, personalities, etc. The students’ weekly conversation practice alone was not powerful enough to help them effectively and significantly reduce their anxiety.

Regarding the third research question about the relationship between the students’ conversation performance and their foreign language anxiety, the Pearson’s correlation analysis of the students’ pre- and post-test FLCAS scores and paired conversation scores indicates that the students’ conversation performance significantly and negatively correlated with their anxiety levels. In other words, the less anxious students performed better in their conversation practice. As many researchers (Cheng et al., 1999; MacIntyre & Gardner, 1994; Horwitz et al., 1991; Scovel, 1991; Wang, 2010) have argued, anxiety is often believed to negatively affect language learning, and it is even more true when it comes to speaking, which requires language learners to produce the language on their own with their limited command of the language. The results of the study are in accordance with the belief and confirm the need for EFL teachers to help their students reduce or manage their foreign language anxiety so that they can present better performances.

Finally, a couple of points for discussion have emerged from the students’ responses to the 4 open-ended questions. The majority of the students felt that insufficient vocabulary (70%) and grammar competence (45%) were the two main problems that stopped them from freely conversing in English with their partners. Two interpretations can be made from this finding. First, some EFL students feel they have limited English vocabulary or grammar knowledge and thus they are unable to express themselves or communicate with others in English. This negative feeling about their own English competence will then make EFL students feel unsure or even anxious when they have to use English to accomplish a language task, which in turn may result in foreign language anxiety and will impede their language learning. As Cheng et al. (1999) found that “negative self-perception of language competence plays an important role in [these] Taiwanese learners’ experience of second language classroom anxiety ...” (p. 436). To remedy this issue, EFL students, especially those with limited vocabulary and grammar competence, need to be reminded that there are alternative ways to express themselves in English with their insufficient vocabulary or grammar knowledge, and they need to be taught necessary skills and strategies such as circumlocution, asking for clarification, non-verbal gestures, etc. to do so. Furthermore, EFL

teachers need to employ instructional approaches at their disposal to effectively facilitate their students' development of vocabulary, grammar competence, or whatever skills they lack. With proper improvement of their weaknesses, EFL students can feel more confident in themselves and perform their language tasks better.

Regarding whether the weekly conversation practice helped them improve their speaking ability and what they could do to improve their English speaking ability, the majority of the students acknowledged the importance and effectiveness of the weekly conversation practice in helping them improve their speaking ability. Although researchers such as Krashen (2002) questions the usefulness and effectiveness of output practice, the results of this study have shown that output practice, rather than being a mere manifestation of what they know about the language, does bring benefits to EFL students' language development. Therefore, as supported by some researchers (Ernst, 1994; Stephens, 2015; Swain, 1995; Taylor & Wolfson, 1978; Zhang, 2009), it is worth the time and effort to provide EFL students with opportunities to practice their speaking and communication skills with clear goals and necessary scaffoldings in meaningful and structured fashions.

CONCLUSION

The current study investigated the effects of weekly conversation practice on students' ability to conduct conversation with their peers, and the results showed that in-class conversation practice can effectively help students develop their conversational ability even though the students' foreign language anxiety did not significantly become lower. Two pedagogical implications can be made based the findings of the study. First, EFL teachers should allocate part of their class time to speaking activities, such as group discussion, paired conversation, and information gap, so that students can interact with their peers, negotiate meaning, find and overcome their problems, internalize the new elements of English they have learned recently, and express their thoughts and ideas in the target language, which many students don't have chance to do in their daily life. In addition, communication strategy training should be incorporated in EFL teachers' instruction. As Ferris and Tagg (1996) and Nakatani (2005) have recommended, strategy training can allow language learners to carry out their speaking tasks and activities in a more effective and communicative way. The students in this study were not specifically instructed strategies which might help them with their conversation making. Had they received such instruction, it is likely that they would have benefited from such strategy instruction and performed their conversations better. Second, as pointed out by some of the students in this study, EFL teachers can include some English movies or TV shows in their teaching materials. Students can watch movies or TV shows as input and learn how English is used in authentic contexts. Afterwards, students can use what they have learned from them as contents or topics for their discussion in their activities of producing output.

Finally, one limitation of the current study has to be pointed out. Due to the small sample size

of the study, the findings cannot be readily generalized to students of different proficiency levels studying in contexts different from the one in this study. Future research is recommended to investigate and compare the respective influences of in-class extensive reading and in-class output activities on EFL students' output performance and anxiety levels.

