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Abstract

My aim in this study was to examine suggestions inherent in the literature on process drama that it has viability for enhancing ESL/EFL learners’ language proficiency. This intention was enacted by exploring effects of a process drama intervention in training English learners’ use of oral communication strategies (OCSs) in a comparison context with a more conventional drama technique, role-playing. Dependent variables used as measures of effect were the variety of OCSs that learners used and with what frequency. The respective approaches used a series of planned lessons incorporating techniques of process drama, and a similar set of lessons using scripted role-play with 53 EFL participants from a Junior College in southern Taiwan.

Quantitative and qualitative data were gathered from participants’ responses to questionnaires based on an adapted Oral Communication Strategy Inventory (OCSI), oral exams, after-task reflection surveys, semi-structured group interview, questionnaires of Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale (FLACS), journals and video-recording. Excerpts of class activities of each group are used as supplemental reference.

The primary question was, To what extent does process drama successfully induce greater frequency of use and/or greater variety of OCSs? Results of the study provided a positive answer to this question. Specifically, frequency and variety of use of oral communication strategies by participants who received the process drama intervention increased, participants developed more of these strategies and were less
anxious about having English conversations than their counterparts in the conventional group.

A secondary research question of three parts helped further structure the study when data in response to the first question had supported process drama as successfully inducing OCS actions from participants. The three parts enabled me to address how participants themselves described its operation, accounted for its facilitation effects and, valued these effects.

Although there are limitations to this study, such as its setting in only one school during a short period of time, it sheds some light on perspectives that these EFL technical and vocational college students have about process drama as a potential pedagogy for promoting the use of English oral communication strategies in spontaneous speech acts and indicates that the approach warrants further research to explore its wider viability.
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1 Introduction

1.1 Introduction

English language is the main lingua franca used in human communication with increasingly systematic attention being paid to its learning amongst nations of what Crystal (2003) termed the Expanding Circle (e.g., Taiwan, China, South Korea, Thailand) and Outer Circles (e.g., Philippines, Singapore, India) in comparison with those of the Inner Circle where many have it already as a dominant first language (e.g., Australia, New Zealand) (Crystal, 2003; Hinkel, 2005; Kachru, 1992). For example, at the beginning of the 21st century, South Korea invested 4 billion U.S. dollars to encourage more of its people to speak English fluently after finishing their high-school educations (Song, 2008). Other Asian nations, such as China, Singapore, Malaysia, Indonesia, Japan, Thailand and Vietnam, have also put effort and finance into improving their national levels of competence in English language (Asian News Net, 2005). The measures taken by these governments emphasised acquiring English listening and speaking competence in their EFL contexts. An obvious reason behind this has been to enhance the competitiveness of their own countries with globalisation (Lee, 2004). English is principally spread through economic links and increasing interdependence in trade matters (Kam & Wong, 2004).

Quirk (1987) characterised this kind of spread of English as the econocultural model. With high English proficiency, a country is in a more strategic position to have better economic links and opportunities in trade matters or development in other industries (Kirkpatrick, 2002). For example, Taiwan is a major exporter of industrial products. Yet, among all the nations or regions of the Expanding Circle and the Outer Circle, Taiwan reportedly drags behind its neighbouring countries in outcomes from national
effort to improve English language competencies. Its technical and vocational college (TAV) students achieve scores lower than those of students at all other levels of the nation’s educational sector and lower than their peers at a similar level in other near countries.

For instance, a major English test made and popularised by Taiwan’s Language Training and Testing Centre (LTTC), “General English Proficiency Test” (GEPT), included tests for listening, reading, writing and speaking. Taiwanese students who finish English courses at junior high schools ought to pass it. However, when the LTTC randomly tested students of TAV Junior Colleges and Institutes on this test in 2002 and 2003, the pass rates (12.71% and 14%, respectively) were well below expectation (Ministry of Education Taiwan, 2004). What these unexpected GEPT results revealed was that very few TAV students understood and could communicate even at basic levels in English.

Taiwan’s average score in 2006 on reading, writing, listening and speaking in English as measured on the International English Language Testing System (IELTS) was 5.62 (Hsie, 2007). Taiwanese students’ IELTS results were ranked as the 17th among the 20 countries whose main official language was not English. They were better only than those tested in Bangladesh, China and the United Arab Emirates.

Moreover, the representatives of Educational Testing Service (ETS) Taiwan office have been reporting low average scores on the Test of English for International Communication (TOEIC) over a number of years (Hu, 2013; Lin & Kao, 2009). In 2008, four educational levels: university, TAV college, local senior high school and graduate students of three countries from the Expanding Circle, Taiwan, Japan and South Korea, were compared. Scores for students of TAV institutions in each of
these three countries were the lowest of all four educational levels, with Taiwan’s TAV college students scoring lowest of the three countries, averaging 408, compared with 460 (Korea) and 484 (Japan). By 2012, Taiwan’s TOEIC overall average score (539) was much lower than China’s (747), the Philippines’ (678) and South Korea’s (628) (Hu, 2013).

The education of TAV students in Taiwan has particular purposes of preventing human resource shortages and uplifting the nation’s competitiveness in industry (Altbach, 1991; Chen, 2003). This student group has been described as part of the fundamental workforce of Taiwan (Yung & Welch, 1991). Thus, raising their levels of acquisition of English is a national imperative and is the reason that this group has been targeted for participation in this study.

The importance of creating a meaningful contexts for effective language learning for low proficiency language learners has been discussed by Halliday (1971), notably:

In order to be taught successfully, it is necessary to know how to use language to learn; and also how to use language to participate “as an individual” in the learning situation . . . The ability to operate effectively in the personal and heuristic modes is, however, something that has to be learned; it does not follow automatically from the acquisition of the grammar and vocabulary of the mother tongue. (p. 14)

In line with this suggestion, I chose drama approaches to help create a more authentic context within which to examine oracy and affective changes while and after training VAT students as EFL learners of oral communication strategies.

This study thus assesses two groups of students’ use of oral communication strategies (OCSs) after a semester-long intervention of process drama on OCS training. Many studies (Byron, 1986; Kao & O’Neill, 1998; O’Toole, 1992; Oxford & Crookall, 1990; Parry, 1972; Richards & Schmidt, 1983; Rivers, 1983; Smith, 1984;
Stewig & Buege, 1994) have shown the positive effect of drama assisting in divergent educational purposes. Since the 1970s, it has been found to be effective in the field of English language education.

This study furthers such exploration by testing the effectiveness of mediating pedagogy with process drama with the objective of helping Taiwanese EFL learners improve the quality of their English conversation. It used a mixed-methods design to investigate interventions in which two different drama approaches are applied comparatively to help training of OCSs in an EFL setting. Process drama was taught to students in an experimental group as a focal tactic for acquiring and producing OCSs and in comparison to another and more commonly used pedagogical skill in many language classes in a control group, where scripted role-play was conducted for the same purposes. Comparison and examination of the frequency and variety of OCSs used before and after their treatments by students who received the respective interventions would then enlighten the field particularly in relation to whether such strategies can be easily and effectively acquired.

Although instruction for both groups typically involved role-plays, role-plays for process drama were mainly group role-play where in the intervention of scripted role-play, pair or triad role-plays were exclusive forms. The experimental hypotheses of this present research were that those who received the process-drama intervention (a) would acquire more strategies and (b) would use them more frequently. Namely, those in the training of process drama would register higher descriptive knowledge and appreciation of the instructional treatment than the ones in scripted role-play.

This study helps document whether its findings provide alternatives for oral communication strategy training and if incorporating strategy training in school
curricula adds value to students’ language skills learning. The results of this study also inform the existing literature on OCS training research using process drama. They help clarify how EFL learners perceive a process drama-mediated intervention in OCS training, and to record any observed changes and effects of the learners’ OCS knowledge and use (including the variety and frequency of OCS use) along with their value changes toward OCSs.

To contextualise the setting for this research, an account is given in the following sections of Taiwan’s demography, geography, history, overall educational system and English education, including several phases of language-in-education policy, curricula and assessments of English education, teacher qualifications as well as an introduction to constraints and features of English as a foreign language (EFL) context in Taiwan. Discussions about EFL contexts include three subsets: didactic language classes, written-exam based assessments, and cultural heritage which convey Confucianism, indirectness and face-saving. The main elements of the scopes, aims, objectives, structures and the significance of this study are explicated as follows.

1.2 Scope of the Study

1.2.1 Aims

According to Canale (1983), communicative competence consists of the development of four major competencies namely, grammatical, discourse, sociolinguistic and strategic competencies. Some researchers (Canale, 1983; Dörnyei, 1995; Kitajima, 1997) assert that strategic competence often is taken for granted, as if it would be naturally and fully transferred from the learning experience of people’s native language. This assumption is supported by Hassan et al.’s (Hassan
et al., 2005b) systematic review of the primary research on strategy training in which the value of deliberate intervention is demonstrated.

Speaking is more commonly used as the first judgment of one’s English ability than other language skills (McDonough & Shaw, 2003), and yet, this is not adequately reflected in language research literature. Training and instruction of OCSs in EFL contexts are yet to gather momentum (Hassan et al., 2005b; Nakatani, 2005, 2006).

Therefore, the proposed study aims to contribute to this area. It will investigate interventionist strategy training, where drama-assisted interventions set up relatively authentic settings within which EFL students practise oral communication strategies. The experimental hypothesis is that those “trained” with the assistance of process drama will outperform others trained without the process drama component in the variety and frequency of oral communication strategy use.

1.2.2 Objectives

Process drama is the intervention used in this strategy training. The extent of how process drama successfully induces the use of OCSs among the TAV students is examined in both qualitative and quantitative terms. Moreover, how participants describe, account and value facilitation of the process drama intervention is inspected by analysing and triangulating the data.

The objectives of the study thus were to explore whether a process drama-assisted intervention affected OCS training and whether any measured effects differed for this intervention in relation to a control where conventional pedagogy was used. It also sought to record participants’ perceptions of process drama in OCS training and oral communication strategies.
1.2.3 Structure of the thesis

The thesis is presented in five chapters: the first as an introduction to the work, positions the study within discussion of Taiwan’s educational system and tests used by the nation to measure its learners’ English language performances. It also lists the aims and objectives of the research situating these in the relevant literature. A third section outlines the method.

In Chapter Two the literature review recounts studies on three different kinds of strategies: language learning strategies, communication strategies, and oral communication strategies (OCS) are discussed. The value of OCSs is examined, in terms of how OCSs sustain EFL learners’ oral communication and help transform communication discontinuities to their oral communication competence. Next, drama in English language education as incentive to language learners is outlined as are the various drama approaches with a focus on process drama. Two approaches, namely, process drama and scripted role-play, are compared. The final element of Chapter Two is a presentation of the underlying theories for OCS learning and usage, and for process-drama assisted pedagogy, the key components of this study.

Chapter Three is used to unfold details of the brief outline of the research design for the study that was presented in this Introduction, and to convey details about research participants, the research context, instruments and procedures. Results are presented in Chapter Four, and discussed in relation to the research questions within limitations of the study in Chapter Five. The same chapter also contains an exposition of implications and conclusions from the study.
1.3 The Significance of the Study

The significance of conducting this study can be outlined from three perspectives: expanding the literature about OCS instruction, fostering more cross-disciplinary studies, and augmenting EFL teachers’ pedagogy options and students’ learning efficacy.

First, some significance lies in what the study contributes to expanding the existing academic research, pertaining to the English oral communication issues as discussed in this and the following chapter. Although communicative competence comprises development of many other competencies (Canale, 1983), oral communication competence is often taken for granted or undervalued. Speaking is more commonly used as the first judgment of one’s English ability than other language skills (McDonough & Shaw, 2003). In this regard, the relative undervaluing of oral communication competence is reflected in a comparison of the lesser volume of OCS research in academic literature and the greater available information about literacy components of language learning strategies (LLS) (Wu & Gitsaki, 2007). In other words, there are fewer strategy studies concerned with how to train or instruct learners OCS than LLS in EFL contexts. Thus, by focusing on EFL learners in their own context and with process drama-assisted approaches to learn and practice OCS use, the current study could help redress this gap.

Second, it is anticipated that this study may encourage more foreign language teachers and their students to teach and learn how to use OCSs, in the light of experimenting or experiencing cross-disciplinary approaches for their respective purposes. This study aims to integrate disciplines to promote and facilitate the application of strategies in language communication tasks. That is, it would help
language learners to experience an alternative pedagogy for acquiring oral communication strategies through the integration of the two disciplines of drama and oral communication strategies.

These two disciplines have characteristics in common. The study of communication is an essential component of drama or theatre art. Drama performances are representations or transformations of all sorts of communication occurring in life; oral communication strategies are tactics used to cope with communication gaps or break downs between two parties (Brammer & Sawyer-Laucanno, 1990; Byron, 1986; Di Pietro, 1987; Hutchinson & Sawyer-Laucanno, 1990; Jensen & Hermer, 1998; Kao & O'Neill, 1998; O'Toole, 1992; Oxford & Crookall, 1990; Richards & Schmidt, 1983; Rivers, 1983; Sedgwick, 1993). Studies into the interaction between drama and OCS training are scarce (Cohen & Weaver, 2006), but the interrelationship between them could still be presumed and logically implied. This study focuses on exploring how process drama assisted oral communication strategy training influences EFL learners’ performance of oral communication affectively and effectively.

Third, the research design for each research question aims to generate valid and reliable research results which could be useful references in terms of EFL teachers’ real classroom practice at the same time. This mixed-method study explores interactive and multi-faceted flow among students and teachers. The concepts of the process drama intervention entail notions of learner-centredness, task-based language teaching and CLT (Canale, 1983; Nunan, 1996b, 2004; Richards & Renandya, 2002; Richards & Schmidt, 1983). Conducting the study with existing classes and curriculum brings practical value for EFL contexts. For this reason, exploring
effective pedagogy through experimenting with EFL learners and their contexts to train their knowledge and ability of using OCSs warrants further research.

To make the current research meaningful in this way, this study was then designed to explore the effectiveness of two drama approaches--process drama and scripted role-play-- in enhancing low proficiency EFL learners’ performances of oral communication strategies (OCSs). The value of this doctoral study lies in its investigation to reveal the extent to which OCSs are induced by process drama and whether any progress in this respect in classroom settings is reflected in EFL students’ perceptions.
2 Research Background

2.1 Demography, Geography and History

Taiwan is an island about 150 kilometres off the eastern coast of China. On Taiwan’s north lies Japan, and at its south lies the Philippines. It consists of 35,980 square kilometres with a population of roughly 23 million (Kaplan & Baldauf, 2003b; Ministry of Education Taiwan, 2008b). Taiwan has played an important role in the world’s history, politics, business and trade mainly due to its geographic location and maritime and aerial importance. Taiwan’s geographical and historical uniqueness has given rise to a diversity of ethnic groups, cultures, and languages.

Taiwan is one of the most densely populated countries in the world, with 630 people per square meter (Government Information Office of Taiwan, 2007). The largest population group in Taiwan is Minnanren (Southern Min people), who used to claim themselves as “the Taiwanese”. However, due to the rise over the past decade of Taiwan as an independent polity, the definition of “Taiwanese” has been expanded to “New Taiwanese”, conveying all the ethnic groups in Taiwan (Hsueh, Tai, & Chow, 2005; Tsao, 2000), including indigenous people (about 1.7%), Holo (namely, Minnanren) (about 73%), Hakka (12%), Chinese immigrants arriving after 1945 (13%) and recent immigrants (Government Information Office of Taiwan, 2007). Amongst “New Taiwanese”, the population of native English-speakers is extremely small. However, although each ethnic group has its own native language, every colonial or hegemonic government has implemented its own language policy according to its economic or political concerns – and a current political imperative is

---

1 In 1945, when World War II came to an end, the Chinese Nationalist Party (Kuomintang, also called “KMT”) represented the Alliance receiving Taiwan from Japan. Within the following four years, the KMT was defeated in China by the Chinese Communist Party and retreated to Taiwan from China in 1949.
to increase the numbers of Taiwanese who can use English (Barclay, 1954; Kahane, 1992; Tsurumi, 1977). Taiwan has experienced about four hundred years of colonial history (see Table 1). As Tsao (2004), a Taiwanese linguist observed, this has left Taiwan a diverse ethno-linguistic heritage.

The language policies of Taiwan have always been greatly influenced or manipulated by the different ideologies of political parties in power (Hsiau, 1997). For the purposes of this study, only the era of Japanese colonial history and R.O.C governance will be discussed as these two periods of history have had the most significant influence on current language policy (Kaplan & Baldauf, 2003a).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Historical Period</th>
<th>Colonised by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1624-1662 (38 years)</td>
<td>Holland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1626-1642 (16 years)</td>
<td>Spain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1662-1683 (21 years)</td>
<td>Ming Dynasty- Zheng Imperialism (Kingdom of Dongning)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1683-1895 (212 years)</td>
<td>Ching Dynasty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1895-1945 (50 years)</td>
<td>Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945-</td>
<td>Republic of China (ROC-Taiwan)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fifty years of Japanese colonisation had made Taiwan one of the most modern societies in Asia (Hsueh et al., 2005). This modernisation included efforts to decrease the rate of illiteracy, albeit in line with Japanese nationalist ideology. Through a language-assimilationist policy, Taiwan’s largely illiterate population was expected to be effectively controlled, thereby securing civil rule (Tsurumi, 1977). By 1944, 71.1% of Taiwanese children were receiving six-years of free and compulsory elementary education in 1944, with about 70% of Taiwanese literate in Japanese

---

(Lin, 1987; Mendel, 1970). Japan’s language planning and policy was to make
Japanese the national language of Taiwan as well as a leading language of the world
following the expected success of their imperialism.

Subsequently in 1949, after the Chinese Nationalist Party (Kuomintang) officially
withdrew from Mainland China to Taiwan, the ruling party insisted on distinguishing
between the Republic of China in Taiwan from the People’s Republic of China in
Mainland China. The political antagonism between the two sides has given rise to
considerable tension, competition and self-protection on many issues, including
language planning and policy in general. In addition, inter-group hostility due to
ethnic identification associated with linguistic terms as well as political grudges and
wrestling between China and Taiwan, has meant that Taiwan’s language-in-
education policy has frequently shifted in different directions.

