

# The Effect of Using Four of Speaking Activities in Developing the Jordanian Basic Stage Students' Speaking Skill

Issam Mostafa Ta'amneh

Assistant prof. of TEFL, Languages and Translation Department, Tabuk University, KSA.

## Abstract

The study aimed to investigate the effect of using four of speaking activities (picture describing, find the differences, role play ,and interview) in a strategy-based classroom interactional instructional program on developing Jordanian basic stage students' speaking skill. To achieve the purpose of the study, the speaking test as well as the interactional instructional programme were prepared in advance. The sample of the study consisted of 51 male tenth grade students who were chosen purposefully at Zahar Secondary School for Boys in Irbid Directorate , Jordan. The participants were assigned into two groups, the experimental group and the control group. The design of the study was a mixed method design. The data were obtained through the analysis of the participants' responses in the speaking test. The findings of the study showed that there were significant differences between the mean scores of the experimental group and the mean scores of the control group in favor of the experimental group. This means that using the four speaking activities had a positive impact in enhancing the students' speaking abilities.

**Keywords:** Classroom interaction, strategy, speaking activities

## 1. Introduction

Nowadays, English language is widely used in different fields. It is the main language of teaching, science, economics and modern technology. It is a main language that the majority of people dream of mastering it. According to Ramelan (1992) English, as an international language, is used to communicate, to strengthen, and to fasten relationships among all countries in the world. To communicate with each other, people need a language that helps them to share experiences and feelings as human beings can not live in a community without communicating with each other. Each society needs a language to communicate. Language is considered a vital mean of communication for communities as people can not live without a language that help them in exchanging ideas and opinions. English is considered a universal language that is widely used in what we call nowadays the global village. Communication has a lot of purposes. Some people use it to influence, gather information; whereas others depend on it to make social contact or to avoid tension (Whiteman, 1983). People depend on the written or the spoken form of language to communicate with other people. It is supposed that many people depend on speaking as a medium to express their opinions and ideas about different topics in their life. From the above assumption, speaking skill gains more important than the other language skills (reading, listening, and writing). It is considered an essential tool for language learning (Goh 2007,1).

Communication is also important for the international students who learn English as a foreign language because through communication students can express their points of view as well as develop their oral skills. Consequently, learners of English depend on communication to send and receive messages effectively (Rubin and Thompson, 1994). The situation is the same when talking about Jordanian students who learn English as a foreign language as Jordanian students depend heavily on English as a main language instruction when they join the Jordanian universities. They use communication to express their ideas and opinions about different topics. They depend on speaking to do so as it is considered- according to many educationists- the most effective skill that students depend on to reach the goal of communication (Samovar, 1989; Brown, 1994; Burns and Joyce, 1997; and Celce-Murcia, 2001). In addition, Saunders & O'Brien (2006) look at speaking as an essential and beneficial to learners' academic and professional success.

Swain in her comprehensible output hypothesis (1985) argued that in order to help learners to learn the language, they have to speak and use the language. Consequently, speaking is a skill that should be given a lot of attention and concern to help the learners to speak the foreign language with confidence inside the classroom and outside it. Students should be encouraged to use language otherwise, they will not be able to learn and master it. Halliday, McIntosh, and Strevens (cited in Rabab'ah 2012, p187) stressed that "oral mastery depends on practicing and repeating the patterns produced by a native speaker of the foreign language. It is the most economical way of thoroughly learning a language." Consequently, Classroom interaction creates the best opportunity of language learning through the real performance and the increased knowledge (Lier,1996). Moreover, if classroom interaction is managed and presented properly by teachers, then this will play an important role in the students' progress at the educational level (Johnson,1995). Beyazkurk and Kenser's belief (2005), goes in harmony with Johnson(1995) and Lier(1996),when they consider the teacher-student interaction an essential stage in the learning and teaching process as students get a lot of benefit from this interaction at both the social as well as the academic level.

The Jordanian students may find a lot of difficulties to communicate with native speakers, because the majority of them live in villages and Bedouin areas, so the only way to communicate in the target language is only in the classroom with their teachers and their colleagues. To solve this problem, educationists suggest using speaking widely in the classroom. Teachers should believe that upon their shoulders, there are a lot of responsibilities to facilitate the learners' use of English. Hafitsa (2010) provided a number of suggestions that teachers may take into consideration to encourage their learners to use the language. First, teachers should choose the interesting lessons that motivate learners to use the language. Secondly, teachers should present these lessons in a very attractive way. Thirdly, they have to create an interesting atmosphere because learners' ability to use and learn English depends on their previous schemata, and the teacher's procedure to attract their feelings and interests. Miller (2007) thought that teachers can facilitate learning the speaking skill when they use speaking activities that utilize pair work and group work. On the other hand, Rivers (cited in Curtain and Pesola, 1994, p.117) suggested a group of solutions to help the teachers in their teaching of the speaking skill. He believed that "teachers should use the target language extensively, and encourage the students to do so." He also added that teachers are supposed to provide their students with the opportunities that help their students to communicate in the target language in meaningful, purposeful activities since this will help a lot in stimulating real life situations.

Hafitsa (2010) asserted that teachers should know that the teaching and learning process is a kind of interaction between the teacher and his students from one side and between the students themselves from the other side. Educationists believe that the teacher's role in creating a vivid interactional classroom is crucial. Consequently, classroom interaction is considered one of the most beneficial strategies that teachers may use to develop, and improve the students' speaking skill and to encourage their students to participate actively in the classroom.