REFERENCES

- Cheng, Y. S., Horwitz, E. K., & Schallert, D. L. (1999). Language anxiety: Differentiating writing and speaking components. *Language Learning*, 49(3), 417-446.
- Daly, J. (1991). Understanding communication apprehension: An introduction for language educators. In E. K. Horwitz, & D. J. Young (Eds.), *Language Anxiety: From Theory and Research to Classroom Implications*, 3-13. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Ernst, G. (1994). "Talking Circle": Conversation and negotiation in the ESL classroom. *TESOL Quarterly*, 28 (2), 293-322.
- Ferris, D. & Tagg, T. (1996). Academic listening/speaking tasks for ESL students: Problems, suggestions, and implications. *TESOL Quarterly*, 30 (2), 297-320.
- Horwitz, E. K., Horwitz, M. B., & Cope, J. A. (1991). Foreign language classroom anxiety. In E. K. Horwitz, & D. J. Young (Eds.), *Language Anxiety: From Theory and Research to Classroom Implications*, 27-36. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Krashen, S. D. (1992). *Fundamentals of language education*. Lincolnwood, Illinois: Laredo Publishing.
- Krashen, S. D. (2002). *Explorations in language acquisition and use: the Taipei lectures*. Taipei, Taiwan: Crane Publishing.
- Lee, Sy-ying. (2017). Storytelling and sustained silent reading in foreign language acquisition: Evidence from Taiwan. Retrieved September 10th, 2017 from: <http://www.kzneducation.gov.za/Portals/0/ELITS%20website%20Homepage/IASL%202008/professional%20papers/leepp.pdf>
- Liu, M. & Jackson, J. (2008). An exploration of Chinese EFL learners' unwillingness to communicate and foreign language anxiety. *The Modern Language Journal*, 92 (1), 71-86.
- MacIntyre, P. D. & Gardner R. C. (1994). The subtle effects of language anxiety on cognitive processing in the second language. *Language Learning*, 44(2), 283-305.
- Mason, B. & Krashen, S. D. (1997). Extensive reading in English as a foreign language. *System*, 25 (1), 91-102.
- Miller, P. C & Endo, H. (2004). Understanding and meeting the needs of ESL students. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 85 (10), 786-791. Retrieved April 22nd, 2011 from: <http://faculty.weber.edu/mtungmala/Hybrid4270/Articles/MeetNeeds.pdf>
- Mir, M. (2006). IDEA: Using "Oral Journals" to develop speaking fluency, self-confidence and much more! *Hispania*, 89 (3), 559-561.

- Murphy, J. M. (1991). Oral communication in TESOL: Integrating speaking, listening, and pronunciation. *TESOL Quarterly*, 25 (1), 51-75.
- Nakatani, Y. (2005). The effects of awareness-raising training on oral communication strategy use. *The Modern Language Journal*, 89 (1), 76-91.
- Poorsoti, S. & Asl, H. D. (2016). Effect of extensive reading on grammatical accuracy and fluency of EFL learners' writing performance. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Language Research*, 3 (2), 188-201.
- Scovel, T. (1991). The effect of affect on foreign language learning: A review of the anxiety research. In E. K. Horwitz, & D. J. Young (Eds.), *Language Anxiety: From Theory and Research to Classroom Implications*, 15-23. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Stephens, M. (2015). Why Extensive Reading and Listening to Audio Books May not be Enough. *The Reading Matrix: An International Online Journal*, 15(2), 252-255.
- Swain, M. (1995). Three functions of output in second language learning. In G. Cook & B. Seidlhofer (Eds.), *Principles and practice in Applied Linguistics* (pp. 125-144). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Taguchi, N. & Iwasaki, Y. (2008). Training effects on the development of oral fluency in L2 Japanese. *Japanese Language and Literature*, 42 (2), 413-437.
- Taylor, B. P. & Wolfson, N. (1978). Breaking down the free conversation myth. *TESOL Quarterly*, 12 (1), 31-39.
- Wang, T. (2010). Speaking anxiety: More of a function of personality than language achievement. *Chinese Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 33 (5), 95-109.
- Yang, Y. T. C. & Chang, L. Y. (2008). No improvement – reflections and suggestions on the use of Skype to enhance college students' oral English proficiency. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 39 (4), 721-725.
- Zhang, S. (2009). The role of input, interaction and output in the development of oral fluency. *English Language Teaching*, 2 (4), 91-100.