Contemporary Taiwan is a democratic society characterised by the ability to
accommodate and absorb different cultures and languages as well as enjoying a high
level of openness and variety in many areas of society (Ministry of Education
Taiwan, 2008b). With Taiwan’s ethnic, geographical and historical background,
citizens in Taiwan appreciate higher education, especially in relation to learning
foreign languages. Younger generations are expected to be able to communicate in a
global world as well as having foreign language competence, qualities that enhance
social status and create employment opportunities.
2.2 Overview of Taiwan’s Educational System

Against this sketch of Taiwan’s socio-political and economic background, the nature of the country’s educational system and its language-in-education policy, curriculum, assessments, and teachers’ qualifications will be outlined.

As citizens of a developing country, the Taiwanese are required to receive nine years of compulsory education, including six years of elementary schools and three years of junior high school. Students then choose to enter secondary education, which consists of four options: three-years of normal high school, three-years of comprehensive high school (half academic and half vocational training-oriented), three-years of vocational high school, or five-years of Junior College (equivalent to the combined three years of high school and two years of tertiary education).

For their tertiary education, students who have finished three years of high school education can choose to study in college or university for four years comprehensive study or technical study. They also can choose a two-year Junior College, which is equivalent to the two-year TAFE colleges of Australia or community colleges in the United States. Students who graduate from the two-year or five-year Junior Colleges are entitled to an Associate Bachelor degree. With that degree, they can begin a professional career or commence further study in two- or four-year technical colleges or universities. The different levels of Taiwan’s educational system are shown in Figure 1 (Ministry of Education Taiwan, 2008a). Required or elective English courses are offered at each level of education.
Figure 1: Current school system
2.3 Taiwan’s English Education in General

Smith (1991) observed, “Few societies can indicate better than Taiwan its concern for its future . . . . [Taiwan’s educational system] has its goal of developing youth to their fullest potential to anticipate needs and demands of that society” (p. 4). Taiwan, indeed, like many East Asian countries (e.g., Japan & South Korea), has put heavy expenditure into its foreign language education, especially EFL education, in the hope of developing significant communication and growth (Lee, 2004; Ministry of Education Taiwan, 2004). Unfortunately, the overall outcomes have been rather disappointing thus far (Lin & Kao, 2009; Oladejo, 2006; The Central News Agency, 2006; Yuan, 2007). “Various efforts to improve English education have been unsuccessful, and it is fair to say that, with minor exception, English language instruction has not changed much in 50 years” (Kaplan & Baldauf, 2003a, p. 58).

In order to understand why this has occurred it is necessary to examine what English language-in-education policies have been planned in order to address the gap between policy planning and real learning effects, and how they have been implemented.

2.3.1 Phases of language-in-education policy

Kaplan and Baldauf (2003b) noted that Taiwan’s earliest major foreign language-in-education policy in Taiwan was created and implemented during the Japanese colonial period. The colonists did this in three stages. During the first (Pacification, 1895-1919) and second stages (Assimilation, 1919-1937), Chinese languages were still tolerated in schools, but they were banned in the third stage (complete Japanisation, from 1937-1945). In fact, Chinese was banned everywhere, and an
Only-Japanese-speaking-families language policy was imposed on all households (Kaplan & Baldauf, 2003a).

However, Japan’s introduction of this language policy was unsuccessful. Later, after the Kuomintang (KMT) officially retreated to Taiwan in 1949 and gained control from the Japanese, Mandarin became the official language and the lingua franca instructed in schools and used at workplaces. Other languages, including foreign languages, were not encouraged by the KMT government lest the spread of unofficial languages should hinder political unity (Hsiau, 1997; Tsao, 2004). However, English, especially the U.S. variety, has gradually become the most favoured foreign language in Taiwan since the development of the Sino-American partnership in WWII (Kaplan & Baldauf, 2003a). Even experiencing two major political challenges, the break of diplomatic relations with the U.S. in 1979 and the lift of martial law in 1987, Taiwan’s Ministry of Education (MOE) required English education for every student in secondary schools and later in primary schools.

The MOE of the KMT government during the time of implementation of martial law was not likely to accommodate its foreign language-in-education policy to the global trend of adopting English language as the lingua franca in most aspects. However, the 1990s were a growth period for applied foreign language departments in technical and vocational (TAV) institutions, especially in English and Japanese. The first applied foreign language department with a major in applied Japanese was established in 1980, with applied English majors allowed in 1993. Dramatically, from 1993 to 2000, about 117 TAV institutions gained permission to establish about 130 applied foreign language departments, majoring in applied English or Japanese.
languages in a small island like Taiwan (Chen, 2003). This was the largest expansion of applied foreign language departments in Taiwan’s educational history.

After the year 2000, many changes and adjustments occurred on English language education policy when political power changed to an opposition party, the Democratic Progress Party (DPP). It was not only a decisive year for Taiwan’s political profile but also for its foreign language-in-education policy change. With the new ruling party’s pluralistic ideology, its MOE promulgated more language-in-education policies by encouraging language learners to recognise the importance of their own ethno-linguistic heritage and incorporating vernaculars in primary school curricula. In addition, with a new policy called “The Nine-Year Joint Curriculum Plan for Primary and Junior High Schools” (aka. “New Curriculum Plan”) effective from 2001, the MOE had primary school students start their English lessons at the third grade from 2005. This policy was considered another breakthrough in the history of Taiwan’s English language policy and planning.

It was not only the “New Curriculum Plan” that helped determine young peoples’ English education as the most important foreign language education, but also another large-scale framework, “Challenge 2008: The Six-Year National Development Plan” (Department of Social Education of MOE Taiwan, 2004). Both aimed to promote the English language-in-education policy.

In accordance with the latter plan, the requirements of recruiting native English-speaking teachers (NESTs) were promulgated. Large-scale, official human resource imports were conducted from 2003 in order to solve a shortage of NESTs (Barnes, 2007; Huang, 2003). In anticipation of this new need, more university students were also allowed to take various short-term English teacher training programs in order to
fill the vacancies for English teachers in primary schools. In the past, only students from normal schools had opportunities to be trained as English teachers in junior high schools (Chern, 2003). Furthermore, with the new development plan, a mandate, including setting up bilingual signs on every campus and street in Taiwan, was implemented in order to create and support an English-friendly social environment for all. However, following the shift of political power back to the KMT from 2008, the vernacular and foreign language policies of the previous government were modified again.

### 2.3.2 Curricula and assessments

English learning is deemed to be a grass-roots movement (Chern, 2003) because the relationships between many Asian polities and the United States grew strong not only through military collaboration but also with business, academic and religious contacts involving the general community. The influence of hegemonic American English and culture thus had become obvious in many Asian regions, especially in Taiwan (Kaplan & Baldauf, 2003b).

As a result, American culture including its products, fashion, music, movies and language, has deeply influenced Taiwanese life. Many youngsters have therefore been expected to learn and use English as early as possible (Oladejo, 2006). The official English curriculum in Taiwan is introduced from grade three of primary schools, but a large number of parents do not wait until primary school and begin their children’s English education at bilingual or trilingual kindergartens or day-care centres.

With this frantic English learning trend, it is quite common to see 2 year old toddlers sitting in an English class in Taiwan. The only reason for doing this is the fear that
these children may miss their optimum ages in learning a second or foreign language. Lenneberg’s (1967) idea that being young is advantageous for achieving better learning outcomes, is commonly believed in Taiwan although the notions inherent in it have not been fully substantiated scientifically (Tseng, 2008). For instance, Brown (2000), emphasised that this has only been proven for helping pronunciation. Lee (2004) contended that young children probably learn better as they are less concerned about making mistakes, but older learners are probably more efficient in learning morphology and syntax. The phenomenon of many Taiwanese parents adhering to the concept of “the earlier the better” is reflected in the number and prosperity of private cram schools or language learning centres that have opened in the nation (Huang & Chiu, 1991).

In terms of the official curriculum, the first mandate was implemented in 2001 for English instruction from fifth grade (Ministry of Education Taiwan, 2005, 2006). However, several issues were identified by the Taipei Bureau of Education, including the divergence of teaching materials (both imported and teacher-generated ones) used by different schools and communities, the infrequent adoption of multi-media resources by teachers, and the lack of qualified teachers (Chern, 2003). These concerns remained after the second mandate was promulgated in 2005 to advance English education to grade three (Scott & Liu Chen, 2004; The Central News Agency, 2006). According to the “New Curriculum Plan”, each primary and junior high school is entitled to select their own textbooks under three conditions, namely, they are to be based on definite criteria, discussed in academic affairs meetings and decided upon with an open mindset.
Although the MOE still has the responsibility to review textbooks and compile them if necessary, in order to meet specific needs of individual schools and students, schools have the right to make decisions on textbooks and this cannot be countermanded by city or county governments (Kaplan & Baldauf, 2003b; Ministry of Education Taiwan, 2008c). Institutions of other levels of education also have complete freedom to select their textbooks from different publishers without any governmental review, based on the spirit of school-based management (Marsh, 2009).

Furthermore, the “New Curriculum Plan” (Ministry of Education Taiwan, 2006) replaced the traditional separate-subjects teaching approach with an integration approach, which categorises all subjects into seven major areas, with Language Arts being one of them. Primary and junior high school students are required to learn three languages, Mandarin, English and one of the local languages. Yet, hours for English courses instructed in junior high schools were reduced from five hours per week to two or three hours per week because English was also introduced into primary schools at the rate of two hours per week.

The Junior High School English Curriculum Standards have adopted communicative approaches since the 1990s (Ministry of Education Taiwan, 1994). Yet, Taiwanese teacher-researchers like Su (2000) have contended that textbooks and syllabi still rely heavily on accuracy-oriented and test-driven activities which promote rote learning. As Chern (2003) stated, “The textbooks, though developed following communicative language teaching principles, still resembled a form-based, structure-oriented syllabus” (p. 430). In short, most English classrooms of junior high schools still remain static and stressful instead of dynamic or learner-centred.
Other than adopting new pedagogy, the MOE increasingly offered multiple entrance initiatives in the 1990s to help diminish the impacts of students’ English language and exam anxiety. With most of the entrance initiatives, students who have outstanding extra-curriculum performances could apply to schools or colleges with certificates and evidence earned from all sorts of events. For instance, oral communication and expression skills, proven by all kinds of English contests (i.e., speeches or story telling contests) are used in admission to many universities and colleges.

As for senior high school curricula, senior high school teachers usually have more freedom than junior high teachers in selecting teaching materials. The latest English curriculum benchmark for senior high school English education was set up in 1995 (Chern, 2003). It focused on developing students’ interests in learning English and helping students to learn independently. Although the communicative approaches and the concept of learner-centeredness were adopted for the senior high schools’ English curriculum as central guiding principles, there were still difficulties in really implementing those principles. One of the essential reasons (Kam & Wong, 2004) could be that unlike other Asian countries, such as Singapore, Brunei Darussalam and the Philippines, English language has seldom been used as the principal tool for instruction of academic subjects in Taiwan’s EFL classrooms. Without applying English frequently in practice, it is difficult to implement the principles set for English education. The major national high-stakes entrance examinations (such as The Basic Competence Test for junior high school students and Joint College Entrance Examination for senior high students) also have not included speaking tests. These educational phenomena and provisions hardly motivate students’ use of
English either in or out of class contexts. As a result, Taiwanese English learners’ oral communication competence is often weakened when they are still in school.

Since 1997 the MOE has lifted requirements mandated earlier for tertiary foreign language education and allowed colleges and universities to decide on credit hours and course content (Scott & Liu Chen, 2004). Upon gaining autonomy over the curricula, most colleges and universities set six required credits for foreign language learning, and for English in particular (Shih, 2000). Some universities offer other foreign languages other than English in cases where they have appropriate personnel to teach them (Huang, 1997). More and more colleges and universities offer General English courses to freshmen focusing either on different language skills or specific topics and many content-based courses (i.e., Journalistic English, Business English, Oral-report skills or Advanced conversation, etc.) as elective courses for students in second-year and beyond (Chern, 2003). In short, the curricula of tertiary English education in Taiwan are moving toward a school-based framework instead of state-oriented unification.

Another important educational system in Taiwan is technological and vocational (TAV) education. TAV students are the fundamental force of a society (Yung & Welch, 1991). However, because they are usually people whose immediate interests are in technology and career development rather than academic research, their academic performances in English in their nine-year compulsory education are typically not outstanding. Nevertheless, TAV students in Taiwan would very likely contact foreigners or use foreign languages in their workplace or for their business affairs in order to practice and improve their English (Barnes, 2007). English, as a
powerful and useful instrument for international communication, has become one of their essential and practical vocational skills (Tseng, 2008).

In other words, TAV students’ employment and promotion is often linked to and evaluated by their foreign language proficiency, particularly their English proficiency. A human resource bank in Taiwan reported that about 85% of Taiwanese corporations with 250 or more staff take potential employees’ English proficiency as well as the quantity of their language certificates (e.g., TOEIC, TOEFL or LTTC-GEPT)\(^3\) into serious consideration for all sorts of evaluation (Liu, 2005).

Given this fact, learning and applying oral communication strategies are likely to be in high demand and extremely useful for TAV students or comparable groups of students in interviews or oral examinations. High oral communication competence would possibly make them look good “at face value”.

### 2.3.3 Teacher qualifications

Prior to 1999, there were no screening criteria and accreditation procedures for hiring qualified teachers for compulsory English education. A nationwide teacher preparation program was designed in July 1999 for elementary school English teachers and was implemented in September 2001 (Chern, 2003). However, teacher availability and other resources have long been insufficient in remote areas in

---

\(^3\) TOEIC, TOEFL and LTTC-GEPT stand respectively for “Test of English for International Communication”, “Test of English as a Foreign Language” and “General English Proficiency Test”. The LTTC-GEPT is a criterion-referenced test made available in 2000. It is currently held only in Taiwan and serves as a key indicative instrument for graduation and references for employment and promotion, etc. There are four levels of the tests currently being administered: elementary, intermediate, high-intermediate, and advanced. A fifth level, the superior level, was suspended, pending further need. Speaking, listening, reading and writing components are all included in this type of test (McDonough & Shaw, 2003, p. 133) as well as professionally. Yet, these students’ oral communication learning and achievement largely depends on availability and access to competent and qualified teachers. Teachers’ training and accreditation is thus an important issue that should be examined.
Taiwan. According to Scott and Liu Chen (2004), the MOE has taken a number of measures to accommodate the huge discrepancy between remote and affluent areas of Taiwan. To deal with this, all sorts of summer camps for learning English have been held and subsidised and the use of broadband internet was popularised for more authentic audio and visual English interactions, as well as recruitment initiatives for NESTs. Qualified NESTs were often sent to remote areas to co-teach with local English teachers.

According to the MOE’s plan, prospective NESTs need to meet special requirements in order to work in Taiwan. They must be under the age of 45 and come from an English-speaking country with English as their mother tongue. They must have a college degree in a linguistics-related field and be proficient in basic Mandarin Chinese. No criminal records are allowed, and previous teaching experience is recommended (Huang, 2003).

The NESTs either teaching in government schools or in bushiban (private commercial schools) would be paid double what local Taiwanese English teachers usually get. Since Taiwanese parents and business owners are willing to pay comparatively higher salaries to foreign teachers, a large number of unqualified or illegally working foreigners teach in kindergartens or private commercial schools (Sommers, 2009). This phenomenon gave students from affluent backgrounds a competitive advantage over those students who had access to only two hours of English classes a week. Scott and Liu Chen (2004) argued that even if the latter group of students commenced English courses in grade one, it would still be very difficult for them to reach the standards of spoken English of their counterparts.
In line with the new curriculum’s focus and local teachers working with NESTs, local English teachers also are required to achieve a certain competence level. According to the “Challenge 2008: The Six-Year National Development Plan” (Department of Social Education of MOE Taiwan, 2004), it was planned and expected that 100% of pre-service specialist English elementary and junior high teachers could pass the high-intermediate level of the LTTC-GEPT by 2007. All the pre-serviced homeroom or generalist elementary and junior high teachers should pass the intermediate level of the LTTC-GEPT by 2007. At the same time, 70% of the current in-service junior high teachers should pass the high-intermediate level of the LTTC-GEPT and 40% of passing rate of the same test for the in-service elementary teachers.

Junior Colleges and universities are responsible for recruiting their own qualified teachers, and the MOE must verify those teachers’ credentials and curriculum vitae, and give the qualified staff certifications in order to work full-time as lecturers or in higher academic positions. All tertiary level English teachers, with either local or overseas educational backgrounds are required to obtain masters or doctoral degrees.

The challenge for both local and foreign English teachers is that they have to adopt or adapt teaching methods and materials appropriate to Taiwanese EFL students. They also need to transform or integrate educational philosophy mostly originating from western contexts into Taiwan’s cultural milieu (Scott & Liu Chen, 2004). While the MOE hopes to build a solid bridge between Taiwan and the world via English language, English teachers need to first make their students aware of the differences between their native language and the target cultures. Lee (2004) contended that meta-linguistic and multilingual awareness and concepts will help students’ learning
in many ways and generate their curiosity, particularly in learning the use and form of a foreign language. The status quo surrounding Taiwanese students’ English learning environment and socio-historical influences on their English oral communication training and performance are presented in the following sections.

2.4 Constraints and Features of EFL Contexts in Taiwan

While many Asian countries claimed to have insufficient qualified teachers to teach listening and speaking courses, Xu (2002) contended that English as an international language (EIL) is not inextricably tied to Anglo-culture(s), and non-native English teachers can more properly help their students, “raise the awareness that EIL reflects multi-cultures and multi-identities” (p. 234) than native English speaking teachers. Thus, not only do tangible foreign language policies and educational systems need to be examined in this study, but also intangible elements, such as socio-historical ideologies and influences and learners’ affective nature ought to be addressed while exploring the value of intervention.