Students' lack of opportunities to communicate in English may be one of the crucial issues that stand against the students' progress in learning English as a foreign language. Jordanian teachers are considered successful if they encourage their students to use and practice the language either inside the classroom or outside it. In the classroom, classroom interaction is considered the key to reach this goal. Teachers should have a great belief that teaching is an interactional process between them and their students to transfer knowledge to improve the learners' knowledge of English (Hafitsa, 2010).

## 2. Literature Review

In order to develop the students' speaking skill through increasing their classroom interaction, it is expected that using some of the speaking activities, such as picture describing, find the differences, role play, and interview in a classroom interactional instructional program, may help in developing the students' speaking skill. Pictures are considered good examples of the purposeful activities that increase the students' participation in the classroom as they provide all the learners with opportunities to use the language that he/she has learned and to develop vocabulary acquisition (Skrzypczynska, 1992; and Sloan, 1992). They have a great effect in learning English as a foreign language (Mayer and Gallini, 1990, and Hibbing and Rankin-Ericson, 2003). Moreover, using pictures in learning a foreign language will definitely help in developing their accuracy and this finding is supported by Conray, Sage, and Ralph (2009). Furthermore, engaging students in picture activities to develop their speaking skill will help in developing the students' cognitive engagement. These findings are supported by Hsiao (2010), and Ellia, van den Heuvel-Panhuizen, Georgiou (2010).

To show the importance of pictures in the learning process, Bishop (1977) wrote an article to describe his experience while working with children in a non-western culture. He used the pictures as a main source to facilitate the children's learning. He found that there were many benefits of using pictures since they helped children to overcome the amount of difficulty in the learning process. Pictures play the role of the facilitator to learn and to master the language.

In the same context, Ernestova (1981, pp.5-9) suggests using the pictures in the learning process at all levels as they play a positive role in facilitating the learners' performance. She believes that pictures can be used to achieve many educational aims such as (a) introducing new lexical items, (b) illustrating a new grammar structure, and (c) eliminating some pronunciation difficulties. She also adds that pictures play a vital role in motivating the students to participate in the classroom activities. Moreover, she stressed that pictures can provide them with the necessary experience to practice using the language which is the main factor that helps students to learn English.

Skrzypczynska (1992, pp.42-44) supports this idea. He points out that using picture in front of students gives each learner the opportunity to use the language he/she has learned inside the classroom and in front his colleagues which helps in reducing the amount of fear and hesitation in using the language. He also adds that students can use pictures to practice speaking or writing. Moreover, he notices that using pictures encourage students to take an active role in discussion and conversation among students and through using them. In addition, he stresses that by using pictures, the lesson could be more interesting and more attractive.

In fact, teachers must take into their consideration that using pictures to present a new lesson may have a positive effect in facilitating the students' understanding to the lesson because the lack of some details when presenting a lesson may cause a kind of confusion. This confusion could be solved by using pictures as they play a great role in facilitating the learning process for the new lessons. Moreover, they play a positive role in reducing the amount of fear that students may face when learning new lessons.

On the other hand, role play is considered one of the speaking activities that can be used to increase the classroom interaction. In this field, Livingstone (1983, p.6) stressed that role play is a "classroom activity which gives the students the opportunity to practice the language they may need in the classroom." Moreover, it helps students to use their language store and to try their communicative abilities (Gower and Walters, 1983; and Dougill, 1989). Lucantoni's (2003) point of view goes in harmony with Gower and Walters, 1983; and Dougill, 1989 as he looked at role play as an interesting and enjoyable experience for learners. Furthermore, role play has another advantage since it helps the learners to increase their motivation as well as their involvement in the learning process (Ments, 1999; and Livingstone, 1983). Studies on the effectiveness of role play in the foreign language learning showed that it has a great effect on developing the students' oral skill (Sue, 1990; Al-Senaidi, 2010; Shen and Suwanthep, 2011). Moreover, Peterson's study (2012), concerning the effect of role playing game on developing the students' linguistic interaction, showed that the learners' participation in role playing activities enhanced their fluency practice.

In fact, when students are engaged in doing role play activities, this may help in developing their self-image as it helps in increasing their self-confidence and it helps in giving them the chance to practice using the language freely. In this context, Ladousse (1987) looks at role play as an enjoyable activity that does not affect negatively on students' personality as it helps in building up self-confidence rather than destroying it.

As for interview, it is one of the effective speaking skills that helps in developing the learners' speaking skill. Nowadays, interviews are widely used in the field of employment especially for those who seek to get a job in a bank, a factory, an organization, or an institution. In addition formal interviews are held for those who plan to immigrate to other countries to get a visa for work or study in some developed countries. In fact, to have a successful interview, it is advisable to have certain stages that should be arranged in an appropriate manner. Kumar (1989) suggests the following stages:

*a) Initial Contact: It is a critical stage since it helps in creating a good atmosphere between the interviewer and the interviewee.*

*b) Sequencing Questions: It is helpful to start with one or two of general questions about the things that may interest the interviewee. Questions should be sequenced in a way that achieves the aim of the interview.*

*c) Wording of Questions: To have wording of questions, the interviewer should keep the following three considerations: First, questions should be simple and short. Secondly, questions should be formed to elicit detailed information. Thirdly, unrelated questions should be avoided as they may create a kind of confusion.*

*d) Role Playing: One of the helpful methods to assess the interviewee's ability. The interviewer asks the interviewee to play the role of someone and asks him/her what he/she would do if he/she in another person's position or place.*

*e) Controlling Conversations: Successful interviewers are those who are able to control the conversation when the respondent gives irrelevant responses. In such these cases, the interviewer should be patient and try to understand what the respondent is trying to say (p.16).*

Teachers who try to interview their students to examine their communicative abilities should take these suggestions into their consideration as they help them a lot to arrange a well-planned interview. Teachers, in many cases, depend on interviews to evaluate and assess their students' oral proficiency.