Appendix 1

	Stron gly agree	Agr ee	Neut ral	Disag ree	Stron gly disagr ee
1. I never feel quite sure of myself when I am speaking English in my class. 在課堂中說英文時,我從不對自己有信心.	1	2	3	4	5
2. I don't worry about making mistakes in the English class. 我不擔心在上英文課時犯錯.	1	2	3	4	5
3. I tremble when I know that I'm going to be called on in the English class. 當知道我會在英文課中被點到發言,我會發抖.	1	2	3	4	5
4. It frightens me when I don't understand what the teacher is saying in English. 聽不懂老師用英文所說的話讓我覺得害怕.	1	2	3	4	5
5. It wouldn't bother me at all to take more foreign language classes. 我完全不在意再多上一些英文課.	1	2	3	4	5
6. During my English class, I find myself thinking about things that have nothing to do with the course. 在上英文課時,我發現自己會想一些和課程不相關的事.	1	2	3	4	5
7. I keep thinking that the other students are better at English than I am. 我總是認為其他同學的英文比我好.	1	2	3	4	5
8. I am usually at ease during English tests in my class.	1	2	3	4	5

我通常能以平常心輕鬆地做英文測驗.					
9. I start to panic when I have to speak without preparation in the English class. 當我必須沒有準備就在英文課中發言,我會不知所措.	1	2	3	4	5
10. I worry about the consequences of failing my English classes. 英文課沒過的後果會讓我覺得擔心.	1	2	3	4	5
11. I don't understand why some people get so upset over English class. 我不懂為什麼有些人會因為英文課而覺得如此地不高興.	1	2	3	4	5
12. In the English class, I can get so nervous I forget things I know. 上英文課時,我會因為太過緊張而忘記我所知道的東西.	1	2	3	4	5
13. It embarrasses me to volunteer answers in English class. 上英文課時自願回答問題會讓我覺得不好意思.	1	2	3	4	5
14. I would not be nervous speaking English with native speakers. 和來自英語系國家的人說英文我會比較不緊張.	1	2	3	4	5
15. I get upset when I don't understand what the teacher is correcting. 當我不懂老師所做的更正時我會覺得不高	1	2	3	4	5

興.					
16. Even if I am well prepared for the English class, I feel anxious about it. 即使我做好萬全的準備上英文課,我還是會覺得焦慮.	1	2	3	4	5
17. I often feel like not going to my English class. 我常常覺得不想上英文課.	1	2	3	4	5
18. I feel confident when I speak English in class. 當我說英文時我覺得有自信.	1	2	3	4	5
19. I am afraid that my English teacher is ready to correct every mistake I make. 我害怕我的英文老師準備好隨時更正我所犯的錯誤.	1	2	3	4	5
20. I can feel my heart pounding when I'm going to be called on in the English class. 當我將要在英文課被叫到時,我可以感覺到我的心臟跳動.	1	2	3	4	5
21. The more I study for an English test, the more confused I get. 我讀英文讀的越多,我越覺得困惑.	1	2	3	4	5
22. I don't feel pressure to prepare very well for the English class. 我不覺要有壓力必須做好準備上英文課.	1	2	3	4	5
23. I always feel that the other students speak English better than I do. 我總是覺得其他同學英文說的比我好.	1	2	3	4	5

24. I feel very self-conscious about speaking English in front of other students. 在班上同學前說英文讓我覺得很不自在.	1	2	3	4	5
25. The English class move so quickly that I worry about getting left behind. 英文課程的進度快到讓我覺得我跟不上.	1	2	3	4	5
26. I feel more tense and nervous in my English class than in my other classes. 我在英文課中會比在其他課程中覺得更神經繃緊且緊張.	1	2	3	4	5
27. I get nervous and confused when I am speaking English in class. 當我在英文課中說英文時,我會緊張,困惑.	1	2	3	4	5
28. When I'm on my way to the English class, I feel very sure and relaxed. 當我在去上英文課的途中,我覺得有自信且心情輕鬆.	1	2	3	4	5
29. I got nervous when I don't understand every word the English teacher says. 當我不懂老師所說的某個英文字時,我會變的緊張.	1	2	3	4	5
30. I feel overwhelmed by the number of rules I have to learn to speak English. 說英文要學會的文法規則多到讓我覺得受不了.	1	2	3	4	5
31. I am afraid that the other students will laugh at me when I speak English. 我害怕我說英文時,其他同學會笑我.	1	2	3	4	5