Altbach (1991) also contended that educational systems are always deeply embedded in the cultures of their countries or regions. It would be worthwhile to discuss potential influences of certain pedagogy or training from learners’ cultural, social and historical background. After all, local English teachers are insiders in relation to the cultural context of their teaching and most likely have both tangible and intangible influences on their students while modelling the target language or applying new pedagogy. Thus, for this research, it is essential to discuss first some prominent native socio-historical elements engendered from the colonial or martial law periods as well as from traditional and Confucian values. Whether they inspire or
hinder EFL learners’ training and performance in Taiwan, with a special reference to oral communication, one of the weakest language skills, is to be elaborated upon.

2.4.1 Didactic language classes

Most EFL classrooms for Taiwanese college students are still arranged in a conventional way with rows of seats and a lectern in the front for a teacher – a move which facilitates teacher-centred pedagogy and good classroom order. The teacher’s monopoly on classroom communication is often obvious and overwhelming. A learner’s voice about teaching and content learning is inhibited in the class although chatting with peers is a common occurrence.

Wilson’s (1974) early observations of Taiwanese society revealed a commonly-applied attitude and technique of traditional teaching. He noticed shaming and isolation from the group as a dominant technique used in most Taiwanese classrooms. The reason this technique is dominant might have originated in the colonial and dictatorial ideologies rooted in Taiwan’s elders. These educational techniques may parallel how colonialists and dictators treated natives (Kirkpatrick, 2002). For example, throughout four decades of American colonialism in The Philippines, American methods of teaching English language were visible in the public schools of The Philippines (Martin, 2002). They were mainly mechanical, such as reciting memorised passages, reading aloud or performing grammar drills.

Taiwan’s situation is rather similar to that of The Philippines. As the partnership between Taiwan and the U.S. has grown strong since WWII, American language teaching methods have also been imported and continually modified in Taiwan. This kind of intangible imperialism or colonialism somehow influenced Taiwanese teachers’ teaching attitudes. Thus, their language classrooms would easily become
didactic and their teaching style would likely be a lecturing-like instead of learner-centred.

2.4.2 Written-exam based assessments

The fact that Taiwan’s educational environment tends to promote product and examination-oriented teaching and means students gain only surface knowledge and memorisation of facts (Kaplan & Baldauf, 2003b; Oladejo, 2006). However, what the 21st century workplace needs is to deal with uncertainty and complexity and to obtain spontaneous adaptations to intellectually challenging society. Students need to be able to communicate for business negotiations, international trade or fostering social relationships although this seems to be seldom recognised in many EFL classes.

Based on written exam-oriented schooling in Taiwan, the time given to oral activities has never been sufficient. Because written tests and high-stakes entrance exams still play crucial roles in admission to high schools and colleges in Taiwan, the implementation of more communicative assessments (e.g., portfolio or web-based assessments) are not yet popular (Grabinger & Dunlap, 2000; Yang, 2003). Many teachers still insist only on form-focussed instruction using traditional resources, rather than on developing general communicative proficiency of students through communicative activities.

2.4.3 Cultural heritage

As Young (1999b) suggested, successes or failures of language learning are associated with learners’ identities, self-esteem and personality characteristics. Additionally, erroneous beliefs about language learning might involve anxieties about success to the extent that second language (L2) learners impede the development of fluency and performance (Horwitz, Horwitz, & Cope, 1991). There
is a fundamental difference between learning a language, and learning other skills (MacIntyre, 1999), namely, “that language and self are so closely bound, if not identical, that an attack on one is an attack on the other” (MacIntyre, 1999, p. 33). Hall (1990) contended that “culture shap[es] how communication happens and communication [is] central to cultural transmission and vitality” (p. 31).

The results of two studies illustrate this connection. First, Dadour and Robbins’ (1996) research in Egypt showed a significant gender difference in speaking skills, which is likely to be caused by cultural and environmental factors. Their research was conducted in a small Egyptian college town, where women are raised to inhibit their own speaking rights totally or partially in front of men, unless it is essential that they speak. This accepted practice would be deemed as gender discrimination for women in western English-speaking societies. This proscription for Egyptian females arises from their compliance with prevalent religious and cultural forces and thus might result in lowered self-esteem. Dadour and Robbins found that the females’ speaking performance as students of L2 often was tempered by severe inhibition whether men were there or not. Furthermore, even though the gender difference in oral communication favoured males, females and males were shown as capable of using strategies at approximately equivalent frequencies.

Second, Bedell and Oxford’s (1996) study showed that although different Asian cultures have many similarities, subtle differences emerge among people who speak the same L1, due to the different social strata and contexts in which they were brought up. Bedell and Oxford researched 353 EFL learners at six second and tertiary-level institutions in three cities in China and compared their results with these of other studies involving other ethnic groups. Similarities and differences of
strategy use among cultures and ethnicities were found. For example, compensation strategies (e.g., non-linguistic means or code-switching) seemed to be common among Asian students (e.g., Chinese, Taiwanese, Japanese, Thai and Korean), but not for Puerto Rican or Egyptian learners. Additionally, both Chinese and Taiwanese learners seemed to guess meanings more often in oral communication although this was less common among Puerto Ricans. They associated these differences to different cultural factors.

Furthermore, Bedell and Oxford believed that strategy choices are made according to socio-cultural mores. For example, English learners in both China and Taiwan are less likely to ask an English speaker for help, compared to Puerto Rican learners. The relative scarcity of native English speakers in both countries might explain these results in that the samples are not truly representative. Yet, the Taiwanese were more likely to practice the sounds of English because of access to all sorts of broadcasting media, while Chinese learners were more likely to read English for pleasure. The researchers presumed that this may be due to more distractions available to Taiwanese than Chinese students in their respective social contexts.

### 2.4.3.1 Confucianism

In Confucianism, teachers as superiors deserve students’ respect and full attention while interacting with them. Teaching has always been regarded as an exalted profession in Chinese culture (Bond, 1991). Students need to give the same respect to teachers as to their fathers. Liu, Chen, and Chen (1988) remarked that respecting superiors includes obeying them. Bond (1991) also commented that “respecting superiors Chinese style entails silence and reproduction of what the teacher regards as important” (p. 31). Chinese students thus are found to pay less attention to
thinking processes and to be weak at summarising or concluding things but are good at producing a paper with facts which fit a general topic (Bond, 1991). Higher order thinking requires a more playful and speculative attitude, not an avalanche of examinations of memorisation of facts. While keeping silence or reproducing others’ ideas is regarded as showing respect for superiors and maintenance of group harmony, this could also compromise one’s creativity, spontaneity and verbal fluency, for students’ debating skills are not developed (Benson, 2000; Davies, 2006; Dörnyei & Murphey, 2003; Nunan, 1996b; Tsang & Wong, 2002).

Researchers’ observations of Chinese students’ expressions are at the two ends of a continuum. Some argue that Chinese children are emotionally expressive, socially gracious and adept, but others believe the opposite and argue that their responses are stereotyped and emotionally flat (Bond, 1991). Vernon (1982) analysed Oriental students’ intelligence and reported that Orientals of all ages in any cultural setting score higher than Caucasians on spatial, numerical or non-verbal intelligence tests, but score less on verbal abilities and achievements. With much controversy surrounding how students interact with others and why, more scientific measurement and research will be needed.

Societies based on Chinese culture mostly rely on “education as the vehicle for upward social mobility, good government, social and political harmony, and a general relative absence of societal rancour” (Smith, 1991, p. 4). Undoubtedly, one of the major influential scholarly ideologies in Taiwan is Confucianism, which has included both intellectual and ethical teaching and learning for over two thousand years of Chinese traditional education. It is therefore necessary to examine how Confucianism has impacted on learners in modern Taiwan because the merit of
Chinese culture has been preserved and promoted by Taiwan’s governments and educational systems (Kaplan & Baldauf, 2003b; Tsao, 2000). Nevertheless, there would be some differences between the Confucianism applied in Taiwan and in other Asian countries and it is important to avoid what Bond (1991) described as “the questionable habit of talking about ‘the Chinese’ as if they were the same and ignoring the possible differences ” (Bond, 1991, p. 4). Therefore, these differences also need to be noted while discussing Chinese culture.

2.4.3.2 Indirectness

Bond (1991), a western psychologist who had a long and profound observation of Asian people within Chinese cultures, commented that a significant problem in Chinese education was lack of creativity. He did not think that there was enough “encouragement of active and searching modes of behaviour and exploratory playfulness in many Chinese culture settings” (p. 25). Summarising a number of studies on Asian students, Tsui (1996) noted that Asian students were more reserved and reticent than their Western counterparts. According to her, “…the problem of getting students’ responses is particularly acute with Asian students” (p. 145). Many ESL/EFL students could easily be inhibited when introduced to new situations in class because their teachers do not often encourage them to look beneath the surface of problems.

Another salient characteristic of the people influenced by Chinese culture is their constant and sometimes extreme modesty while dealing with people and situations. Verbally, many Chinese tend to speak about group accomplishments rather than individual contributions because people are taught from a young age to put other family members before themselves. Yang (1988) explained Chinese students’
achievement as follows. First, one’s achievements are often presented for the benefit of a group, be it the family or the state, rather than the individual. Secondly, one’s achievement is often defined and measured by other people’s standards. According to Bond (1991), playing down one’s efforts publicly in discourse or behaviours would be labelled “self-effacement”. Within the indirect tradition, self-effacement might be regarded as “relationship honouring” (p. 52). Such an attitude and approach would easily lead to revealing less about oneself at initial social activities.

The disposition of many Asian students for silence in a group conversation is higher than for most Western learners (Chaudron, 1988) because, from a Chinese perspective, a tentative approach in class permits the group relationship to evolve harmoniously (Bond, 1991). According to some observations, superiors in a group, such as teachers of traditional classes, seem to have the privilege to present their perspectives (Aoki, 1999; Auerbach, 1995). An old Chinese saying might reveal how being reticent or careful about one’s utterance in daily life is regarded in Chinese culture: “A word once uttered cannot be drawn back, even by a team of four horses”. In other words, the indirect attitude might make people who are influenced by Chinese culture more comfortable and less threatened while dealing with superiors or strangers in public. However, that attitude, at the same time, could also lead the people being less actively involved in class contributions and learning.

2.4.3.3 Face-saving

Taiwanese parents often expect their children to elevate their social status by graduating from well-known academic institutions or passing civil service examinations, of which very limited places were allocated to native Taiwanese in earlier times (Hsueh et al., 2005; Huang & Chiu, 1991).
By the end of WWII and the withdrawal of the Japanese, most government officers were recruited from Mandarin-fluent soldiers or their families withdrawing from China with the KMT (Lin, 1983). Only a few elite native Taiwanese could advance beyond their allocated station in life through national exams (Shan & Chang, 2000).

In the past two decades, an unfair examination system has been gradually modified along with the rising awareness of democracy and independence of Taiwan (Hsueh et al., 2005). Therefore, with the influence of KMT education many Taiwanese parents developed the belief that childhood achievement is defined in academic terms (Sommers, 2009). Although Taiwan’s MOE has tried to establish more higher education institutions in order to lessen student competition (Chen, 2003), people in Taiwan still consider that competition will better enable the best students to enhance their academic competence. Many parents therefore prefer their children to enrol in the best institutions or classes. As a result, resources became scarce (mainly teacher resources) with large classes (usually 40 to 50 people a class) being common (Bond, 1991).

However, during the past decade, class size has gradually declined (to about 25 to 30 people a class), due to low fertility rates since 2000 (Government Information Office of Taiwan, 2007). The lower birth rates will soon impact on the profile of Taiwan’s educational institutions, and parents and teachers will need to adjust their mindset in order to deal with such changes. Emphasis on individual performance, creativity and uniqueness as well as the ability to cooperate with others might be more easily promoted with smaller classes. Thus, notions or beliefs that might impede learning,
such as avoiding mistakes in order to save one’s face in class, might gradually recede.

Moreover, according to Huang and van Naerssen (1987), “face-saving” is more a universal notion relevant to risk-taking than a culture-specific feature, and it is valued differently in different cultures. They found in their research in China that “second/foreign language learners, Chinese and others as well, could be made aware of the benefits of being willing to lose face or take risks in their language learning” (p. 294).

Wu and Gitsaki’s (2009) research also showed that learners with a higher proficiency in the target language did not care about making mistakes but learnt from them, while learners with lower levels of proficiency attempted to save face, and did not like to take risks in learning English as a foreign language. In response to face-threatening situations, some learners were less willing to adopt interactive practices (Brown & Levinson, 1978; Wen & Clément, 2003). In language classes, however, getting the target language learners to test what they have learned is pivotal (Tsui, 1996). When one can respond to others’ inquiries, raise questions or give comments, one is actively involved in processing input and output information without barriers.

### 2.5 Taiwanese Students’ English Oracy

Teachers and students in Taiwan have tended to concentrate on content and skills that would provide likely success in examinations, rather than on broader, authentically-oriented language competencies for engaging in real life activities (Kaplan & Baldauf, 2003a; Scott & Liu Chen, 2004). There has been little emphasis on communicative competence for high-stakes entrance examinations or school assessments. Reading and listening sections that have been added recently to the high
school entrance exams are in-line with international tests of communicative English (Sommers, 2009). Communicative competence, especially oral communication ability, is more commonly used as the first judgment of one’s English ability than other language skills (McDonough & Shaw, 2003). However, many EFL learners’ oral communication training in Taiwanese classes is often incidental and inadequate, and their communicative competence and interest left underdeveloped. Fossilised curricula designs for oral communication training also have been accused of hindering the rapid and changeable developments and interactions with other countries in a globalised world (Asian News Net, 2005).

Major entrance exams and academic evaluations in Taiwan usually do not include speaking tests (The Central News Agency, 2006). There is also limited research about whether communication strategies (CS) or oral communication strategies (OCSs) are emphasised or considered in most English curriculum or classroom tasks in EFL contexts (Littlemore, 2001; Nakatani, 2005). With such studies, some important challenges might be considered. For instance, given the compelling evidence that their foundations in English language is weak, the TAV students might need not only more opportunities to practise oracy but also more oral communication strategies (OCSs) to create and sustain their practice (Wu & Gitsaki, 2007). Particularly as oral communication competence is undervalued in Taiwan’s English language planning, customizing OCS training for TAV students becomes pivotal.
2.6 Current English Oracy Training

As has been indicated before, Taiwanese people experienced Japanese colonialism, martial law under the KMT ruling and hegemony of American culture and its language during the past century. It is also impossible to talk about the Taiwanese socio-historical context without reference to Chinese traditional culture, as Taiwan has long been impacted by Chinese philosophies, history and immigrants arriving in Taiwan after 1945 (Smith, 1991). This background has shaped the Taiwanese socio-educational disposition, which might affect how people learn and use English.

In relation to the hegemonic influence of the U. S. in education, the Audio-Lingual Method (ALM) of learning and teaching a L2, which was popular and considered useful for the purpose of national defence by the U.S. in WWII, was introduced as a pedagogic approach to Taiwan. Mainly influenced by the theories of Behaviourism, the ALM places importance on patterned drills rather than the communication of meaning (Brown, 2000; Gay, Mills, & Airasian, 2006). Even today, the ALM is used throughout Taiwan’s language classrooms when it is no longer a popular method in the US- perhaps because it is difficult for most EFL learners to be involved in authentic L2 conversations. Thus, considering Taiwan’s existing socio-educational background and EFL learners’ complex psychological characteristics, alternative pedagogies need to be considered to improve English language skills, particularly for oral communication.

2.6.1 Communicative approaches

Because of the tenacious hold of ALM, Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) has been introduced only gradually from western English-speaking countries. Initially, this method was implemented only in a few places in Taiwan and other
Asian regions (Hung, 2009; Savignon & Wang, 2003; Wang, 2002), and generated significant discussion in the country as to how it could be used within the country’s socio-educational and socio-cultural contexts. Questions were raised about whether it could accommodate EFL learners’ attitudes, especially in Asian contexts where didactic pedagogy has been the norm for a long period of time (Butler, 2011).

However, because of the disconcertingly low performances of most EFL learners in many Asian countries, alternative and innovative pedagogies based on the CLT have gradually drawn researchers’ and teachers’ attention (Kao, Carkin, & Hsu, 2011). Under the CLT framework, it is increasingly important for teachers to provide authentic contexts in class for OCS training. If EFL teachers adapt their classrooms in a flexible way for themes that their students are interested in, it should increase ease for students to participate in activities calculated to scaffold their acquisition of English communication competence. Many EFL educators have therefore sought innovative pedagogies that can be adapted to the Taiwanese context. Of these, drama-based pedagogies occupy a prominent place.

2.6.2 Application of drama approaches

Dialogues are a typical resource provided in textbooks for EFL teachers to use, and they are usually pre-scripted for two or three people in a group. In role-playing, students as players do not have to engage sincerely in the roles they play because emphasis is not on role-playing. Rather, they take turns in reciting conversational sentences, concentrating their efforts on becoming familiar with the use of grammar, idioms or vocabulary within.
Other drama approaches might be occasionally used as tactics to help enhance English learners’ language skills. As Liu (2002) asserted in his review of the application of drama:

Among those environment-enhancing activities, drama has shown itself through many years of research and practice a useful tool in engaging learners in constructing their own language growth. Through using drama for educational purposes has been widely practised for years, studies on using drama for second- or foreign-language learners seem to be relatively scarce. (p.54)

For instance, “second language teachers have long been familiar with the use of different dramatic activities to create opportunities for a variety of classroom interactions in the target language” (Kao & O’Neill, 1998, p. 1). Drama approaches have been applied in many Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) contexts as well as for training of other professions (Brammer & Sawyer-Laucanno, 1990; Cohen & Weaver, 2006; Nunan, 1993, 2004; Nunan & Burton, 1989b). In short, it has been suggested by many studies that drama can help cultivate language learners’ imaginations, uniqueness, and bravery to deal with issues in real life (Anderson, Hughes, & Manuel, 2008; DiNapoli, 2009; McCaslin, 2006).