Studies conducted by many researchers showed that the interview activity helped in increasing the students' participation, learning the open-ended questions technique, building a good relationships among the students, and examining the learners' views or opinions about different topics (Sue, 1990; Diani, 2005; Powel, Fisher, and Hughes-Scholes, 2008; Herman and Foster, 2008; Neumann and Hopf, 2012).

To achieve the purpose of the study, the researcher designed a classroom interactional instructional program that was based on some of the classroom interaction strategies such as questioning, negotiation of meaning and cooperative learning. The researcher believes that using some of the speaking activities such as picture describing, finding the differences, role play and the interview may play an important role in developing the students' speaking skill. To do so, the researcher involved the four speaking skills in an instructional program to enhance the students' ability to use English in the classroom. The instructional interactional programme was taught for three months in the academic year 2017/2018.

### **3. Statement of the Problem**

As a teacher and a lecturer of English language, at national schools and universities, the researcher has noticed

that a good number of Jordanian students face a lot of difficulties in participating in the classroom activities due to the fact that they do not have the ability to participate well in these activities. This fact is proved when you ask students about their bad results that they achieve in the English language courses' tests at either school level or the university one. This feeling is expected to have a bad effect on their participation in the classroom. In addition, Jordanian students in the secondary and basic stages are quite low achievers in English in general and speaking in particular, this issue has a negative effect on creating a vivid interactional classroom environment (Smadi, 1986; Al-Dwiek, 2008 and Al-Zaid, 2008).

Teachers face many difficulties while teaching students English as a foreign language. One of these difficulties is to prepare learners and children to use the language (Pygate, 1987; Luama, 2004; and Hafitsa, 2010). Learners or children usually hesitate to use the language either because of their shyness or because of their lack of confidence in their communicative abilities. Teachers may find in the classroom interaction the best way to foster their students to use the language as it has a great effect in developing the students' oral skills since it provides all students with opportunities to participate in the classroom activities (Tsou (2005), Sang (2006), Khadijah (2009), Wang and Castro (2010), Nurmasitah (2010), Monica (2011), Naimat (2011), and Hernandez (2012).

Studies conducted by Al-Nimerat (2005), Ismail (2005), and Jweihan (2007), indicated that the vast majority of students in Jordan graduate from secondary and basic schools with low levels of communicative ability in English, particularly oral and written communication skills. This issue is known on the international level as there are still a good number of people as well students who face a lot of difficulties when they engage in any act of communication and feel afraid to express themselves (Wallechinsky, Wallace and Wallace, 1997; Munter and Russel, 2002; and Hartman and LeMay, 2004).

#### **4. Objectives of the Study**

The study aimed to achieve the following two objective:

1) Find if there are significant differences in the participants' achievement in the speaking test between the control group and the experimental group due to the teaching strategy (The use of four of speaking activities in the proposed instructional program and the conventional way).

#### **5. Question of the Study**

The current study aimed at answering the following question:

1- Are there any significant differences in the students' achievement in speaking English between the control group and the experimental group due to the speaking instructional program?

#### **6. Significance and Limitations of the Study**

The results of this study could be helpful to the EFL teachers and English language lecturers as it presents clear evidence on the importance of using some of the speaking activities to develop and improve the students' speaking skill as well as to increase their interaction in the classroom.

Moreover, the results of this study could be helpful to the Jordanian and other EFL teachers through providing them with the most successful speaking activities that help in improving the students' speaking skill. In addition, the recommendations of this study could be of great value to the Ministry of Education, researchers, and decision makers on the importance of such instructional programs in developing the Jordanian students' speaking skill.

The generalization of the results of this study is limited due to the following factors:

- 1- The study is limited in the number, gender, and context of students. Only 51 male tenth grade students participated in this study who study English in Zahar secondary school for boys.
- 2- The study is limited to four units out of six presented in the first semester in the Student's Book of Action Pack 10.
- 3- The study is limited to four speaking activities: picture describing, find the differences, role play, and interview.

#### **7. Methodology**

##### ***A- Scope of the Study***

##### ***7.1. The participants of the study***

The participants of the study were 51 male EFL tenth grade basic students at Zahar Secondary School for Boys who were chosen purposefully to participate in the study. The participants were divided into two groups; the experimental group was 25 students whereas the control group was 26 students. Both groups received a pre-test. Then the researcher started implementing the study, which lasted for 3 months. The researcher taught the experimental group following the instructional program whereas the control group was taught according to the way of teaching as it was described in the Teacher's Book.

## 7.2. Design of the Study

The present study adopted the quasi-experimental design since one experimental group and one control group were selected purposefully and because it is impossible to control the variables in the humanistic researches.

## 7.3 Variables of the Study

The present study included the following variables:

1. The independent variable was the teaching strategy (the interactional instructional program, and the conventional way of teaching).
2. The dependent variables were the participants' mean scores in the speaking test with its three dimensions.

## 7.4. Instruments

To conduct the study, the following instrument was used:

**I-The speaking test.** (Appendix A). It was divided into two parts. The first part consisted of 20 questions. It was divided into three types of questions:

1. Personal Questions.
2. Guided Questions.
3. Open Questions.

The second part consisted of 15 questions. It was divided into four sections: Picture describing, find the differences, role play, and the interview. The purpose of the speaking test was to assess the participants' accuracy and fluency before and after implementing the instructional program.