32. I would probably feel comfortable around native speakers of English. 和母語是英文的人在一起時我覺得比較自在.	1	2	3	4	5
33. I get nervous when the English teacher asks questions which I haven't prepared in advance. 當英文老師問我有關我沒有事前準備的題目時,我會覺得緊張.	1	2	3	4	5
34. I feel tense and nervous when talking to a person whose sex is opposite to mine. 當我和異姓說話時我會覺得神經繃緊且緊張.	1	2	3	4	5
35. I get tense and nervous when I have to discuss things unfamiliar to me in English. 當我必須用英文討論不熟悉的主題時,我會覺得神經繃緊且緊張.	1	2	3	4	5
36. I feel overwhelmed by the number of words I have to learn to speak in English. 說英文要學會的單字多到讓我覺得受不了.	1	2	3	4	5
<p>37. I started to learn English at the age of _____.</p> <p>38. I have English speaking friends (a. yes b. no) and we contact each other by writing (e.g., letters, emails, msn, and FB) _____ and / or by speaking (e.g., phone, meetings, and Skype) _____.</p> <p>A. occasionally B. once a week C. several times a week D. very often</p> <p>39. I rate my reading ability in English as _____, listening ability in English as _____, writing ability in English as _____, speaking ability in English as _____, and my overall English proficiency as _____.</p> <p>A. poor B. OK C. good D. very good</p>					

40. What problems or difficulties do you have when you have to speak English? 你認為你說英文時,遭遇到的問題或困難為何?

41. What do you think you have to do to improve your English speaking ability? 你認為你應該如何加強英文口說能力?

42. What activities in the classroom do you think can help you improve your English speaking ability? 你認為課堂中可以做什麼練習來加強你的英文口說能力?

43. Do you think practicing making a conversation in class with your partner can help you improve your speaking ability? If yes, please state in what way or aspect does the conversation practice help you. If no, please state why you think it doesn't help you. 你認為課堂中所做的對話練習可以幫助你加強你的口說能力嗎? 如果可以請詳述對話練習如何或在哪方面增進你的口語能力.如果沒有幫助的話,請詳述為何你覺得對話練習對你並無幫助。

Appendix 2

1. A is going to have a vacation in Canada next month. A tells B the things that A has to do and why he/she needs to do them. B asks A some questions about the trip and tries to give A suggestions.
2. A is going camping in Kenting this weekend. A tells B the things he/she is going to bring and explains why he/she needs them. B suggests what A can do in Kenting or what A still needs to prepare.
3. A is looking at photos A has taken on his/her trip abroad. B asks A about the photos and the trip, and A tells B details of the trip.
4. A is reading a magazine about traveling and A tells B why he/she likes to travel in Taiwan or abroad. A and B discuss what they can learn or experience when they travel. A and B also share with each other what needs to be done before they go on a trip.
5. A and B are coworkers at a restaurant / clothing store / super market. A suggests that A and B take a break from work for 3 or 4 days and travel to somewhere. B agrees with A. A and B start to plan their trip and make suggestions. A and B then respond to each other's suggestions to show if they like or dislike the ideas.
6. A and B are watching a TV show about special places in the world. Then, A and B start to talk about the most unusual / special / unforgettable places they have been to. Try to give more details.

Appendix 3

<i>Pair</i>	<i>Content</i>	<i>Grammaticality</i>	<i>Fluency</i>	<i>Pronunciation</i>	<i>Total</i>
1	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	
	/ 50	/ 20	/ 20	/ 10	
<i>Pair</i>	<i>Content</i>	<i>Grammaticality</i>	<i>Fluency</i>	<i>Pronunciation</i>	<i>Total</i>
2	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	
	/ 50	/ 20	/ 20	/ 10	
<i>Pair</i>	<i>Content</i>	<i>Grammaticality</i>	<i>Fluency</i>	<i>Pronunciation</i>	<i>Total</i>
3	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	
	/ 50	/ 20	/ 20	/ 10	
<i>Pair</i>	<i>Content</i>	<i>Grammaticality</i>	<i>Fluency</i>	<i>Pronunciation</i>	<i>Total</i>
4	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	
	/ 50	/ 20	/ 20	/ 10	
<i>Pair</i>	<i>Content</i>	<i>Grammaticality</i>	<i>Fluency</i>	<i>Pronunciation</i>	<i>Total</i>
5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	
	/ 50	/ 20	/ 20	/ 10	

Directions for rating:

- 1** = poor, **2** = dissatisfactory, **3** = average, **4** = good, **5** = excellent
- Content:** The degree to which the content is meaningful, logical, organized, relevant to the topic, and/or long enough as required.
Grammaticality: The degree to which the utterances are grammatically accurate and complete.
Fluency: The degree to which the speech is fluent, smooth, and properly paced with appropriate pauses.
Pronunciation: The degree to which the speech is loud, clear, correct, easy to understand, and articulate.
 - 1 – Poor (1 ~ 30)
 - 2 – Dissatisfactory (31 ~ 55)
 - 3 – Average (56 ~ 70)
 - 4 – Good (71 ~ 85)
 - 5 – Excellent (86 ~ 100)
- After rating each aspect of the four above, give each aspect a global score. Add up the scores of the 4 aspects to have the total score.