However, due to a lack of teacher training and other constraints, not many teachers know how to conceptualise and apply other drama approaches in EFL classes (Kao & O’Neill, 1998; Miccoli, 2003; To, Chan, Lam, & Tsang, 2011). There has also been little research into drama approaches other than scripted role plays that might be co-opted for purposes of experimenting with more authentic and strategy-centred EFL teaching and learning, though recently research on process drama has highlighted it as a strong possibility. For instance, whether process drama provides an opportunity to better education for English language learners, especially in acquiring oral
communication competence, has been drawn much attention as many positive study results have shown (Kao & O'Neill, 1998; Liu, 2002; O'Toole & Dunn, 2002; Prendiville & Toye, 2007). Process drama integrates many types of drama activities and helps learners transcend their current social roles and explore new aspects of personae created by themselves and others. It is an imaginary art that can be used to deal with many authentic subjects and issues.

In conclusion, Taiwan’s overall position in Asia, and given the historical and current context of the country, suggest that Taiwan could be a particularly interesting case for the present research. In the following chapter, several theoretical positions drawn from the literature as potential pedagogical influences on teaching are used to underpin the framework of the current study.
3 Literature Review

3.1 Introduction

Subsequent to discussions of the features and issues of Taiwan with special reference to EFL education in the previous chapter, in this chapter I explore an array of relevant literature surrounding the present study’s experimental hypothesis and research questions.

According to Lo Bianco and Crozet (2003), through activities involving immersion, such as simulation exercises, role-play and many other drama approaches, students can be assisted to encounter and resolve misunderstanding, conflicts, tension and culture shock. Those difficulties are what EFL learners often face while learning and applying a foreign language. In this study, process drama and scripted role-play are purposefully chosen as pedagogic interventions to facilitate application of Oral Communication Strategies (OCSs) for Taiwanese teenage EFL learners, for Kao and O'Neill’s (1998) research provided critical and inspiring references for the present study. These two researchers built a continuum from their understanding of drama strategies for L2 teaching and learning. “Drama strategies available in the second language classroom range from exercise-based games, short rehearsed scenes presented in the classroom, brief role-plays, planned simulations, scenarios, to the more challenging and extended mode of ‘process drama’ ..” (Kao & O'Neill, 1998, p. 1). Their continuum shows various drama types that language teachers might implement for multiple language encounters.

While process drama and scripted role-play are on the opposite ends of their continuum, process drama is characterised as far more likely to foster learners’ abilities in negotiation, creativity, spontaneity and fluency in communication. Its
group-oriented feature seems to further ensure inhibited learners some support, in contrast to the feature of scripted role-play, pair work, which is on the other end of the continuum. The drama technique of role-play is widely used in most of Taiwan’s EFL classrooms, but process drama is not. Thus, in line with the concept of a continuum of drama approaches, it would be appropriate and interesting to implement a methodological choice of the two opposite drama approaches to explore whether EFL learners would have greater use of strategies in process drama than in scripted role-play. Results of such a research design might provide significant value to both classroom practice and contemporary literature in this field.

The evaluation of the efficacy of the two opposite drama approaches as pedagogic tools also allows exploration of participants’ perspectives of what value drama generates in OCS training and how this occurs. To start with, a brief introduction to the relationship between learners’ oracy and drama will be explicated and then one presented about drama in education (Sections 3.2 and 3.3). In Section 3.4 the nature of process drama and scripted role-play are compared, and an analysis made of how they might help affect oral competence according to the existing literature. These discussions will draw on the work by theorists such as Vygotsky (1978), Wigfield and Eccles (2000a) and Anderson (2010) to illustrate how process drama can motivate language learners in class and help promote their efficient application of English language in special relation to OCSs. The subsequent sections from 3.5 to 3.10 will review the literature pertaining to drama in EFL education, distinctions between language learning and language use strategies, definition and value of oral communication strategies, classifications, relevant studies and research questions addressed in the present study.
3.2 Oracy and Drama

To understand the interrelationship between drama and oracy, several concepts are explored. Wertsch (1985) is credited with coining the term ‘sociocultural’, and Vygotsky (1978) is widely recognised as the founder of sociocultural theory. This theory is used to explain the relationship between human mental development and learning with semiotic, cultural and social mediation. Vygotsky and his neuropsychologist colleagues developed concepts of cognitive functions based on this theory. They revealed that a child gradually commands regulatory, social and internalised speech through interaction with others, which is distinguished from the egocentric speech occurring in early childhood. They explained functions of internalised speech for thinking, orienting intellectual endeavours, developing conscious awareness, problem solving and stimulating creativity, and imagination, which relate to social and cultural interaction and development (Mahn, 1999).

“Individuals construct new knowledge as they internalize concepts appropriated through participation in social activities . . . . internalization was transformative rather than transmissive” (Mahn, 1999, p. 344). The internalisation of speech in cultural development, according to Vygotsky (1997), transforms interpersonally and then intra-personally along with growing experiences.

While individual and social processes are interdependent, one’s learning environment plays an essential role in forming speech and other cognitive developments (McCaslin & Hickey, 2001). Yang (1992) found in her research that Taiwanese students in an intensive language program who had plenty of communicative stimulation tended to sustain an English conversation for social purposes. In other words, if divergent sociocultural settings and purposes are created,
even in a fictional world, learners might demonstrate stronger communicative competence.

According to Vygotsky’s construct of Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD), within a certain range children can independently solve problems, and transform and construct their knowledge; however, they can also use some guidance or peer assistance to accomplish harder tasks and develop higher self-esteem. He suggested that learners can develop two kinds of concepts: scientific concepts and everyday (or spontaneous) concepts. The former is a more advanced and complicated kind of concept development. He believed that the effect of foreign language learning is analogous to the influence of scientific concepts on a person’s mental development. EFL learners are usually trained and expected to acquire sufficient awareness of grammatical, syntactic and phonetic forms but usually lack of everyday practical experience (Azar, 2004; H.-H. Gao, 2000; Kaplan & Baldauf, 2003a). According to the notion of the ZPD, the development of both scientific and everyday concepts is equally important in terms of requiring learners’ awareness and recognition.

Within a learning environment, teachers as one of the most influential factors bring in their high expectancy and value on students’ work. High expectancies from teachers help generate students’ high and positive expectations, and instead low teacher-expectancies have a negative impact on students’ perceptions and achievements (Green, 2002a; Parsons, Kaczala, & Meece, 1982). Some researchers have argued that low or unstable student-expectancies have a negative impact on achievement (Berndt & Miller, 1990; Dweck & Leggett, 1988). This said, some researchers may differ in their assumptions about how expectancies and values relate to achievement.
For example, Berndt and Miller’s (1990) research showed that a “student’s achievement is more strongly related to their expectancies of success than to the value they attach to success” (p. 325) while Eccles et al. (1983) found that a student’s values have a greater and longer impact on their achievement than do their expectancies because curriculum choices may depend on the values the students have. These mixed findings could provide useful information when conducting new interventions for EFL classes.

Hatch (1978), Nunan (1991, 2004) and Bygate, Skehan and Swain (2001) questioned the assumption that learners need to first know syntax or build up a repertoire of structures in order to use a second or foreign language in discourse. They contended that one’s syntactic structures are developed out of interactions. In other words, through interactional talks, phonemes, words, clauses and sentences could then be practised properly and efficiently (Fujii & Mackey, 2009). This notion of working from the larger elements to the smaller underpins the functions of process drama and echoes the theoretical framework of sociocultural ideologies.

While process drama seems to simulate complicated and authentic sociocultural environments closely, it is anticipated to be the most effective dynamic approach to help command a foreign language, such as the English language, in an EFL context. To cope with features of interactions of drama in general, Kao and O’Neill (1998) categorised all drama activities or techniques into three drama approaches. They are closed, semi-controlled and open communication. According to their observation, the open communication drama approach is the closest to daily conversations in learners’ real lives. In a language class, this approach provides opportunities for authentic and
spontaneous challenges for development and brainstorming of students’ input. Yet, in many EFL and ESL classroom practices, the other two approaches, closed and semi-controlled communication, are applied often (Evans, 1984; McCaslin, 2006; Miccoli, 2003; Oxford & Crookall, 1990; Parry, 1972; Stewig & Buege, 1994). For that, more research needs to be conducted in order to examine whether the use of the drama approach of open communication might enhance foreign language learners’ oracy or internalised speech if drama is applied in language classes.

In Taiwan, most national level exams do not emphasise evaluation of oral communication to the same extent as the other skills (Cheng & Winston, 2011; Chern, 2003; Kaplan & Baldauf, 2003a; Wu & Gitsaki, 2009). Yang (1999b) had a finding from her research about Taiwanese EFL learners’ paradoxical beliefs and behaviours. “. . . while it is the oral skill that most interested these EFL students, speaking in the foreign language was also a cause for concern” (p. 530). In her study, 92% of the participants rejected the statement that “you shouldn’t say anything in English until you can say it correctly”, but meanwhile over 80% of participants reported their fears of fossilisation if not speaking correctly at the beginning stage of using the language. Therefore, according to the researcher, EFL teachers have the responsibility to help their learners build up confidence through the use of functional practice strategies so that communicative break-downs and poor communication competence can be addressed.

Undoubtedly oracy consists of several essential elements and abilities, such as delivering structures and meaning properly in different situations, or listening to utterances displayed by different characters. With their practical teaching experience
in process drama, Prendiville and Toye (2007) stressed the subtle differences in individual oral and aural communication:

We often only allow that a pupil is demonstrating engagement in talk when they contribute and demonstrate they have listened. There are other signs of listening. We must learn to read body language, including facial expressions during the drama. If a pupil only speaks once we must look at that single contribution and at other evidence drawn or written after the event to see what they know from the drama. That will show how they have listened. (p. 86)

They also emphasised that drama helps generate speaking and listening with the function of “reflecting on the meaning of the fiction both within and outside the drama” (p. 84). Since oracy is not an easy skill to attain or to teach, especially oracy in L2, oral communication strategies become essential and practical for language learners to acquire in order to supplement their inadequacies. In this case, training for strategies should be taken seriously to better equip EFL students for positive communicative results.

Another observation for implementing strategy training is that language learners tend to be more extrinsically than intrinsically motivated while learning strategies (Ehrman, 1994; MacIntyre & Noels, 1994). For instance, MacIntyre & Noels (1994) proposed that strategy use depends upon three general factors: knowledge of appropriate strategies, having a reason to use them, and there being nothing to prevent their use. The second and third factors are obviously extrinsic motives.
Learners with requirement motivation\(^4\) performed poorly and used few strategies (Peng, 2001). On the other hand, when a well-integrated environment provides adequate engaging opportunities, such as all sorts of creative activities set in fictional world, language learners might be anticipated to obtain high oracy.

### 3.3 Drama in Education

Drama has long been used as a medium for passing down rituals and all kinds of knowledge between generations. The earliest written record of drama was the Abydos Passion Play (a religious play) in Egypt around 1868 B.C (Chang, 2004; Courtney, 1989). Drama in early human history has been transformed from simply religious rituals into education.

Although it has been debated since the 1970s whether drama should be used in classrooms as either a learning-medium or an art-form, some Australian state curriculum guides and drama theorists have been inclined to blur the line between the two areas and have attempted to include both (Board of Studies NSW, 2007; Hamilton, 1992; Queensland Studies Authority, 2002). In other words, rather than setting up a distinction between drama as art and drama as learning, they have tended not to give any singular definition for drama used in education.

The absence of an audience, however, is a prominent feature of one kind of drama approaches, process drama. Participants in process drama have two overlapping functions: “representing an experience” and “being in an experience” (O’Neill, 1995, p. 118). Every participant in process drama needs to construct an improvised world together as well as actively inhabit their real world. The roles are not designed or pre-scripted but created by the participants themselves.

\(^4\)“Requirement motivation means learning the language because of being forced to do so” (Peng, 2001, p.344).
In contrast, the audience in a theatre usually waits to passively receive stimulation, and the actors perform their designated roles or tasks in order to produce a play and present a script in front of the audience. Slade (1954) and Way (1967) also made a distinction between drama and theatre. According to them, theatre carries an important function of communication between actors and audiences and focuses less on drama as a vehicle for intended learning. Drama, on the other hand, emphasises teaching and learning by creating dramatic experience with both its participants and the audience.

Drama is not only full of human contact, but also its techniques are regarded as applicable to teaching in most subject areas (McCaslin, 2006). Drama helps enhance participants’ cognitive, linguistic and social capacities as well as demanding their perception, imagination and speculation. Wagner (2002) contended that educational drama is not expendable adornment in the classroom, but a basic and central experience. Hadaway, Vardell and Young (2001) especially stressed the importance of using drama in learning languages. Drama activities in class therefore not only provide meaningful interactions for learners but also help them recognise the pragmatics and paralinguistic uses of a target language; drama focuses on interactions between individuals and their contexts in the same space for learning. With activities involving immersion, such as simulation exercises, role-play and many other drama approaches, students can be assisted to encounter and resolve misunderstanding, conflict, tension and culture shock (Lo Bianco & Crozet, 2003).

As a result, drama seems to be able to incorporate more social and contextual factors with existing curricula and classroom discourse than other instruments (Ryan-Scheutz & Colangelo, 2004). In other words, drama might easily help shift EFL
learners’ habitual focus from language accuracy to how they should be communicating effectively with others while using a target language.

Some popularly applied theories of learning and motivation, such as socio-cultural theory and expectancy-value theory, also acknowledge the need for teaching and learning in dynamic and naturalistic classroom settings in which drama-assisted pedagogies are implemented (Perry, Turner, & Meyer, 2006; Perry & VandeKamp, 2000; Shand, 2008). It is believed by many drama theorists and practitioners that through diverse interactions occurred in drama activities, drama promotes interpersonal relationships and helps construct learners’ knowledge and skills through individuals’ learning trajectories (Reagan & Osborn, 2002).

3.4 Drama Approaches: Scripted Role-Play and Process Drama

With the significance of drama recognised in the literature, one drama approach among all, scripted role play, has been used most frequently in foreign language classrooms (Kao & O'Neill, 1998; Miccoli, 2003; Nunan & Burton, 1989a, 1989b, 1990). Another drama approach, process drama, however, is utilised comparatively less in teaching foreign languages, especially in Asian contexts (Kao & O'Neill, 1998). A possible explanation for this phenomenon is that there still might be many unanswered questions and concerns about the nature of drama practice in EFL teachers’ minds, which worried drama educators and researchers several decades ago (Hamilton, 1992). For instance, Seely (1976) analysed the nature of educational drama from the teacher’s point of view:

Teachers have been left with a vague feeling of dissatisfaction at their inability to cope with a “subject” that they have been led to believe not only exists but also is
fundamental to the personal and social development of every child; yet they have found that when they stretch out to grasp it, it separates into a hundred mocking shadows. (p. 2)

In line with this uncertainty, for most teachers it is reasonable to first comprehend various techniques of the main drama approaches used in this study, as well as how each drama technique could possibly liberate language learners’ verbal, physical and psychological limitations and enhance their competence of expression.

3.4.1 Scripted Role-Play Defined

Role playing is central to “role taking”, which confines learners to predetermined situations, scenes and roles (Moreno, 1959). It is usually a kind of brief and informal performance with no delicate costumes and props. According to Kao and O’Neill (1998) and DiNapoli (2009), many L2 course books focusing on spoken skills use role-playing to deal with lexical, grammatical and functional areas of language performance. Participants are usually given dialogues and asked to practise in pairs and then to present conversations in two roles in front of the class. This approach allows learners to internalise and produce desired or accurate linguistic patterns after repeated practice. By repeatedly reciting pre-written lines, the learners are expected to apply sentence patterns, particular idioms and vocabulary learned in real situations outside of class. DiNapoli (2009) argued that textbooks which provide functionally rhetorical dialogues seldom take human sentiment into account. He called textbook dialogues without a dramatic context, “undramatic role-plays” (p. 101), and regarded them as schematic and unnaturally mechanical. Ekman (2003) contended that the ability to sense feelings or emotions helps improve communication. Thus, when a minimum of context is provided to language learners for exercising pre-written
textbook scripts, nothing is unexpected or unpredictable among the confined conversations. Subsequently, learners are not required to think beneath the surface and behind the linguistic configuration of dialogues (e.g., emotions and dilemmas of personae).

### 3.4.2 Process Drama

#### 3.4.2.1 A brief history

Slade (1954) in line with progressivism, which built classroom drama principally around personal development and valued the impact and interaction of content, culture and teachers in classrooms, greatly influenced many drama practitioners and researchers. For instance, Hornbrook (1997) stated that drama is

> “dedicated to the aesthetic and developmental ‘needs’ of the young . . . the universality of moral feeling and the primacy of the subjective, the authentication of the self through the exercise of the creative faculty, the need to play” (p. 9).

Way (1967), another influential follower of Slade, was criticised then for promoting classroom drama which focused on an individual’s sensory exercises as it was argued that neither teachers’ nor learners’ development was extended or challenged significantly (Hamilton, 1992). By the 1970s, dramatists such as Heathcote (1980) and Bolton (1979) began to steer away from using educational drama as a means to increase the individual’s self-awareness, self-expression and spontaneity toward learning in and through different socio-cultural experiences (Hamilton, 1992).

Bolton (1984) and Heathcote and Bolton (1995), further suggested that drama activities can be designed to significantly impact on a student’s learning process and to help them deal with subject matter across a range of knowledge areas. Once
known as “Drama In Education” (DIE) or “educational drama”, another term “process drama” emerged in the early 1990s (O'Neill, 1995; O'Toole, 1992) to better portray its function in helping students to learn.

Heathcote regarded process drama as “not creative dramatics, role playing, psychodrama, or sociodrama, but a conscious employment of the elements of drama to educate, to literally bring out what children already know, but don’t yet know they know” (Wagner, 1976, p. 13). In line with employment of drama elements in education, the techniques of process drama are regarded as applicable in teaching most subject areas nowadays (McCaslin, 2006). Hadaway, Vardell and Young (2001) support McCaslin’s view with their description of students learning things in the classroom efficiently through a target language if they are not focused on what they do not know about the language (e.g., sentence structures or word usage). By employing various drama techniques, learning environments might become less stressful for language learners. It is believed that process drama not only provides meaningful interactions for learners, but also helps learners recognise pragmatics and paralinguistic uses of a target language.