## 7.5. Validity and Reliability of the Test

To insure the validity of the speaking test, a jury of five TEFL specialists in the curriculum and instruction in some of the Jordanian universities, and three colleagues who hold a PH.D from the Department of Curriculum and Instruction at Yarmouk University and work as lecturers in colleges were asked politely to participate in the process of validity. To obtain its reliability, it was computed on a pilot study of 30 students using the test-retest method. The reliability coefficient was computed using Cronbach's Alpha formula.

## 7.6. Data Collection

To collect the data, quantitative techniques were used to analyze the data obtained from the speaking test.

## 8. Results and Discussion

### 8.1. Findings related to the research question

The first question of the study was: *Are there any significant differences in the students' achievement in the speaking test due to the teaching strategy (The proposed instructional program and the conventional way)?*

To answer this question, means and standard deviations of the students' achievement in the pre and post speaking test were calculated due to the teaching strategy (The proposed instructional program and the conventional way). Moreover, the researcher calculated the adjusted means and the standard error of the students' achievement in the post speaking test as it is illustrated in Table 1 below.

**Table1: Means and Standard Deviations of the Students' Achievement in the Pre and Post Test due to the Teaching Strategy and the Adjusted Means and Standard Errors**

Teaching Strategy	N	Pretest(Covariate)		Posttest			
		Mean	Std. Dev.	Mean	Std. Dev.	Adj. Mean	Std. Error
Conventional	26	1.292	0.57	1.498	1.15	1.764	0.09
Program	25	1.595	0.79	3.492	0.58	3.872	0.09

Table 1 shows that there is an observed difference between the two means of the students' achievement in the post test due to the teaching strategy. To investigate the significance of the observed difference, ANCOVA was used for the students' achievement in the posttest due to the teaching strategy after excluding the pre students' achievement. The results are presented in Table 2.

**Table 2: Results of ANCOVA of the Students' Achievement in the Post Test Due to the Teaching Strategy**

Source of Variance	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial $\eta^2$
Examination (Covariate)	25.625	1	25.625	<b>130.760</b>	0.000	73.15%
Teaching Strategy	2.982	1	2.982	<b>15.219</b>	0.000	24.07%
Error	9.406	48	0.196			
Total	44.188	50				

The table shows that there are statistically significant differences at  $\alpha = 0.05$  between the adjusted two

means for the post students' achievement in the test due to the teaching strategy as indicated in Table 1, in favor of the students in the experimental group who were taught using the proposed instructional program compared with the students of the control group who were taught according to the conventional way as it was described in the Teacher's Book. The practical significance for the teaching strategy with the students' achievement in the test is 24.07% as shown in the table which showed that the instructional program had a great effect in improving the participants' speaking skill.

Moreover, means and standard deviations of the pre and post students' achievements in the domains of the test were calculated due to the teaching strategy. The adjusted means and their standard errors were also calculated for the domains of the posttest as it is illustrated in Table 3 below.

**Table 3: Means and Standard Deviations of the Pre and Post Students' Achievements in the Domains of the Test Due to the Teaching Strategy**

Dependent Variable	Teaching Strategy	N	Pretest (Covariate)		Posttest			
			Mean	Std. Dev.	Mean	Std. Dev.	Adj. Mean	Std. Error
Personal Questions	Conventional	26	1.912	0.68	2.335	0.88	2.502	0.10
	Program	25	2.304	0.71	4.012	0.76	4.838	0.11
Guided Questions	Conventional	26	1.182	0.43	1.523	1.17	1.822	0.10
	Program	25	1.529	0.80	3.185	0.59	3.874	0.10
Open Questions	Conventional	26	1.065	0.37	1.246	1.05	1.519	0.08
	Program	25	1.408	0.74	3.776	0.47	3.492	0.08
Picture Describing	Conventional	26	1.474	0.81	1.478	1.25	1.711	0.16
	Program	25	1.500	0.83	3.613	0.53	3.971	0.17
Find the Differences	Conventional	26	1.082	0.42	1.361	1.24	1.612	0.12
	Program	25	1.553	0.90	3.200	0.57	3.939	0.12
Role Play	Conventional	26	1.178	0.50	1.293	1.13	1.627	0.10
	Program	25	1.395	0.82	3.288	0.49	3.940	0.11
Interview	Conventional	26	1.262	0.75	1.250	1.31	1.557	0.15
	Program	25	1.418	0.76	3.368	0.64	3.048	0.15

Table 3 shows that there is an observed difference in the students' achievement in the domains of the test due to teaching strategy. To investigate the previously mentioned observed differences, MANCOVA was conducted to analyze the dimensions of the post test due to the teaching strategy after excluding the effect of the pre students' achievements in the domains of the speaking test as shown in Table 4.

**Table 4: MANCOVA Results for the Students' Achievement in the Domains of the Post Test Due to the Teaching Strategy**

Effect	MANOVA Test	MANOVA Test Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.	Partial $\eta^2$
Personal Questions (Covariate)	Wilks' Lambda	0.737	1.838	7	36	0.110	26.33%
Guided Questions (Covariate)	Wilks' Lambda	0.800	1.286	7	36	0.285	20.01%
Open Questions (Covariate)	Wilks' Lambda	0.790	1.367	7	36	0.249	21.00%
Picture Describing (Covariate)	Wilks' Lambda	0.585	3.645	7	36	0.005	41.48%
Find the Differences (Covariate)	Wilks' Lambda	0.588	3.609	7	36	0.005	41.24%
Role Play (Covariate)	Wilks' Lambda	0.848	0.924	7	36	0.500	15.24%
Interview (Covariate)	Wilks' Lambda	0.780	1.452	7	36	0.215	22.02%
Teaching Strategy	Hotelling's Trace	0.652	3.352	7	36	0.007	39.46%

Table 4 shows that there is a statistically significant effect at  $\alpha=0.05$  due to the teaching strategy in the students' achievements in the domains of the post test all together. To find out the domain which was more affected by the teaching strategy, an ANCOVA was conducted for the students' achievements in the domains of the post test separately due to the teaching strategy. The results of ANCOVA are shown in Table 5.

**Table 5: ANCOVA Results of Students' Achievement in the Domains of the Post Test Due to the Teaching Strategy**

Dependent Variable	Source of Variance	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial $\eta^2$
Open Questions	Personal Questions (Covariate)	0.108	1	0.108	41.815	0.000	49.9%
	Guided Questions (Covariate)	0.048	1	0.048	18.628	0.000	30.7%
	Open Questions (Covariate)	0.596	1	0.596	230.576	0.000	84.6%
	Picture Describing (Covariate)	0.235	1	0.235	90.974	0.000	68.4%
	Find the Differences (Covariate)	1.560	1	1.560	603.200	0.000	93.5%
	Role Play (Covariate)	0.481	1	0.481	185.947	0.000	81.6%
	Interview (Covariate)	0.257	1	0.257	99.360	0.000	70.3%
	Teaching Strategy	5.005	1	5.005	<b>1934.995</b>	0.000	97.9%
	Error	0.109	42	0.003			
Total	8.401	50					
Picture Describing	Personal Questions (Covariate)	0.158	1	0.158	5.439	0.025	11.5%
	Guided Questions (Covariate)	0.274	1	0.274	9.398	0.004	18.3%
	Open Questions (Covariate)	0.686	1	0.686	23.542	0.000	35.9%
	Picture Describing (Covariate)	0.017	1	0.017	0.587	0.448	1.4%
	Find the Differences (Covariate)	2.112	1	2.112	72.532	0.000	63.3%
	Role Play (Covariate)	0.653	1	0.653	22.436	0.000	34.8%
	Interview (Covariate)	0.220	1	0.220	7.562	0.009	15.3%
	Teaching Strategy	33.325	1	33.325	<b>1144.253</b>	0.000	96.5%
	Error	1.223	42	0.029			
Total	38.669	50					
Guided Questions	Personal Questions (Covariate)	0.031	1	0.031	2.491	0.122	5.6%
	Guided Questions (Covariate)	0.019	1	0.019	1.506	0.227	3.5%
	Open Questions (Covariate)	0.493	1	0.493	39.052	0.000	48.2%
	Picture Describing (Covariate)	0.256	1	0.256	20.280	0.000	32.6%
	Find the Differences (Covariate)	2.458	1	2.458	194.816	0.000	82.3%
	Role Play (Covariate)	1.290	1	1.290	102.227	0.000	70.9%
	Interview (Covariate)	0.835	1	0.835	66.152	0.000	61.2%
	Teaching Strategy	8.021	1	8.021	<b>635.771</b>	0.000	93.8%
	Error	0.530	42	0.013			
Total	13.931	50					
Find the Differences	Personal Questions (Covariate)	0.150	1	0.150	6.321	0.016	13.1%
	Guided Questions (Covariate)	0.108	1	0.108	4.534	0.039	9.7%
	Open Questions (Covariate)	0.921	1	0.921	38.778	0.000	48.0%
	Picture Describing (Covariate)	0.193	1	0.193	8.138	0.007	16.2%
	Find the Differences (Covariate)	2.812	1	2.812	118.476	0.000	73.8%
	Role Play (Covariate)	0.672	1	0.672	28.294	0.000	40.3%
	Interview (Covariate)	0.268	1	0.268	11.305	0.002	21.2%
	Teaching Strategy	10.829	1	10.829	<b>456.181</b>	0.000	91.6%
	Error	0.997	42	0.024			
Total	16.949	50					
Role Play	Personal Questions (Covariate)	0.001	1	0.001	0.062	0.805	0.1%
	Guided Questions (Covariate)	0.006	1	0.006	0.271	0.606	0.6%
	Open Questions (Covariate)	0.654	1	0.654	29.702	0.000	41.4%
	Picture Describing (Covariate)	0.707	1	0.707	32.101	0.000	43.3%
	Find the Differences (Covariate)	2.871	1	2.871	130.274	0.000	75.6%
	Role Play (Covariate)	0.447	1	0.447	20.274	0.000	32.6%
	Interview (Covariate)	0.000	1	0.000	0.020	0.887	0.0%
	Teaching Strategy	8.758	1	8.758	<b>397.479</b>	0.000	90.4%
	Error	0.925	42	0.022			
Total	14.371	50					
Interview	Personal Questions (Covariate)	0.032	1	0.032	0.683	0.413	1.6%
	Guided Questions (Covariate)	1.250	1	1.250	26.688	0.000	38.9%
	Open Questions (Covariate)	0.035	1	0.035	0.745	0.393	1.7%
	Picture Describing (Covariate)	2.158	1	2.158	46.099	0.000	52.3%
	Find the Differences (Covariate)	0.633	1	0.633	13.522	0.001	24.4%
	Role Play (Covariate)	1.330	1	1.330	28.416	0.000	40.4%
	Interview (Covariate)	1.737	1	1.737	37.097	0.000	46.9%
	Teaching Strategy	17.869	1	17.869	<b>381.646</b>	0.000	90.1%