Many Western dramatists (Bolton, 2000; Fleming, 2001; Lewis & Rainer, 2005; Neelands, 1998; O'Toole, 1992) have attempted to seek more confirmation in order to further popularise process drama in educational institutions. They argue that process drama should be a legitimate sub-genre of theatre taught in drama curricula like Augusto Boal’s Forum Theatre. However, research into and the practice of

---

5 According to Anderson, Hughes, and Manuel’s (2008) “Forum Theatre” in the glossary of their book, is “a technique of participatory theatre made popular by Augusto Boal, the Brazilian founder of the theatre of the Oppressed, whereby actors create a scene depicting oppression or conflict” (p.xx). Spectators are invited to enter and transform a scene or action at any point in order to resolve the situation of oppression or conflict by alternative behaviours.
process drama in EFL and Asian contexts are still in their infancy even though drama and language education are intertwined frequently in practical teaching and curricula (Jensen & Hermer, 1998; Liu, 2002; Schmidt, 1998; Stewig & Buege, 1994; Wilkinson, 2007). To address this inadequacy, Kao and O’Neill’s (1998) research remains one of the few major and significant studies on how process drama affects English learning and teaching in Taiwan’s tertiary institutions. Their research has therefore influenced the present study in terms of implementing process drama techniques in an EFL context as well as attempting to generate enhanced communicative competence for EFL learners.

3.4.2.2 Process drama defined

In contrast to scripted role play, process drama aims to help participants spontaneously learn negotiation, form and express opinions from various perspectives, and respond to simulated circumstances. Choices of drama themes and contexts depend upon the participants’ language proficiency levels, social skills and cultural understanding. The participants simultaneously experience and create improvised dramatic events. From realistic situations to imaginative contexts for drama, participants of different ages are likely to have different preferences and performances. For instance, Kao and O’Neill (1998) observed that in general adolescents may need a realistic approach in order to overcome doubtful attitudes toward the usefulness of drama initially and be induced to imaginative approaches later. Yet, adults feel more secure in playful contexts rather than serious ones.

For younger learners, Shand (2008) researched 18 elementary school students in Arizona, USA, who were reluctant to speak English. She conducted the same sets of
drama curriculum and activities (including process drama and creative drama\(^6\)) on different grade classes using an adapted pre- and post-test of the Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale (FLCAS). This study also used a mixed method design with a 5-point Likert-scale questionnaire, drama curricula, the researcher’s reflective teaching notes, observational field notes and interviews. Means of the pre- and post-tests were calculated and compared by a standard paired \( t \)-test.

The results of Shand’s study showed different impacts for different grades of students. The third graders showed a significant decrease of anxiety and an increase in motivation and confidence, but the sixth and seventh graders exhibited no significant changes in motivation, anxiety and confidence. In other words, the adolescent learners did not gain the same level of positive changes on the affective properties, like anxiety, motivation and confidence, as the younger learners did with drama-assisted oracy training.

Process drama focuses on role creating, which demands both creativity and spontaneity on the part of learners (Moreno, 1959). A major difference between scripted role plays and process drama is that learners in a process drama environment are not able to anticipate their characters, plot and lines, while participants in scripted role-playing environments are informed of this beforehand. Participants in process drama work through discussions and activities in groups first to “shape” their respective roles. As the drama unfolds, the role each group creates gradually differs from each other in terms of characteristics, personal background, attitudes, past experiences and perspectives towards future events.

---

\(^6\) Creative drama refers to “any informal drama created by the participants” (McCaslin, 2006, p.7).
O’Neill (1995) defined process drama as “a complex dramatic encounter” which can be regarded “as a legitimate part of the realm of theatre” (p. xiii). She also pointed out that its prominent feature is to help students learn from authentic contexts: “it proceeds without a script, its outcome is unpredictable, it lacks a separate audience and the experience is impossible to replicate exactly” (p. xiii). O’Toole (1992) defined process drama as “fictional role-taking and improvisation” (p. 3), which involves role-play techniques, other theatrical conventions and rehearsal exercises. Namely, it utilises the most drama techniques among all drama approaches. As a result, through various theatrical techniques, participants of process drama get to distance themselves spontaneously from learning subjects and easily adopt other viewpoints by switching their pretend identities among characters in the drama (O’Toole & Dunn, 2002). All participants, including teachers, can be players and audience members in the same episode of process drama. Teacher artistry is even regarded as essential for applying drama as pedagogy for additional language learning according to Dunn and Stinson (2011).

Since process drama has its own set of techniques and features, the following sections will discuss the techniques applied in this present study and the justification behind using them in enhancing learners’ communicative competence. This includes drama techniques such as pre-texts, teacher-in-role, hot-seating, mantle of the expert, tableau (namely, freeze frame, frozen picture or still image), and group role-play.
3.4.2.3 Features and Techniques of Process Drama and Their Justification

3.4.2.3.1 Pre-texts

*Pre-texts* are usually used first to help activate process drama and can also be regarded as introductions to the subsequent drama activities. By “a word, a gesture, a location, a story, an idea, an object, or an image, as well as by a character or a play script”, process drama activities can then be carried out (O'Neill, 1995). O’Neill contended that:

> *Pre-texts* could help activate the weaving of process drama. It not only appears prior to all the activities of process drama but also relates to them. It also helps define the nature and limits of the fictional world that process drama creates and implies roles for participants. (pp. 19-20)

Since the drama situations can vary from realistic (e.g., protests or rescue events), to imaginary scenes (e.g., fairy tales), teachers need to determine drama themes based on learners’ linguistic, cultural and social competence and backgrounds as well as what age groups they belong to in order to best promote learning efficacy through the drama (Piazzoli, 2011). With suitable drama themes or situations selected, learners can explore and enjoy learning more with less pressure to produce grammatically correct speeches.

Kao and O’Neill (1998) also suggested that the flexibility and suitability of themes in process drama help promote language learners’ confidence and fluency. Liu (2002) further commented that *pre-texts* provide verbal instructions about the direction the drama might head to, and they also emotionally help students engage in a starting point for unfolding rest dramatic scenes. *Pre-texts* help establish time, location and the atmosphere of the action, roles and situations, and “the students’ linguistic output
triggered by curiosity and imagination will start from here” (Liu, 2002, p. 58). In short, choosing a proper drama context and introducing it with pre-texts is the very first step language teachers can engage in to ease learners’ potential anxiety toward drama development or any subject before going on to more complex drama activities.

With regards to potential anxiety generated while implementing process drama, Wagner (1976) emphasised Heathcote’s attitude toward drama of “always looking for the precise dramatic pressure that will lead to a break-through, to a point where the students have to come at a problem in a new way, to fight for language adequate to the tension they feel” (p. 13). Pre-texts are thus used to help create adequate and constructive tension for developing subsequent drama to generate learners’ curiosity and communication fluency.

3.4.2.3.2 Teacher-in-role

In process drama, teachers are encouraged to take roles as facilitators with low social status or inadequate competence, and seek their students’ help or opinions in order to induce or boost learners’ engagement in speaking and listening (Kao & O’Neill, 1998; O’Toole & Dunn, 2002). Prendiville and Toye (2007) proposed five types of roles for teachers: the authoritarian role (e.g., a governor), the opposer role (namely, an authority role but dangerous), the intermediate role (e.g., a secretary or a servant), the needing help role and the ordinary person (e.g., villagers). O’Neill (1995) commented that the purpose behind teachers taking roles is to invite participants to enter the fictional world after accepting the teacher’s invitation. “The participants can respond actively, begin to ask or answer questions, and oppose or transform what is taking place” (O’Neill, 1995, p. 61). Facilitating through acts of teacher-in-role,
power-shifting among teachers and students in classes occur naturally. The teacher uses shifts in status and power to engage and attract students.

For teachers, the dramatic technique of teacher-in-role should be regarded as ‘an act of conscious self-presentation’ (Kao & O'Neill, 1998, p. 26). Students have ‘a semblance of power’ (Prendiville & Toye, 2007, p. 23) but do not engage in a takeover of power because their power only lies within the fictional and dramatic scenes. In other words, a shift of some power is needed to make the interest level flexible, and only with this kind of dramatic technique can the original asymmetric relationship between teachers and students be adjusted (Prendiville & Toye, 2007). Teachers still run the class and can get in and out of role at any time to resume control. Teachers of process drama allow and encourage students to make more decisions. All participants have to get involved in decision-making processes and so arbitrariness from any superior power, mostly from teachers, can be avoided in process drama classrooms.

3.4.2.3.3 Group role-play

The difference between conventional role-plays and group role-plays lies in the kinds of roles available to students. The former usually entails limited individual roles with attitudes and characteristics strictly pre-determined for certain situations. In contrast, group role-plays are likely to endow students in groups with generic roles or initially, roles of the same type. Along with drama development, participants of process drama are encouraged to create and construct their roles’ background stories, characteristics and inner thoughts in small groups. The participants shape their respective roles through brainstorming and discussions. Wagner (2002) also stated that the growth in cognition depends on growth in role-taking. Thus, as the
drama unfolds, the role one group moulds would gradually differ from other groups’ in all areas. For example, after the participants are divided into groups and given generic roles, such as villagers, along with the respective group’s creation for playing villagers, the groups would adopt the roles of different types of villagers with various characteristics, personalities and backgrounds. While communicating and interacting with each other, different villagers then create dramatic tension, conflicts and develop plots for the drama they are working on all together.

It is posited that one cannot easily anticipate what and how other group characters might respond to or comment on things. Yet, according to Kao and O’Neill (1998), “The most useful roles will be those that permit students to ask and answer questions, to solve problems, to offer both information and opinions, to argue and persuade, and generally to fulfil the widest range of language functions” (p. 25). For language learners, group role-plays can easily enhance their confidence in using the target language in public because they have been practising in authentic and unpredictable contexts. O’Neill (1995) also indicated the value of process drama by stating that, “In this drama world, participants are free to alter their status, adopt different roles and responsibilities, play with elements of reality and explore alternate existences” (p. 151). In other words, through improvisations and challenges in group role-plays, participants create a momentum together to encounter and practise in consecutive dramatic moments in a class session. Therefore, peer collaboration becomes a salient and essential element of group role-plays.

Many educators (Di Pietro, 1987; Moffet, 1968; Nunan, 2004; O’Toole, 1992; Oxford & Crookall, 1990; Smith, 1984) emphasised the significance of collaborative work for language learners and indicated that drama could provide optimal contexts
for collaborative learning. For instance, Moffet (1968) contended in his theory of discourse that interactional speech is the major means to develop thought and language. In particular, dialogue between people in dramatic work can enhance language proficiency and higher-order thinking. Heathcote (1980) echoed Moffet’s remarks by stating that, “Conversation, interactional dialogues, stimulated by the need for individuals to collaborate in meaningful tasks and experiences, can encourage higher level thinking and language development” (p. 14). Students can naturally exercise their peer influence in class and make each other come out with their individual learning outcome.

Prendiville and Toye (2007) also commented that a small number of disrupters in class could be asked to stop their behaviour by the majority if class enjoyment was spoiled. According to McCaslin and colleague (1996) the ‘arena of co-regulation’ is a concept generated from sociocultural theory that conveys supportive relationships in classrooms, individual values (e.g., beliefs and expectations), scaffolding instruction and proper-level challenges, which are assumed to encourage motivated learning. Accordingly, peer pressure or advice would make uncooperative members in class reflect upon their own actions or rectify their playful attitude or passive mindset (Maley & Duff, 1982; O’Neill & Lambert, 1982; Scarcella & Oxford, 1992).

In light of sociocultural theory, peer interactions with some instructional support would enhance students’ engagement and learning (Hickey & Granade, 2004). With this theoretical underpinning, *group role-play* in process drama could impact on language learners in many constructive ways. One of these is to help learners to appreciate others’ perspectives.
For example, O’Neill (1995) argued that another strength of this group-oriented method is that it is likely to have a distancing effect mainly because a group of students in the same role would have to allow different perspectives on drama events. When forced to be flexible with unfolding dramatic encounters, they would naturally modify their opinions and responses genuinely and spontaneously to cope with the logic of situations.

With collaboration either among students or between students and teachers, this technique is likely to alleviate some anxiety and inhibit learners’ low-confidence by allowing imagination for role-creation, meaning construction or student questioning (Bowell & Heap, 2001; Clark & Goode, 1999). When students are in role in this way, it is not that their acting or performing skills are emphasised, but the adoption by the group of their perspectives and responses would be encouraged, and this would lead to them gaining further confidence and interest in communicating with others.

3.4.2.3.4 Mantle of experts

This is a convention whereby participants take on the role of experts or specialists, such as scientists, journalist, psychiatrists, celebrities, or advisers. In process drama, this technique can lead to the participants acquiring sufficient knowledge in order to complete the fictional experts’ tasks or to resolve anticipated questions or doubts (Anderson et al., 2008). This is usually integrated with group role-playing. With various conflicts and challenges generated in drama, students in groups could take on experts’ roles and respond to teachers’ roles which are usually designed to elicit student experts’ professional advice (Heathcote & Bolton, 1995). In other words, by elevating students’ social status and expectations along with their new identities in a fictional world, their learning autonomy could then be stimulated, and learning

The theoretical underpinning for the use of the mantle of the expert has been constructivism. Constructivist pedagogy is characterised by: power-shifting between teachers and students, the teacher’s recognition of the student’s self-knowledge and resources from their cultural heritage brought to class (Grabinger & Dunlap, 2000; Hull & Schultz, 2001), as well as learner autonomy (Aoki, 1999; Benson, 2000; Ehrman & Dörnyei, 1998). From the middle of the 20th century, behaviourist influence in education has been very much replaced by cognitive psychology and social-constructivist theories. Wood, Bruner and Ross’ (1976) claimed that learning is best achieved by learners when instruction and learning activities are scaffolded and that knowledge acquisition is a co-constructive process where learners’ prior knowledge and their present educational opportunities interact.

Moreover, according to Vygotsky’s (1978) Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD), teachers need to regard students as experts of their own life experience stemming from their respective backgrounds, and help scaffold students’ expertise based on their prior and unique experiences. In other words, a richly created learning environment gives students chances to synthesise and progress their individualised verbal thought through the teacher’s instructions and collaboration with peers (Mahn, 1999). Student learning is maximised if they are exposed to learning materials beyond their current level of competence.

3.4.2.3.5 Tableau

The drama technique, tableau, is also called by various names, such as frozen picture, freeze frame, still image or depiction (Kao & O'Neill, 1998, p. 30; O'Neill,
It has a long history in both educational drama and theatre as it possesses demonstrative power to compel the spectator to analyse still images by suspending time (O’Neill, 1995). Participants in several small groups pose as an unmoving image to represent and capture a particular moment or idea in time. A tableau can be used to encourage viewers to expand and construct meaning of the present, the past and the future from a still image presented by different groups.

Here is an example that I might use in class. A group of students might be asked to prepare and pose their actions in still form for the moment when they first sensed that an airplane was crashing into their own office building on the 11th of September, 2001. Each of the performers could throw a sentence to describe their posture. The teacher and the student-viewers ask or interpret about the still images posed. They could also anticipate each performer’s thought at that moment, of the time before coming to his or her office or possible life changes if they survived.

According to O’Neill (1995), tableau provides sufficient time for viewers to interrogate, reflect or criticise the apparent values of an image. “... the significance of the use of a tableau lies in its expansion of the participants’ capacity to perceive ... A frozen image will compel the observers to interrogate it for its possible meanings”. Although this kind of activity might not seem improvised, the presentation of tableau is likely to offer students, especially language learners, adequate opportunities to construct meaning, deliver opinions or analyse using comprehensive concepts and precise expressions.

In tableau activities, endowing students with power to lead class discussions and directions is an essential element. Empowering students is often believed to create a rich classroom where opportunities are provided to promote students’ autonomy and
peer learning (O'Neill, 1995). Heathcote (1980) declared that teachers should not be overly timid about conducting drama in education although they might only have very limited experience of this approach. She suggested that teachers usually quickly realise that once a child commits to his or her drama tasks, there is no need to impose restrictions or make demands, as the drama provides its own discipline. Language learners’ autonomy might thus be triggered naturally. They may be fascinated by the freedom endowed and power transferred from their teachers, and they would be expected to think and act profoundly while resolving problems, encountering dilemmas or merely listening to others.

In addition, using the tableau technique might also ease many teachers’ anxieties about their class being silent or avoid impatience and frustration when waiting for students’ responses because students in tableau activities all get a chance to think, act and deliver speech by taking turns. Once the teacher’s anxiety of getting students’ immediate responses to prove his or her successful teaching disappears, students could then become less anxious, too, and through such a technique, they would more likely get even allocation of turns or opportunities to respond to discussions or communicate with their peers (Tsui, 1996). Teachers would not be the only authority in allocating turns for responses and answers, and thus a shy or incompetent student’s sense of being neglected in class might be greatly reduced.

3.4.2.3.6 Hot-seating

Hot-seating is an activity in which a person speaks and responds as a certain character on a specific seat, and is interrogated by other participants in order to provide information, opinions or advice (Anderson et al., 2008). The person on the hot seat could be a teacher or a student, and his or her sitting location is usually the
centre of attention for the rest of participants. The person on the hot seat might seem to take on much pressure from others’ interrogations, but there is also stress on other people because they have to brainstorm and prepare to ask precise questions in their group roles. Thus, the technique, mantle of the expert, is also integrated with the activities of hot-seating because students can be either playing the role on the hot seat or interrogating others depending on dramatic events. For example, there might be several group roles (e.g., villagers, scientists, school teachers, economists and government officers) asking questions to an agent of a nuclear power plant on the hot seat, who has come to announce plans of constructing a new nuclear power plant in six months in the village. Another scenario might be that the character on the hot seat is a high-ranked government official and the rest of the people are villagers holding pro- or against-opinions for the proposed nuclear power plant located.

With hot-seating and the other techniques discussed, the element of power-shifting in class of process drama is obvious and crucial. Active power-shifting among the teacher and students reveal their high expectancies and values toward the drama activities they engage in. With their high expectancies and values for the effects of the drama techniques, teachers and learners both have greater opportunities to succeed in achieving their respective goals for teaching and learning. The theory underpinned the effects of these dramatic tactics is expectancy-value theory, which has often been used to explain the development of motivational strategies as well (Green, 2002b). The nature of expectancies and values and how they interact with learning and teaching are discussed further below.

First, about the nature of expectancies, according to Bandura’s (1997) construct for the notion of expectancies, distinction is made between ‘efficacy expectations and
outcome expectations’. The former is about an individual’s belief in his or her own ability for accomplishing a task, and the latter is the belief that a given behaviour will generate a certain outcome. Second, Eccles et al. (1983) defined three components of the values in their expectancy-value model. The first is attainment value, which conveys ‘the importance of doing well on a given task’, the second, intrinsic value, is ‘the enjoyment one gains from doing the task’, and the third, utility value, refers to ‘how a task fits into an individual’s future plans’ (Wigfield & Eccles, 2000b, p. 72).

The Expectancy-value model promoted by Eccles, Wigfield, and their colleagues suggests significant relationships between adolescent performance and choice, and the nature of the expectancy and value framework (Eccles et al., 1983; Wigfield, 1994; Wigfield & Eccles, 1992, 2000b). Expectancies and values not only directly influence learners’ ‘performance, effort, and persistence’, but also the learners are impacted by “ability beliefs, perceived difficulty of different tasks, and individuals’ goals, self-schema, and affective memories” (Wigfield & Eccles, 2000b, p. 69). In other words, these cognitive variables are intertwined and interacted with contextual influences and what they are led to believe (Yang, 1999a). Many researchers (Eccles & Wigfield, 2002; Turner, Meyer, Midgley, & Patrick, 2003; Winne & Perry, 2000) thus argue that it is necessary to include social and contextual constructs, and to design and interpret studies about motivation in authentic learning contexts if people are to understand learners’ motivated behaviours.
3.5 Drama in EFL Education

3.5.1 Introduction

Although drama used for educational purposes is not breakthrough news, studies about how drama impacts on EFL learners’ communicative competence with special reference to the use of oral communication strategies are still rather limited. EFL learners do not work or study in the target language environment and have limited contact with native speakers as well as opportunities and contexts to apply what they have learned. When potential socioeconomic success is believed to be a product of high L2 proficiency (Brown, Robson, & Rosenkjar, 2001), many parents and children would be tempted to pursue paper qualifications. However, attaining satisfactory levels of competence in the English language depends on authentic opportunities for practice; otherwise, inappropriate structures or invented phrases could become fossilised in learners’ interlanguage system during the learning process (Kao & O’Neill, 1998). Kao and O’Neill contended that the most important elements for effective L2 education lie in the creation of an immediate and unpredictable social context.

Jonassen (1992) also stressed that the real mediation of learning is thinking (mental processes) but thinking is activated by learning activities. For that, drama activities have been regarded to often successfully facilitate learners’ thinking. From the perspective of the Zone of Proximal Development, drama induces stimuli that help enhance learners’ oracy and assists them in comprehending social interactions in multiple ways and with higher-order thinking (Evans, 1984). Wagner (2002) commented that modern technologies, such as computer programs, can hardly replace interactions with human speech and asserted that “... one cannot learn to creatively engage in a conversation in a language unless one has real human beings
to interact with” (p. 4). The researchers emphasised the importance of real human guidance and interactions for education no matter how information or other technologies have been enhanced.

Kao and O’Neill’s (1998) research conducted in Taiwan is of critical importance to this present study, particularly because it examined the influence of process drama in language learning and was conducted in an EFL setting. “Drama strategies available in the second language classroom range from exercise-based games, short rehearsed scenes presented in the classroom, brief role-plays, planned simulations, scenarios, to the more challenging and extended mode of ‘process drama’. . . .” (Kao & O’Neill, 1998, p. 1).

The researchers built a continuum from their understanding of these drama strategies for L2 teaching and learning. The continuum showed major differences among teaching perspectives of various drama types that language teachers might implement for multiple language encounters. Role-play is emphasised, for it is widely integrated in almost all the drama approaches. Moreover, “the initial purpose of endowing students with different roles will be to provide them with fresh linguistic possibilities” (Kao & O’Neill, 1998, p. 24). While process drama and scripted role play are at opposite ends of the continuum, the continuum characterises process drama as far more likely to foster learners’ abilities in negotiation, creativity, spontaneity and fluency in communication. Its group-oriented feature further ensures inhibited learners some support, in contrast to the pair work of scripted role-plays.

Even though drama activities may help most language learners, it does not mean that drama works for everyone. According to Kao and O’Neill (1998), there are three types of learners, classified by their attitudes, who might express negative opinions
toward drama approaches. The first type of student usually has the mindset of putting just enough effort in to pass a drama-oriented language class. This attitude occurs mostly when learners are required to enrol in the course due to school policy or the nature of the educational system. They, as a small proportion in class, are not serious about the course and may skip classes with their ‘take-it-easy’ attitude, which could still possibly influence other students’ interest in learning.

The second type usually has skeptical views and distrusts the drama approach because they may have received language education in a more didactic manner. They often have strong doubts about whether they can really gain something from drama since they perceive drama activities as children’s games. “Some adolescent learners are reluctant to participate in activities with fantastic themes because they think doing so makes them look ‘silly’ or ‘childish’” (Kao & O’Neill, 1998, p. 112). Shy people would also feel timid and uncomfortable when hearing the terms ‘drama’ or ‘role-play’, which they may associate with formal stage performances.

The third type of student usually has low self-esteem in learning or presenting to a target language. They could easily be discouraged by their capable or confident peers during their struggle to learn or express themselves and they may hide themselves in the corner when others are actively engaging in drama activities. It is crucial to notice students’ affective preparation while trying to apply non-conventional pedagogy or curricula in EFL language classes (Rivers, 1983). These characteristics should be taken into account when conducting drama-oriented pedagogies as well as when discussing experiment results. The following sections draw on relevant theories to further explicate the potential of process drama and scripted role-play when applied to teaching EFL.
3.5.2 Scripted role-plays in language classes

Due to the repetition of simple scripted interactions with oral practice, Kao and O’Neill (1998) criticised scripted role-plays because they “may at first appear to produce language that is fluent and accurate . . . However, retention and transfer of learning may be disappointing, since no self-generated communication is taking place during these activities” (p. 6). Thus, the challenges for language learners in this drama approach “lies in the demands of presentation rather than in any struggle for communication” (p. 7). Social situations and roles pre-determined for scripted role-plays are usually straightforward, limiting and selected in order to introduce particular vocabulary and sentences or reinforce previous learning.

Scenes and lines designed for scripted role-plays are mostly placed in or based on realistic events or occasions. Many scripted role-playing dialogues in EFL textbooks adopt realistic situations in light of the culture of the target language, and are not necessarily designed for learners who may come from a different culture. For instance, a conversation between a black woman and a white woman in a big shopping mall on Boxing Day may be appropriate for an American audience but not an Asian one. As a result, although EFL or Asian students are asked to practise what has been written in the textbook, they might not fully comprehend the sociocultural background of the occasion and how different ethnic people might really behave and deliver their speech. Pre-written scripts might be effortless for teachers to prepare before class and to use for reinforcing certain words, idioms and sentence structures but they might not be able to present the subtle differences and diversity of different cultures and social milieu hidden between lines.
3.5.3 Process drama in language classes

Unavoidably, processes involved in language learning can be uncomfortable for some people. There is a fundamental difference between learning a language, compared to learning another skill or knowledge (MacIntyre, 1999). As Young (1999a) suggested, success and failure of language learning can be associated with learners’ identities, self-esteem, characters and personalities rather than solely with the developmental nature of the learning process itself. Therefore, “… language and self are so closely bound, if not identical, that an attack on one is an attack on the other” (MacIntyre, 1999, p. 33). Self-identity is developed along with complex and diverse sociocultural interactions and relations with others. Therefore, drama as one of the commonly used art forms, promotes interpersonal relationships and helps construct learners’ knowledge and skills through individual learning trajectories (Reagan & Osborn, 2002). Bolton (1979) further argued that drama helps change learners’ affective and cognitive values.

Many scholars thus suggest borrowing elements from theatre, such as timing and the ability to create anticipation, drama and excitement for language learning classes. Research with reference to sociocultural theory usually aims to understand the relationship between human mental functioning and cultural, historical and institutional setting (Wertsch, 1995). Moreover, Lantolf (2004) and Thorne (2005) asserted that social context, human agency and culturally constructed artefacts should all be recognised when applying sociocultural theory. Thus, while many uses of process drama techniques can be understood through sociocultural theory, EFL teachers should then integrate issues occurring outside of class with the drama construct, techniques and themes in class more often (Ehrman & Dörnyei, 1998). This kind of teaching demands intelligent orchestration.
Through spontaneous social interactions and exploration of issues that are significant
to characters that participants play, it is likely that the participants can contribute
actively to create a unique experience. The experience is gained by processing
dramatic events and using a target language. Additionally, Evans (1984) suggested
that process drama helps students adopt and prepare for roles that they may have to
play later in their real lives and experience things they rarely experience in a
conventional classroom. Therefore, if language learning classes are static and
unattractive, students might easily have erroneous beliefs or impression about
language learning, which might accompany creating anxiety about success to the
extent that the affective variables, such as anxiety, impede the development of L2
fluency and performance (Horwitz et al., 1991).

Regarding the effects of affective variables in drama-oriented classes, researchers or
educators have different perspectives. Heathcote (1980) held a positive attitude about
the function of tension arising from dramatic situations and regarded it as necessary
for language learning:

Each situation has its own frame, which can demand shifts of
style in delivery, purpose of the language, whether public (highly
selective) or private (exploratory), degree of precision, and
selection of specialised vocabulary. All the variety and
restrictions arise from meaningful productive tension, for the
situations are human and must be struggled through. (p. 22)

While some researchers consider language anxiety as merely ‘a by-product of
students’ cognitive deficits’ (Dörnyei, 2005, pp. 199-200), MacIntyre (1999) and
Horwitz et al. (1991), contested this was an overly simplified view of language
anxiety. MacIntyre (1999) found that language anxiety involves the “worry and
negative emotional reaction aroused when learning or using a second language” (p.
He also offered research evidence that language anxiety is distinct from more general types of anxiety.

Horwitz et al. (1991) further conceptualised an anxiety construct, which they called ‘foreign language anxiety’, stemming from the learners’ current interlanguage stage. They described language learners’ psychological state as complex due to the uniqueness of the language learning process. Tsui (1996) argued that this uniqueness lies in performing in a language that learners are still trying to command. Other researchers such as Arnold and Brown (1999) and Tsui (1996) claimed the importance and the pervasive influence of language anxiety for ESL/EFL students’ learning, with language anxiety relating to second or foreign language learning the most.

Gardner (1985) and MacIntyre (1999) contended that anxiety can be the strongest negative correlation for language achievement. Some researchers have claimed that high language anxiety may cause L2 learners’ low performance (Arnold & Brown, 1999; Dörnyei, 2005; Young, 1999). Conversely, others contend that some degree of anxiety can actually be helpful for language learning (Brown, 2000; Ehrman, 1994). In light of how language learners relate to language learning anxiety, Tsui (1996) and Allwright and Bailey (1991) observed that competent students possibly become anxious and modest toward their language competence due to peer pressure. They might not want to be resented by the class or to stand out from their peers. In comparison, Liu (1989) found that students with poor language proficiency scored higher in anxiety tests while the ones with good language proficiency scored lower. With such different research results about language learning anxiety, further research into language learning should be undertaken.
In terms of alleviating anxiety, researchers of process drama (Bolton, 1984; Bowell & Heap, 2001; Heathcote & Bolton, 1995; Kao & O'Neill, 1998) have contended that the educational purpose of drama is to help students become aware of what they already know but may not yet realise they know. This holds promise for EFL learners. For example, a feature of process drama, group role-play, provides support for EFL learners to become aware of and deal with insecurities and inadequacies in using English by cooperating with group members. It also endows the learners with opportunities to engage in drama with both their individual and group emotions, intelligence and imagination (Kao & O'Neill, 1998). Heathcote (1980) emphasised that one cannot be forced to commit to a particular viewpoint, but if they are put in a position to respond, they may begin to entertain a different perspective in order to solve problems, argue, persuade or simply offer opinions. As Johnson (1988) indicated, students’ degree of control over and engagement in class activities will produce optimal results for L2 learners in listening and speaking.
3.6 Language Learning and Language Use Strategies

Since English communicative competence is essential in an EFL context (Lee, 2004; Scott & Liu Chen, 2004; Sommers, 2009; Tseng, 2008), oral communication strategies (OCSs) then become useful vehicles to accommodate and supplement inadequate language knowledge and skills in oral communication (Dörnyei, 1995; Nakatani, 2005; Tarone, 1977, 1980, 1981). However, before entering discussions of OCSs, strategy types that are relevant but can be somewhat confusing when referring to second language acquisition, such as language learning strategies and language use strategies, need to be explained.

Cohen (1996) affirmed a distinction between language use and language learning strategies. The notion of language learning strategies conveys “an explicit goal of assisting learners in improving their knowledge in a target language” (pp. 1-2). Namely, they are used to facilitate learning. They include four categories: cognitive, metacognitive, social and affective (Chamot & O’Malley, 1996; O’Malley & Chamot, 1990). Chamot and O’Malley (1994) further added that language learning strategies help develop and promote students’ autonomy and self-regulation. Language use strategies, such as communication strategies, focus primarily on the function of negotiating meaning in a conversational exchange (Tarone, 1980), or of “employing the language that learners have in their current interlanguage” (Cohen, 1996, p. 2). They convey the following strategies: retrieval, rehearsal, cover, and communication.

Anderson (2005) argued that learners free their cognitive capacity and implemented more cognitive and metacognitive strategies if moving from thinking about the language per se to knowing how to use it. Anderson hypothesised that once a learner
understands how to use strategies to help his or her communication, metacognitive knowledge about strategic processes play a significant role, and oral language proficiency proceeds at a quick pace. Skehan (1989), Vann and Abraham (1990) and Wenden (1998) also emphasised the importance for learners to be metacognitively aware of what they are doing while applying any learning strategy. Anderson contended that since learners often need to orchestrate more than one strategy for a communicative act in their L2, their use of strategies ought to be conscious and observable.

According to Oxford and Leaver (1996), most efforts from the 1950s through to the 1980s were spent on defining what and how good language learners achieve their goals, rather than considering methods to instruct all students to be good language learners. Good language learners were defined as students who could successfully and effectively employ appropriate language learning and use strategies to compensate and improve their drawbacks and weaknesses (Green & Oxford, 1995; MacIntyre & Noels, 1994; Oxford & Nyikos, 1989).

Studies on good language learners led researchers to define and develop strategy inventories. This resulted in some well-known and commonly used language learning and use strategy inventories, such as Oxford’s (1990) Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL), and Tarone’s (1981), Faerch and Kasper’s (1983), Paribakht’s (1985) and Dörnyei’s (1995) inventories. The study of strategy inventories later led many researchers to further investigate the teachability of strategies in different ESL/EFL contexts (Cohen & Macaro, 2007; Dörnyei, 1995; Oxford, 1996; Savignon & Wang, 2003).
The major difference between language learning strategies (LLSs) and communication strategies (CSs) according to some schools (Bialystok, 1978; Faerch, Haastrup, & Phillipson, 1984; Oxford, 1996; Tarone, 1980), is that the purpose of using LLS is not to communicate but to learn. There are of course researchers who believe that CSs are not especially useful for communication between two different linguistic constructs or cultures (Tarone, 1981). To take Canale and Swain (1980) for example, they proposed a broader definition of communicative competence, which includes linguistic, sociolinguistic and strategic competence. CSs, in their views, are confined to two interlocutors attempting to agree on a meaning based on a shared knowledge of social norms. In short, ‘the interactional function of CSs’ (Tarone, 1981, p. 288) can be overlooked and thus is not particularly emphasised for serving communication between two interlocutors who share different linguistic or sociocultural systems.

As in real communication situations for ESL/EFL learners, CSs play an important role in mediating and transforming knowledge between input exposure and output performance generated from the interlocutor’s different linguistic background (Bialystok, 1978; Faerch et al., 1984). However, because communication strategies may be regarded as one of the sub-categories of communicative competence (Faerch et al., 1984), insufficient research has been done to explore how EFL learners in particular perceive and use strategies while orally interacting with others who might also come from the same or similar sociocultural background (Nakatani, 2006). A detailed and comprehensive strategy inventory designed for EFL participants is thus expected to lead to a thorough understanding and analysis of their strategic actions.
3.7 Oral Communication Strategies

3.7.1 Definition and value

Oral communication, which is comprised of the integrated use of speaking and listening skills, is typically reciprocal. However, both language skills can easily be marginalised in second and foreign language teaching and research. As Bygate (2001) observed, “For nearly 20 years the TESOL convention has run annual colloquia on the teaching of reading and writing, but not on speaking and listening” (p.14). Due to modern technology, many teachers and language experts now acknowledge that speaking and listening have gradually emerged as special areas in language pedagogy, rather than just a part of other language approaches, such as the direct method or the audio-lingual approach.

Moving from a focus on the characteristics of speaking and listening to how exactly learners are processing their learning of oral communication, many researchers of the twenty-first century have drawn their attention to the development of language tasks and strategy training in classrooms (Bygate, 2001; Cohen, 1998; Rost, 2001). Even though there has been increasing research pertaining to English oral communication in the past three decades (Dörnyei & Scott, 1997; Kellerman & Bialystok, 1997; Nakatani, 2005, 2006; Nakatani & Goh, 2007), research into EFL learners’ oral communication strategies and how they can be trained to effectively use these, is still in its infancy (Hassan et al., 2005a).

Paris, Lipson, and Wixson (1983) introduced the term, conditional knowledge, and differentiated it from declarative and procedural knowledge. In the past decade, Anderson (2010) explored conditional knowledge as knowledge about when to perform various cognitive activities. In order to gain procedural knowledge,
Tileston’s (2004) suggestion is similar to the concept of ZPD in that teachers need to assess a student’s ability and then provide suitable and sufficient practice for their learning to become a part of long-term memory. She also contended that procedural memory, also known as motor memory (such as memory of how to ride a bicycle, which is highly likely to be recalled), can be formed when one adds movement to learning. Teaching strategies that may reinforce this memory system include role-playing, drama, debates, hands-on activities or group activities. Moreover, since the brain constructs meaning through relevance, emotion, patterns or connections, elaborate rehearsal works can help students acquire declarative knowledge as well as enhance their performance in gaining conditional knowledge (Anderson, 2010).