Dependent Variable	Source of Variance	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial $\eta^2$
	Error	1.967	42	0.047			
	Total	27.011	50				
Personal Questions	Personal Questions (Covariate)	0.648	1	0.648	26.591	0.000	38.8%
	Guided Questions (Covariate)	0.037	1	0.037	1.519	0.225	3.5%
	Open Questions (Covariate)	0.106	1	0.106	4.347	0.043	9.4%
	Picture Describing (Covariate)	0.158	1	0.158	6.487	0.015	13.4%
	Find the Differences (Covariate)	0.371	1	0.371	15.231	0.000	26.6%
	Role Play (Covariate)	0.470	1	0.470	19.278	0.000	31.5%
	Interview (Covariate)	1.162	1	1.162	47.704	0.000	53.2%
	Teaching Strategy	8.879	1	8.879	<b>364.574</b>	0.000	89.7%
	Error	1.023	42	0.024			
Total	12.853	50					

Table 5 shows that there is a statistically significant difference at  $\alpha=0.05$  between the two adjusted means of the students' achievement in the domains of the post test (Open questions, picture describing, guided questions, find the differences, role play, interview, and personal questions) due to the teaching strategy as shown in Table 5, in favor of the experimental group.

Moreover, the table shows that the values of the practical significance for the most effected domains due to the teaching strategy are arranged in a descending order as the following:

1. Open questions with an effect of 97.9%.
2. Picture describing with an effect of 96.5%.
3. Guided questions with an effect of 93.8%.
4. Find the differences with an effect of 91.6%.
5. Role play with an effect of 90.4%.
6. Interview with an effect of 90.1%.
7. Personal questions with an effect of 89.7%

The values of the practical significance indicate that there is a strong relationship between the teaching strategy and the students' achievement in the domains of the post test according to Cohen's classification of practical significance. These values indicate that using such activities could be a great helper for teachers as well as students to learn the language through using it in the classroom and in front of their classmates without fear. Using such activities could accelerate the learning process.

## 9. Conclusion

The main purpose of this study was to investigate the effect of using four of speaking activities in a strategy-based classroom interactional instructional program on developing Jordanian basic stage students' speaking skill. The results of the study showed clearly that using some of the speaking activities in an instructional interactional program improved the participants' speaking skill and increased their interaction and participation in the classroom activities. Moreover, the results of the study revealed that engaging the students in interactional speaking activities helped a lot in improving the participants' point of views concerning the importance of using the speaking activities in developing their speaking skill. It is clear that the participants' achievement improved more when they were engaged in interactional activities as they help and motivate them to use English in order to develop their speaking skill. Based on these results, the researcher recommended the EFL teachers to use the speaking activities in teaching English as they helped in increasing the students' interaction as well as in developing their speaking skill. The researcher recommended researchers to carry out future experimental studies to include other speaking activities such as storytelling, and brain storming in other instructional programs. The researcher recommended the Ministry of Education to include the instructional program in the Student's Book of Action Pack 10 as the practical significance showed that it had a great effect in developing the participants' speaking skill. Moreover the researcher advices teachers to use the speaking activities in the tasks of the classroom as they help in increasing the students' participation and interaction fact, learners tend to use the activities that help them to speak the language. In addition, using these activities may encourage students to use the language if they are used properly in the classroom. Finally, the researcher looks at these activities as a source of creating enjoyment for student to learn English as a foreign language as they help students to use the language without hesitation.

## References

- Al-Dwiek, A. (2008). *Speaking difficulties that encountered by the learners of English as a foreign language at the upper stage in Jordan*. Unpublished Master Thesis, Amman Arab University for Graduate Studies, Jordan.
- Al-Nimerat, M. (2005). *The effect of using language games and problem solving strategies on Jordanian lower*