Similarly, Anderson (2005) and Riley and Harsch (1999) observed that language learners, especially effective language learners, know how and when to use proper strategies to cope with different contexts. The differences between successful and less successful learners lies in whether they are aware of what strategies can be best used in specific situations or for tasks (H.-H. Gao, 2000; Wu & Gitsaki, 2009). Anderson’s (1991) research suggested that there are no good or bad strategies but only good or bad strategy application.

Less proficient L2 learners have been observed to have a narrow repertoire of strategies and draw them less effectively to accomplish L2 tasks (Green & Oxford, 1995; Oxford, Cho, Leung, & Kim, 2004; Wu & Gitsaki, 2009). Wu and Gitsaki’s research (2009) with 94 Taiwanese Junior College students in high- and low-proficiency groups found that high-proficiency learners take an active role in enhancing their oral communication ability and enjoy learning from making mistakes, but low-proficiency learners hold a passive attitude toward English
interactions and engage less in speaking in order to make fewer mistakes and so secure their self-esteem. Teenage learners’ subtle psychological conditions intertwined with their social and educational environments and it has been suggested that these influence their use of OCSs (Kao & O'Neill, 1998). Thus, training of OCSs for EFL learners needs to take heed of their affective variables and consider how the training can help attend to their psychological situations. For example, language anxiety is one of the affective variables that commonly impacts on EFL learners. While there is positive and negative language anxiety (Horwitz, 1995; Horwitz et al., 1991), it would be worthwhile to investigate how different kinds of anxiety drive or affect the use of OCSs.

3.8 Classifications

Many researchers of communication strategies have developed and used divergent definitions and inventories, while Oxford’s (1990) SILL has been used as a principal instrument for many language learning strategy studies. The earliest researchers, such as Savignon (1972), Selinker (1972) and Váradi (1973/1980), coined the term ‘communication strategies’ (CSs). Later Tarone and her associates (Tarone, 1977; Tarone, Cohen, & Dumas, 1976) first systematised categories and definitions of CSs, such as avoidance, paraphrase, conscious transfer, appeal for assistance and mime. Their taxonomies were influential in much subsequent CS research.

After Tarone (1977), diverse strategy inventories started to develop (Bongaerts & Poulisse, 1989; Politzer, 1983; Politzer & McGroarty, 1985). Politzer’s (1983) five-point self-report questionnaire consisted of three parts: general behaviours, classroom behaviours and interaction behaviours. The reliability of the three parts was estimated by Cronbach’s alpha (.77, .75 and .72 for each), but information about
validity was not presented. How the items of the scale were developed was also not clearly shown. Politzer did not specify and examine learners’ actual strategy use in a real learning task but only dealt with general perceptions among learners. Later,

Politzer and McGroarty (1985) developed another yes-no self-report questionnaire consisting of classroom behaviours, individual study and oral communication strategy use outside the classroom. However, the development of their inventory was criticised by Nakatani (2006) because it was not based upon any unified psychological construct, and that its reliability and validity measures were not discussed. In the second half of the 1980s, a group of Dutch researchers from Nijmegen University became influential in this field (e.g., Bongaerts, Kellerman & Poulisse). The Nijmegen Groups’ empirical projects pointed out some previously unknown features of CS use and challenged other research, such as Canale and Swain’s (1980) and Faerch and Kasper’s (1983) inventories. Some specific strategies the Nijmegen Group defined, such as approximation, circumlocution, word-coinage, literal translation, code-switching or foreignizing, later became pervasive and have often been included in other inventories.

In the 1990s, Dörnyei (1995) synthesised the strategies discussed above into two groups for his own CS inventory. They were reduction or avoidance strategies and achievement or compensatory strategies. He was the first to categorise message abandonment and topic avoidance under the avoidance or reduction strategies. His achievement and compensatory strategies were comprised of nine items: circumlocution, approximation, use of all-purpose words, word-coinage, use of non-linguistic means, literal translation, foreignizing, code-switching and appeal for help. Dörnyei’s inventory is a simple and easy-to-understand model for CSs. Participants
in the strategy training of his study showed an increase in the quality and quantity of strategy use and in their overall speech performance. However, according to Davies (2006), when a closer examination is taken of the inventory, additional modification might be in need for specific groups of learners, such as EFL students in some Asian regions, who might be inhibited in expressing opinions or feelings due to their unique sociocultural backgrounds. An inventory which can accurately examine target participants would more likely provide a thorough analysis. Other limitations of his study observed by Davies were that it did not focus on learners’ oral interaction with others but only on individual performance problems, and that the researcher did not address clearly enough about how strategy training could be integrated into a curriculum or program for developing strategic competence.

Another inventory for specifically examining EFL learners’ oral communication strategies in the EFL context was Nakatani’s (2006) Oral Communication Strategy Inventory (OCSI), which contained two parts: strategies for coping with speaking and listening problems. The OCSI was constructed with reference to the widely recognised inventories of Bialystok’s (1990), Dörnyei and Scott’s (1997), Faerch and Kasper’s (1983) and Tarone’s (1981). The reliability of the 32 items addressing strategies for coping with speaking problems was examined by Cronbach’s alpha. A highly acceptable internal consistency (alpha=0.86) was generated. The reliability of the 26 items for coping with listening problems was 0.85, a highly acceptable coefficient alpha as well. The researcher further examined and compared the validity of the two parts of the OCSI with the total use of strategies on the SILL. Significant correlations were found between the two scales (Nakatani, 2006). The validity of the OCSI was then recognised because the SILL has been examined abundantly and is regarded as an established scale for language learning strategies.
There were 15 factors classified for the total 58 items of the OCSI. Eight factors were used to categorise the specific strategies for coping with speaking problems. They were social affective strategies, fluency-oriented strategies, negotiation for meaning while speaking, accuracy-oriented strategies, message reduction and alteration strategies, nonverbal strategies while speaking, message abandonment strategies, and attempts to think in English strategies. Seven factors were formed with the items for coping with listening problems. They were negotiation for meaning while listening, fluency-maintaining strategies, scanning strategies, getting the gist strategies, nonverbal strategies while listening, less active listener strategies, and word-oriented strategies. While the SILL consists of predominantly so-called good language learner strategies, the OCSI was created to measure all kinds of strategies for oral communication tasks.

Unlike the SILL which refers to language learning strategies in a broad sense, Nakatani’s OCSI focuses only on the use of OCSs in EFL contexts. Wu and Gitsaki (2007) later added two more strategy items to supplement the original OCSI for their research context in Taiwan: foreignizing and word-coinage, borrowed from Dörnyei’s (1995) inventory. The two crucial strategies were absent from the OCSI, but they have been commonly used by many foreign language learners. Such an adaptation would complement and enrich the OCSI and is unlikely to influence the overall validity of the inventory (Davies, 2006). However, Hsiao & Oxford (2002) noted that once the strategy inventories were conducted in different sociocultural contexts with different groups of participants, factor analyses ought to be implemented for valid and reliable data analysis work. Since participants may underestimate their use on a questionnaire (Nakatani, 2006), Nakatani strongly recommended comparing and supplementing results of the OCSI with other valid
data, such as interview data, retrospective verbal reports, actual discourse data and videotaped performances, in order to fulfil research goals.

3.9 Relevant Studies and Their Limitations

There have been limited studies solely investigating the use of OCSs in EFL contexts. Thus, for this study, research relevant to LLSs, CSs, EFL learners, testing EFL learners’ oracy with the theoretical positions discussed in the proceeding chapter will be explored and reviewed abundantly.

First of all, for studies into non-Asian EFL learners’ employment of language learning strategies, Green and Oxford (1995) investigated 374 university students from the University of Puerto Rico (178 females & 196 males) according to proficiency levels of different classes. Khalil (2005) studied the use of language learning strategies of 378 Palestinian EFL learners in two groups (194 tenth graders and 184 freshman tertiary level students). Both studies used a two-way ANOVA to determine variations in the means of reported strategy use across the entire SILL as well as that of each of the six categories of the SILL by language proficiency level and gender. Their studies reported alike that high language proficiency learners employ more strategies as well as specific language strategies, such as cognitive, compensation, social and metacognitive strategies.

However, Nisbet, Tindall and Arroyo’s (2005) study of 168 Chinese junior university students majoring in English generated the opposite results. They revealed that there was minimal correlation between learning strategies and proficiency. They used Pearson correlations to examine relationships among six categories of the SILL, total learning strategies, and L2 proficiency. Only the category of metacognitive strategies was significantly correlated with their participants’ TOEFL scores and was
significantly predictive of language proficiency. The six categories of the SILL were significantly correlated with each other and with the total learning strategies score.

Huang and Van Naerssen (1987) investigated 60 university English major students’ learning strategies of EFL in China and gave oral tests, interviews and a learning strategy questionnaire in which the students were asked about the frequency of how they employed a particular strategy. Interviews in this study compensated for faults inherent in the questionnaire measurement and provided different perspectives on the examination of strategies and oral communication abilities. The intercorrelation analysis showed that the two variables, practice in reading and speaking correlated at a highly significant level. Reading was the strongest indicator of oral proficiency. Their study showed the complexity of how memorisation would influence oracy and confidence, but there was no significance shown in terms of that relationship.

Moreover, the researchers suggested providing situations in which students could learn and use target languages purposefully and meaningfully, and argued that less successful Chinese EFL learners might especially benefit from that kind of classroom environment. Their use of strategies might be weak but it should still be encouraged even if the successes were limited. Their study reported that more successful students employed more functional practice strategies than less successful ones, and the former learners regarded making mistakes as a necessary experience they used to enhance their proficiency. Yet, in the interviews, unsuccessful learners contended that successful techniques used by their counterparts might not work for them.

Other than Huang and Van Naerssen’s study, Gao’s (2000) research also targeted Chinese university students (164 English to non-English majors and freshmen to postgraduate students from two universities in China), and attempted to explore the
relationships between different levels of language proficiency and five types of communication strategies (four achievement strategies and one reduction strategy). Two investigative instruments, a questionnaire and an interview designed by the researcher, were used. The interview found that some Chinese students faced the dilemma of whether to use reduction strategies (namely, strategies such as simplifying sentences or giving up certain topics or sentence patterns) while encountering communicative barriers. They seemed to be aware of the disadvantages of using too many reduction strategies that might not help enhance their language proficiency (e.g., use only ‘well’ or ‘you know’, not ‘to be quite honest’, etc), but they still felt the need to employ them in order to reduce their anxiety and communication errors. In short, less proficient students used more reduction strategies than more proficient ones due to their restricted lexical ability. More proficient language learners were able to use more L2-based strategies. Moreover, students who used achievement strategies reported they were more aware of their weaknesses in oral communication than the ones using reduction strategies.

Yang’s (1996) study showed Taiwanese EFL learners’ increasing use of cognitive and memory strategies of an adapted SILL after a semester of language strategy training. Moreover, the hypothesis that students’ strategy use would change after the training was supported in the post-test. Yang’s (1996) research found that cognitive awareness could be effectively cultivated to increase learners’ strategy use. Her participants who were aware of strategy use were able to determine when and what language learning strategies to use, and they were also usually successful and effective in language learning.
This study involved 68 freshmen from two major universities in Taiwan (38 English majors: 19 males and 19 females and 30 Sociology majors: 7 males and 23 females) completed an English learning questionnaire. Sixty four students (37 English majors: 18 males and 19 females and 27 Sociology majors: 4 males and 23 females) participated in interviews. She emphasised that the use of interviews would not only help identify which language learning strategies were used for what tasks, but could also help reveal how and why certain strategies were used. With regard to her strategy training design, only interactive discussions in group interviews were implemented during the semester. There was no complex or more complete training plans involved. However, the researcher noticed several strategy training and instruction principles from other research (O'Malley & Chamot, 1990; Oxford, 1990; Wenden & Rubin, 1987) and her own (Yang, 1996), which could be useful for future studies.

First, Yang argued that it is essential to diagnose what students are thinking and doing in their studying processes by instruments like questionnaires, diaries, think-aloud methods and interviews. Teachers’ explicit explaining and modelling of strategies as well as how, when and where students should employ strategies can help students transfer and apply strategies to real contexts. Moreover, strategy training should be integrated with regular instruction over an extended period of time and into content-based language curricula, instead of implementing the training in a separate intensive course. She also contended the importance of applying communicative and interactive approaches to language learning for strategy training and providing authentic contexts for strategy use. Teacher and peer scaffolding approaches and affective support would also help students engage in training and generate better learning efficacy. Lastly, group or in-class discussions and reflection
on one’s own strategy use would provide helpful feedback and references for revision of future training.

Another experimental study conducted with Taiwanese EFL learners about their use of language strategies and affective change after strategy training was Huang’s (2001) research. She studied Taiwanese university students aged from 18 to 23, in a control (12 freshmen) and an experimental (35 freshmen) group. This research focused on how training of language learning strategy helped the participants’ development in English proficiency, as well as the use of learning strategies and their affective domain before and after the training course. The experimental group took a language learning strategy-training course and the other did not. She conducted four tests: the Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL), the Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL), the Motivational Intensity Questionnaire (MIQ) and the Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale (FLCAS). For the FLCAS, she replaced ‘foreign language’ in each item with ‘English’. The researcher argued that there were rather limited empirical studies exploring issues of strategy training while there had been increased interest in studying language learning strategy in Taiwan. Therefore, the findings of her research could be useful for this present study. The major findings of her study are summarised below.

The participants who did not receive the strategy training did not show significant improvement in four variables: language proficiency, learning motivational intensity, strategy use and learning anxiety level. There was a significant increase in English proficiency for the experimental group but not for the control. The results of the study showed that the experimental group had a significant increase in motivation from the pre-test to the post-test unlike the control group. The experimental group
also used significantly more strategies than the control after the training, but the control did not show significantly more frequent use of learning strategies. Rather, the control group decreased their use of metacognitive, social and affective strategies. Moreover, the control group did not show a significant decrease in English learning anxiety levels, but the experimental group did.

Although O’Malley’s (1987) research found that Asian students in the treatment group performed worse than those in the control group, he explained such a result with his treatment group’s persistence in only using familiar strategies. To improve the research design, Huang (2001) took O’Malley’s suggestion and added more training hours to her experimental group and obtained significant results for the experimental group as seen above. Huang further suggested that the training format should be made to cope with the goals of training programs, and language strategy training should not be independent from language training courses. In other words, Huang concluded that students’ learning and performance would be more effective if both kinds of training were combined or integrated.

Hsiao and Oxford (2002) analysed and compared different learning strategy classification systems with Oxford’s SILL. Data from 517 Taiwanese college students was collected for the research. The researchers concluded that Oxford’s classification of six strategy factors for the SILL should not be subsumed under two broad types of strategies, direct and indirect strategies. They admitted that it would be necessary to reclassify certain strategy items in order to increase the reliability of a scale when the scale is conducted in different contexts. It was suggested that properly modified inventories would be statistically useful in data analyses. They contended that their modified theory would be more reliable for exploring how
learners reportedly use strategies to aid L2 learning than other systems, such as Rubin’s (1981) and O’Malley and Chamot’s (1990) classification theories. This has implications for future studies of EFL learners and their context as well as L2 learning and use strategies.

The first implication for future studies is to differentiate language learning and use strategies for L2 learners. The researchers have argued that although L2 learning and L2 use are not identical, strategies for both overlap in many areas. Especially for beginning and intermediate learners, learning and use strategies may occur simultaneously. While the SILL was designed to assess a broad variety of general L2 learning strategies, the researchers have suggested exploring the practical value of L2 use strategies for specific purposes in the future. Secondly, the researchers have pointed out differences between conducting instruments or research in ESL or EFL contexts. For example, answering one of the SILL items, “I ask English speakers to correct me when I talk” would be unlikely and impractical for EFL learners because an EFL setting does not provide as many opportunities to talk to native English speakers as an ESL context does. Green and Oxford (1995) also found that ESL and EFL learners might use strategies differently due to their learning environments. Oxford and her associates also planned to uncover the influence of ESL and EFL environments on strategy use through large-scale investigations around the world (Hsiao & Oxford, 2002).

Lastly, Hsiao and Oxford (2002) regarded task-based strategy measurement as a future trend for complementing a strategy survey. It was argued by the researchers that strategy assessment tools conveying the design of L2 learning tasks could more specifically and accurately elicit results from respondents than a generic instrument.
The respondents would naturally judge the strategies based on different L2 tasks. This would create a task-based strategy survey for responding which would be a practical approach, providing immediate pedagogical benefits.

O’Malley, Chamot, Stewner-Manzares, Russo, and Kupper’s (1985) study trained ESL learners in classroom contexts and integrated tasks involving listening, speaking and vocabulary training with teaching of metacognitive, cognitive and social/affective strategies. They found that the strategy training had a significant effect on promoting speaking but was not significant on performance in listening and vocabulary tasks. With the mixed findings, they concluded that the success of such an instruction or training of strategies is not always predictable. Besides, because their study did not include conversations for their task-training, it would be hard to investigate the effects of the strategy training on the learners’ conversational interaction.

In Cohen, Weaver, and Li’s (1998) study of 55 intermediate foreign language learners in the U. S. several instruments for measurement were used: the SILL, three speaking tasks, strategy checklists and verbal report protocols (namely think-aloud protocols). They focused their strategy interventionist study on speaking because “this area had received limited attention in the research literature on strategy interventionist studies, although it is in many cases the most critical language skill of all” (p.114). In their study, both treatment and comparison groups filled out a pre-treatment questionnaire and performed a series of three speaking tasks on a pre-post basis, in which about 15 minutes was given to the three tasks: self-description, story retelling and city description. This was accompanied by the completion of the SILL and strategy checklists after completing each of the tasks. A few minutes would also
be given for participants to prepare for each task. Twenty-one participants of both groups also needed to provide verbal report data while filling out the post-test strategy checklists. They had to give their rationale for their responses to items and their reactions to the checklist instruments. Separate audiotapes were used to record the three speaking tasks at the participants’ individual consoles and the verbal reports while they were filling out each of the three checklists. How to do the verbal report while performing the checklist tasks was demonstrated with a recorded sample of how a participant could complete both tasks at the same time.