- basic stage students' English writing skills*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Amman Arab University for Graduate Studies, Jordan.
- Al-Senaïdi, S.(2010).*Using Role Play to Promote Oral Fluency*. [Online] Available: [https://www.google.jo/#hl=en&sugexp=les%3B&gs\\_rn=6&gs\\_ri=p](https://www.google.jo/#hl=en&sugexp=les%3B&gs_rn=6&gs_ri=p) (January 20, 2017).
- Al-Zaid, N. (2008). *The Effect of a proposed instructional program based on the communicative approach on developing the speaking skill of the basic stage students and their attitudes towards speaking English in Jordan*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Amman Arab University for Graduate Studies. Amman, Jordan.
- Beyazkurk, D., and Kesner, J. (2005) .Teacher-child relationships in Turkish and United States schools: A Cross-Cultural Study, *International Education Journal*, 6(5), 547-554.
- Bishop, A. (1977). Is a picture worth a thousand words? *Mathematics Teaching*, 81, 32-35.
- Brown, H. (1994). *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching*. San Francisco: Prentice Hall Regents.
- Burns, A., and Joyce, H. (1997). Focus on Speaking. Sydney: National Center for English Language Teaching and Research.
- Celce-Murcia, M. (ed). (2001). Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language. Boston, MA: Heinle and Heinle.
- Conroy, P., Sage, K., and Ralph, M. (2009). Improved Vocabulary Production After Naming Therapy in Aphasia: Can Gains in Picture Naming Generalize to Connected Speech? *International Journal of Language and Communication Disorders*, 44 (6), 1036-1062.
- Curtain, H., and Pesola, C. (1994). *Languages and Children-Making the Match*. 2nd Ed. White Plains, NY: Longman.
- Diani, A. (2005). Some Techniques to Make Shy Students Active. Paper Presented at LIAI Conference, Jakarta.
- Dougill, J. (1989).*Drama Activities for Language Learning*. London: Modern English Publications.
- Elia, I., van den Heuvel-Panhuizen, M., and Georgiou, A. (2010).The Role of Pictures in Picture Books on Children's Cognitive Engagement with Mathematics Images. *European Early Childhood Education Research Journal*, 18 (3), 125-147.
- Ernestova, M. (1981). How to Use Ready-Made Pictures. *Teaching English Forum*, XIX(4),278-283.
- Goh, C. C. M. (2003). Speech as a psycholinguistic process: The missing link in oral lessons. *REACT*, 22(1),31-41.
- Gower, R., and Wlaters, S. (1983). *Teaching Practice Handbook*. London: Heinman.
- Hafitsa, M. (2010). Improving the English Speaking Skill of the Students' by Using "PAIKEM" Approach with Use in Focus Media. [Online] Available: [http://universityofibnkhaldunbogor-indonesia.blogspot.com/2011/02/improving-english-speaking-\(January 12, 2017](http://universityofibnkhaldunbogor-indonesia.blogspot.com/2011/02/improving-english-speaking-(January 12, 2017)
- Hartman, J. L., and LeMay, E. (2004). Managing presentation anxiety. *The Delta Pi Epsilon Journal*, 46(3), 145-154.
- Hedge, T. (2000). *Teaching and Learning in the Language Classroom*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hermann, A. and Foster, D. (2008).Fostering Approachability and Classroom Participation during the First Day of Class: Evidence for a Reciprocal Interview Activity. *Active Learning in Higher Education*, 9(2), 139-151.
- Hernandez, T. (2012).Promoting Speaking Proficiency through Motivation and Interaction: The Study Abroad and Classroom Learning Contexts. *Foreign Language Annals*, 43(4), 650-670.
- Hibbing, A; and Rankin-Ericson, J. (2003).A Picture is Worth a Thousand Words: Using Visual Images to Improve Comprehension for Middle School Struggling Readers. *International Reading Association*, 56(8), 758-770.
- Hsiao, Ching-Yuan.(2010).Enhancing Children's Artistic and Creative Thinking and Drawing Performance through Appreciating Picture Books. *International Journal of Art & Design Education*, 29 (2), 143-152.
- Ismail, R. (2005). Developing a remedial program for higher basic stage students in English reading and writing skills based on diagnostic tests. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Amman Arab University for Graduate Studies, Amman, Jordan.
- Johnson, K.E. (1995). *Understanding Communication in Second Language Classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jweihan, T. (2007). An investigation of English language skills in the secondary EFL curriculum in Jordan and in students writing and speaking skills in English. Unpublished Master Thesis. The University of Jordan, Jordan.
- Khadidja, K. (2009).The effect of classroom interaction on developing the learner's Speaking skill. [Online] Available: <http://proquest.umi.com/pqdweb?did=1306834791>(January 10, 2017)
- Ladousse, G. (1987). *Role Play*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Livingstone, C. (1983). *Role-Play in Language Learning*. England: Longman Group Limited.

- Luama, S. (2004). *Assessing Speaking*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lucantoni, P. (2002). *Teaching and assessing skills in English as a second language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mayer, R., and Gallini, J. (1990). When is an illustration worth ten thousand words? *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 82(4), 715-726.
- Ments, M. (1999). *The effective use of role play*. London: Kogan Page.
- Miller, J. (2007). Listening and Speaking Activities for Adult ESL Learners. [Online] Available: [http://www.cde.state.co.us/cdeadult/download/pdf/ListeningSpeaking\(January 17, 2017\)](http://www.cde.state.co.us/cdeadult/download/pdf/ListeningSpeaking(January%2017,%202017))
- Monica, O. (2011). Development and Validation of Classroom Interaction Instrument for Pre-Primary and Primary Level of Education in Nigeria. *European Journal of Educational Studies*, 3(3), 563-576.
- Munter, M., and Russell, L. (2002). *Guide to presentations*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Naimat, G. (2011). Influence of Teacher-Students Interaction on EFL Reading Comprehension. *European Journal of Social Sciences*, 23(4), 672-688.
- Neumann, S., and Hopf, M. (2012). Students' Conceptions about "Radiation": Results from an Explorative Interview Study of 9th Grade Students. *Journal of Science Education and Technology*, 21(6), 826-834.
- Nurmasitah, S. (2010). *A Study of Classroom Interaction Characteristics in a Geography Class Conducted in English: The Case at Year Ten of an Immersion Class*. Unpublished Master Thesis. Diponegoro University, Semarang.
- Peterson, M. (2012). Learner Interaction in a Massively Multiplayer Online Role Playing Game (MMORPG): A Sociocultural Discourse Analysis. *RECALL*, 24(3), 361-380.
- Powell, M., Fisher, R., and Hughes-Scholes, C. (2008). The Effect of Intra- Versus Post-Interview Feedback during Simulated Practice Interviews about Child Abuse. *Child Abuse & Neglect: The International Journal*, 32 (2), 213-227.
- Pygate, M. (1987). *Speaking*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Rabab'ah, G. (2012). Communication Problems Facing Arab Learners of English. *Journal of Language and Learning*, 3(1), 180-197.
- Ramelan, K. (1992). *Introduction to Linguistics Analysis*. Semarang: IKIP Semarang.
- Rubin, J., and Thompson, I. (1994). *How to Be a More Successful Language Learner[M]*. New York: Heinle and Heinle.
- Samovar, L and Mills, J. (1976). *Oral communication message and response*. Iowa: Brown Company Publishers.
- Sang, L. (2006). *The Influence of student-teacher interactions on students' engagement*. [Online] Available: [http://proquest.umi.com/pqdweb?did=1306834791&sid=7&Fmt\(March 15, 2017\)](http://proquest.umi.com/pqdweb?did=1306834791&sid=7&Fmt(March%2015,%202017))
- Saunders, W. M., & O'Brien. (2006). Oral language. In F. Genesee, K. Lindholm-Leary, W. M. Saunders, & Skrzypenska, J. (1992). Some Ways to Use Pictures in Language Teaching. *FORUM*, III, 2.
- D.Christian (Eds.), *Educating English Language Learners: A Synthesis of Research Evidence* (pp. 14-45). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Shen, L. and Suwanthep, J. (2011). *E-learning Constructive Role Plays for EFL Learners in China's Tertiary Education*. . [Online] Available: [//onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.13652729\(January 25, 2017\)](http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.13652729(January%2025,%202017))
- Skrzypenska, J. (1992). Some Ways to Use Pictures in Language Teaching. *FORUM*, III, 2.
- Sloan, L. (1992). The Effects of Four Picture Types on Picture Vocabulary Acquisition by Students with Developmental Disabilities. Northern Illinois University. (ERIC Document. Reproduction Service No. AAC 9324998).
- Smadi, O. (1986). A focused efficient method for teaching compositions. *English Teaching Forum*, 25(3), 35-36.
- Sue, Pi-Chong. (1990). "The effectiveness of Role-Play Activities in Learning English as a Foreign Language by Chinese College Students". University of San Francisco. (ERIC Document. Reproduction Service No. AAC 9035073).
- Swain, M. (1985). Communicative competence: some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output and its development. In S. Gass, C. Maden (Eds.). *Input in Second Language Acquisition*. Roleway, Mass: Newbury House.
- Tsou, W. (2005). Improving Speaking Skills Through Instruction in Oral Classroom Participation. [Online] Available: [http://www.brandeis.edu/departments/roms/pdfs/strategies-\( February 19, 2017\)](http://www.brandeis.edu/departments/roms/pdfs/strategies-(February%2019,%202017))
- Van Lier, L. (1996). *Interaction in the language curriculum*. London: Longman.
- Wallechinsky, D., Wallace, I., and Wallace, A. (1977). *The book of lists*. New York: William Morrow.
- Wang, Q., and Castro, D. (2010). Classroom Interaction and Language Output. *English Language Teaching*, 3 (2), 175-186.
- Whiteman, R. (1983). *Communication*. New York: Macmillan Publishing Co.

## Appendix A

### The Speaking Skill Test

#### (Part A)

##### **1-Personal Questions**

Time: 1 minute for each question.

Note: The answers are going to be marked according to the rubrics provided below in terms of accuracy and fluency.

- 1) What is your name?
- 2) How old are you?
- 3) Where do you live?
- 4) What would you like to be in the future?
- 5) How many brothers and sisters do you have?

##### **2- Guided Questions** **Time: Two minutes for each question.**

- 1) What is your favorite subject at school? Why?
- 2) Do you like playing football? Why?
- 3) What is special about your school?
- 4) What is your favorite pet? Why?
- 5) What is your favorite meal?
- 6) Which university would you like to join? Why?

##### **Open questions** **Time: Four minutes for each question. 3-**

- 1) What do you think of computer games?
- 2) Do you think that sports are necessary for our health? Why?
- 3) In your opinion, what should the Jordanians do to protect the wild animals?
- 4) Why do you think that most Jordanian students do not like English

#### (Part B)

##### **4- Describe the following picture**

(5 minutes for each student to look at the picture and say the sentences)

Each student is asked to say three sentences that describe the picture.



##### **5- Find the Differences**

(5 minutes for each student to look at the two pictures and say the differences). There are many differences, try to find and talk about four of them.



### **6- The Role Play Test**

**Time: Each student is given 10 minutes to think, prepare and respond to the interview.**

You are a tenth grade student; your teacher discussed a topic about some of the endangered animals in Jordan. The topic interests you. You are asked to play the role of a journalist and to do the following:

- 1- Ask the teacher about the reasons of hunting and killing the animals.
- 2- Ask your classmate (Pupil B) about some methods that we can do to stop killing these animals.
- 3- Thank both the teacher and your classmate for their answers and cooperation.

### **7- The Interview Test**

**Time: Each student is given 10 minutes to think, prepare and respond to the interview.**

You are asked to interview a classmate by choosing one of the following topics:

- 1- Talk about yourself and your family (where you are from, where you family lives, number of sisters and brothers)
- 2- Talk about your village and the school where you study.
- 3- Talk about your favorite sport.
- 4- Talk about your favorite meal.

### **Author:**

Issam Mostafa Ta'amneh. An assistant professor in TEFL, who was born in Jordan, 1974. He has a Ph.D. In TEFL from Yarmouk University in Irbid, Jordan, 2013. He has a master degree in Translation from Yarmouk University in Irbid, Jordan; 2000. He has been working at Tabuk University since 2014, Languages and Translation Department. He is the chairman of languages and translation department at the university college of Taymaa since 2014. He is also a member at Jordanian Translators' Association since 2000.