The effects of strategies-based instruction and a link between strategies and their use in specific language tasks were explored specifically in Cohen, Weaver and Li’s (1998) ten-week language course and study. The results showed that the participants who received strategy training outperformed the comparison group on the third speaking task, city description, in the post-tests. The checklists suggested that high-proficiency students did not always use more strategies than low-proficiency ones. Moreover, there was a complex relationship between reported frequency of strategy use and rating of task performance in the pre- and post-tests. The experimental group primarily used language use strategies, such as preparatory strategies (e.g., translating specific words, writing out sentences or practising the pronunciation of words) and monitoring strategies (e.g., monitoring for grammar or paying attention to the pronunciation of words). The comparison group also used more language use strategies (namely, communication strategies), such as attention to pronunciation, use of paraphrasing, and positive self-talk, which were not used by the experimental participants.
From these findings, the researchers provided a possible explanation, namely, even without extensive strategy training some resourceful learners might also be able to use strategies effectively. They also revealed that most of the negative correlations were found in the comparison group data, and suggested that the comparison group participants were less adept at using certain strategies to their benefit due to the lack of systematic training and practice in strategy use. The researchers recognised the supplementary use of verbal report protocols with the checklists because the participants revealed their affective insights by verbal reports, which were not easily shown on strategy checklists.

The limitations of this study, however, were numerous. They included the small sample size of the study and the fact that the students were not randomly assigned to the two groups due to scheduling constraints. In addition, the teachers of the two groups had different professional backgrounds, which might have influenced their teaching style. The checklists might suggest strategies to the comparison group, although the power of suggestion alone was claimed to be rather mild for the participants when choosing to utilise strategies. Besides, there was still a need to refine the checklists as well, for their reliability and validity was not rigorously confirmed. Most importantly, the study did not fully reflect genuine interactional aspects of oral production, and only the individual’s one-way speech acts were audio-taped and studied. Whether genuine communicative competence could be examined is also in doubt, as the speaking tasks were semi-directed due to the provision of prompts and glossaries of target or unfamiliar words and phrases to the participants before beginning the second and third tasks. A few minutes were also given to the participants before they started their individual recordings. In short, in spite of a number of studies being conducted in this area, over the last few decades
there has been insufficiently rigorous research focusing on the interactional aspects of oral communication (e.g., negotiation behaviours for coping with communication breakdowns) for foreign language learners.

Strategy training is another area that has caught the attention of researchers. For example, Nakatani’s (Nakatani, 2005, 2006; Nakatani & Goh, 2007) work has been representative of attempts to determine how strategies for oral production are used by EFL learners in actual oral communication tasks. These studies explored EFL learners’ English oral interactions. As Nakatani (2005, p. 87) noted “Given that EFL learners tend to face many communication breakdowns, they need to acquire such skills in order to maintain and develop their conversational interactions”. Since oral communication has long been a weak language skill for many Asian EFL learners, how OCSs help complete or promote English communicative tasks has drawn EFL researchers’ attention.

Because OCSs have not been as recognised and studied to the degree that language learning strategies were in the past decades, there have been limited studies about OCSs available for review. Nakatani (2002) distinguished OCSs from CSs particularly for EFL learners’ needs, which were different from ESL learners’ requirements due to different sociocultural environments and types of stimulation. Japanese EFL learners’ perspectives and their practical communicative problems have been taken into account in Nakatani’s (2005, 2006) OCS related studies.

Nakatani’s (2005) work using his self-established assessment scale (including 28 individual standards in seven levels), transcription and retrospective protocols found that once EFL learners’ general awareness of OCSs increased, the participants’ oral proficiency test scores would rise. Moreover, only the participants who received
strategy training became aware of how to use achievement strategies and avoid reduction strategies. Nakatani (2006) later established a larger and more complex inventory in order to assess learners’ strategy use for oral communication tasks in EFL contexts. His 58-item Oral Communication Strategy Inventory (OCSI) examined EFL Japanese college students in high and low oral proficiency groups immediately after task-based oral tests (namely, simulated conversations in which the role of a customer and a travel agent were both played by students).

His results showed that speakers with a higher proficiency in English significantly used the following three strategies to deal with speaking problems more frequently than the other group: social affective strategies, fluency-oriented strategies and negotiation for meaning. For coping with listening problems, only one category: fluency-maintaining strategies, was used significantly by the high oral proficiency group. Nakatani (2005) explained this discrepancy due to the fact that the task focused mainly on speaking ability. He further contended that by diagnosis of the OCSI, students’ attitudes could be examined. For example, students who reported using negative strategies (e.g., message abandonment strategies) might frequently be ineffective strategy users in oral communication. With regards to limitations and recommendations about the study, the gender of participants should also be considered in future research as this variable had affected the use of strategies in previous studies (Green & Oxford, 1995; Oxford & Nyikos, 1989). Moreover, other types of communicative tasks should be carried out to investigate their effects on OCSI, and the OCSI used for diagnostic purposes in order to help learners raise their awareness of efficient strategies as well as their weaknesses in strategy use. Nakatani emphasised the need to combine several assessment methods for data collection in order to compensate for problems inherent in the questionnaire method.
3.10 Focus and Research Questions

Given that EFL learners usually have insufficient opportunities to use English in their environment and frequently have oral communication difficulties in English, appropriate strategies and strategy training are needed to improve EFL educational outcomes. Nunan’s (1996a) study observed that strategy training can be valuable because there was limited time for most EFL learners to study and use English based on their curricula and social environment both in and out of schools. Nakatani (2006, p. 161) emphasised that the frequency of his Japanese participants’ strategy use depended not only on their proficiency levels but also on their specific classroom contexts. “Therefore it is important to assess carefully their strategy use in actual learning events and then to choose appropriate strategies for pedagogical purposes” (p.161).

In terms of Taiwanese EFL learners, they also tend to be inhibited while dealing with foreign language expression and communication due to various cultural and/or social factors (Fujii & Mackey, 2009; Shand, 2008; Yang, 1999a). Whether a more engaging pedagogy embedded in existing curricula would encourage learners to implement a larger variety of oral communication strategies frequently would thus warrant in-depth studies.

In order to engage EFL learners and help them cope with different cultural and social contexts, strategy training tasks and measurement tools need to be modified. Based on the preceding discussion, the value of process drama on EFL communication has been recommended in several studies and is underpinned by different theories.

Drama-assisted training for OCSs, however, has not yet been sufficiently investigated. Although all drama approaches help free learners’ bodies, emotions,
minds and thoughts, and lead them to experience a wider range of language uses, process drama still seems so far the most powerful vehicle to extend EFL learners’ imaginations and can be used to evoke engagement in L2 conversations (Kao et al., 2011; Stinson & Winston, 2011; Wu, 2012). Heathcote (1980) emphasised the usefulness of implementing a drama approach, such as process drama, to language learning and learners:

[T]he drama style of depiction gives many complex framings which in turn call forth a variety of language styles and purposes . . . Research into language and education has demonstrated the importance of experiences for children which provide meaningful contexts in which to use language for a variety of purposes. (pp.13-14)

Meaningful contexts and atmosphere produced from drama mediation, especially process drama, depend on the teacher’s efforts to structure and facilitate. When teachers play the role of facilitator, they also demonstrate and model the power of metacognitive awareness (Anderson, 2005). Students are therefore more likely to think more profoundly about what happens in their unique learning process and thus assume stronger cognitive skills as well.

To examine the precise effects of process drama-assisted OCS training for EFL learners, one primary and a secondary research question of three parts have been formed and frame the present study.

**Primary research question:**

(1). To what extent does process drama successfully induce greater frequency and / or greater variety of OCSs?

**Secondary research question components:**
(2) Where process drama successfully induces OCS actions from participants,

a). how do the participants describe its operation?

b). how do the participants account for its facilitation of more variety and/or more frequency of OCSs?

c). what value do the participants place on their increased variety and/or frequency of OCSs?
4 Method

4.1 Introduction

Researchers involved in interventionist strategy studies contend that the intervention needs to be integrated with existing curricula in order to elicit the intended results and valid effects (Cohen & Macaro, 2007; Yang, 1996). In particular, Yang’s (1996) study of awareness-raising in language learning strategy training with Taiwanese EFL learners, recommended providing authentic contexts for strategy use and to further make strategy training. To model and explain strategies explicitly, students’ affective factors should be accounted for in strategy training as she suggested. Oxford’s (1993) recommendations about how to implement strategy training were also used for the design of the research methods of this present study. For instance, strategy training should be integrated into L2 activities over a semester or a year rather than taught as a one-time short intervention. Training should involve authentic tasks and materials to facilitate the transfer of strategies. Students should help evaluate their own use of strategies through surveys and group interviews in order to raise learner-awareness and improve their motivation to use strategies effectively.

Accordingly, on the basis of the recommendations made by various researchers, it was assumed that participants would develop oral communication strategies (OCSs) that provided the basis for a comparison between groups in this study as they were learning and using a foreign language in class. Strategies have been regarded as tactics that learners are able to employ in learning. However, in many Taiwanese EFL contexts and curricula, exactly how to teach language learners more strategically in order to deal with their deficiencies in language application is not yet a major or officially-referenced part of what teachers undertake in planning, implementing and evaluating their teaching. Thus, in this study, the methods used
served the purpose of exploring and comparing the changes in EFL participants’ communicative performance, perspectives and affective factors after interventions. This was done using two drama approaches: process drama and scripted role-play.

Process drama was conducted in an experimental class with 38 enrolled students, of whom 26 consented to the research. The control class had 42 enrolled students, 27 of whom agreed to participate. The course for the two classes was “English Grammar”. The researcher had no control over which course had to be used. That decision was made externally as the course was designated to the teacher-researcher by the Department of Foreign Languages. Any course related to English learning and teaching would have been appropriate for the present research, for OCSs and drama techniques could be introduced to the classes and applied to English interlocution. The course design of “English Grammar” was adapted accordingly. The same topics were used in designing the three drama modules for the two groups.

Mixed-methods were applied to elicit results from the two classes in a comprehensive way. By collecting qualitative and quantitative data with seven instruments before and after the interventions, insiders’ voices and interactions within their learning context could then be validly observed and recorded and added to the overall picture provided from the survey.

A description and rationale for each instrument is provided later in the chapter. Pre- and post- research results were compared and contrasted within and across groups. Information about the setting, participants, instruments, intervention, procedure, ethical considerations and data analyses that describe the methods used also are provided below.
4.2 Setting

This study was conducted in a Junior College of Medicine and Management in Southern Taiwan. The researcher teaches at this institution and had been granted permission to use resources available there that related to her research proposal.

The second semester, when this study was conducted, began in the last week of February 2009 and ended by the third week of June. When they joined this study it was the participants’ second semester in the college.

This college is the second largest among Taiwan’s 14 public and private five-year colleges of medical care and related technology professions. Five-year colleges are vocational institutions as well as providing tertiary education even though the first three years are regarded as high school level. The completion of the last two years in a five-year college confers an Associate Bachelor degree to successful students.

In February 2009 there were eight departments in the college. The Departments of Nursing, Physical Therapy, Optometry, Medical Imaging Technology and Dental Laboratory Technology (with a total number of about 5000 students) trained professionals in medical services. The three that did not relate to medical care or medical technology professions are Departments of Applied Foreign Languages, Information Management and Early Childhood Care and Education (with a total number of 850 students). This study was designed to research medical students in this college. Although they were not English majors, English as a foreign language was a required subject for everyone in the first three years of study. The Basic English Grammar course, which was also an EFL course to help enhance students’ English proficiency, was provided to two medical student classes.
Due to limited available classrooms, the research was conducted in two rectangular cubic classroom spaces (approximately 8 meters long, 6 meters wide and 3 meters for the height) with 48 desk-chairs available in each room. Equipment and facilities in each classroom were a large blackboard, a projector hanging from the ceiling, a pull-down white screen set on the top of the blackboard, two lectern podiums (one with computer facilities) at the front, a front and a back door on the same side of a classroom, and large windows with curtains on one side and transoms on the other side. There were also three half-meter tall garbage bins and about a dozen brooms and mops in the back of each classroom.

The experimental and control groups’ classrooms faced each other, with a corridor between. In short, these spaces were quite crowded and not pre-arranged for students engaged in drama activities. Teachers had to rearrange chairs and desks to suit their respective needs for teaching. Most Taiwanese students at different educational levels have their courses in this kind of classroom setting, except for Physical Education or special laboratory classes.

Two Dental Laboratory Technology major classes were chosen because an English Grammar course was provided to both classes as an elective subject. As an elective course, the teacher had the discretion to adjust the curriculum to suit students’ learning progress and proficiency. The same discretion does not apply for required courses in Taiwan’s tertiary education system.

Thus, as the teacher-researcher, who was assigned an elective English Grammar course for the present research, I was able to implement the intervention as part of this discretion as well as to design my own teaching materials for students. My students had the option to withdraw from the course after the explanation of the
intervention was given. This was a challenge because subjects with fewer than 25 enrolled students typically are cancelled because of financial disadvantage for the college. Fortunately, the two classes remained sustainable under the College’s regulation. Experimental and control conditions were assigned randomly to each class.

4.3 Participants

There were 42 people enrolled in the control group class and 38 in the experimental class. After explaining the research, 26 people (23 females and 3 males) consented to participate in the experimental group and 27 (16 females and 11 males) in the control group. All the participants were tested with the same instruments. They were in their freshmen year and had first enrolled at the Junior College in September 2008, at an average age of 16 years. They were therefore still under parental or guardian care according to Taiwan’s Civil Law. Participants were mostly from low to medium socio-economic backgrounds. Thus, most of them could not afford to go to cram schools or hire tutors to enhance their English ability. Instead, some of them had started part-time jobs after school. Before they entered this Junior College, each of them had received at least three to four years of formal English instruction during elementary and junior high schools.

According to statistics provided by the Department of Applied Foreign Languages (AFL) (2008) at this Junior College, the average English proficiency scores of both the experimental and control classes, generated by the Junior High School Basic Academic Competence Exam, were 18.6 and 18.5 respectively over 60 points of full scores. Thus, average exam scores indicated a generally low level of English proficiency overall when participants entered this Junior College.
Before the research started, the participants received information sheets and informed consent sheets about the study for themselves and their guardians. Completed sheets were collected and stored by the teacher-researcher in compliance with ethical requirements. All participants’ data are retained in a safely locked cabinet for the use of this research only. Summaries of the research analyses and results will be provided to the participants following completion of the study.

4.4 Instruments

Seven instruments were used for the pre- and post-tests in this study. These were the modified Oral Communication Strategy Inventory (OCSI), oral-tests, self-report reflection survey, Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale (FLCAS), and semi-structured interviews with focus groups, logs and video excerpts. Questions and instructions used for the research were presented in both English and Mandarin (see Appendices A to F). Chinese translation of all instruments was proofread by a Chinese language expert to ensure fidelity. Moreover, the researcher’s native language is Chinese/Mandarin which helped in administering the instruments. Except for the oral tests, all participants were free to use Chinese-translated questionnaires or scales and communicated in either English or Chinese, as long as the communication was clear. Participants tended to use more Chinese than English with the instruments. The seven instruments are presented in the following section, in terms of what they were, in what context they were used and what they were designed to measure.
4.4.1 Questionnaire Based on an Adapted OCS Inventory

A 60-item inventory of oral communication strategies (OCSs) was adapted from Nakatani’s (2006) 58-item OCSI. By way of brief review of reasoning for this choice presented in Chapter 3, Nakatani (2006) had synthesised many earlier communication strategy taxonomies and produced his own inventory, specifically for testing EFL learners’ OCS use. Thus, I considered his OCSI as more suitable for examining Taiwanese EFL learners’ OCS use than other inventories.

This modified instrument consisted of two major sections: strategies for coping with speaking and listening problems. There were 34 strategies in eight sub-categories for coping with speaking problems, and 26 strategies in seven sub-categories for coping with listening problems. These were used to explore the variety and frequency of EFL participants’ OCS use before and after an intervention. It took about 30 to 40 minutes to complete the questionnaire. For the context of this study, foreignizing and word-coinage were added to the OCSI as Items 33 and 34 to complement the original OCSI. These two additions are based on strategies commonly used by Taiwanese EFL learners (Wu & Gitsaki, 2009) and therefore were crucial for this study. Items 6, 23, 48 and 49 were revised as well to provide the participants with additional or explicit examples and explanations in relation to the questions.

The original statement for Item 6 was “I abandon the execution of a verbal plan and just say some words when I don’t know what to say”. In the teacher-researcher’s experience with students at the Junior College, it was considered that the phrase, a verbal plan, could easily confuse EFL participants. So, the sentence was rephrased as: “When I don’t know what to say, I just say some words that might not be grammatically well-organised”. Item 23, “I try to use fillers when I cannot think of
what to say”, was inserted with an additional explanation: “e.g., well, you know. . .” behind the word *fillers* as a clarification. Item 48 was altered to the phrase, “give feedback (e.g., sounds like “Ah-ha!” or Hmmm. . .)” because the phrase, *send continuation signals*, was thought by the teacher-researcher as unlikely to carry a direct and clear meaning. A special strategic term, *circumlocution*, was used in Item 49. The teacher-researcher believed the term needed some illustration to clarify its meaning for the Junior College’s EFL learners. Therefore, an example was provided: “For instance, when a speaker says ‘Can you get me the corkscrew?’ I may ask the speaker ‘Do you mean the thing we use to open a bottle?’” This tactic of *circumlocution* could be useful in process drama activities, such as hot-seating or frozen images for language learners to use substitute vocabularies they were more familiar with to rephrase what they think others were saying in order to reassure communicative content. By and large, because there was no revision or editing of the core meaning, it is considered that these changes should not have influenced the reliability and validity of the original inventory as validated by Nakatani (2006). Such an adaptation helped the OCSI elicit valid results for the present study.

Moreover, the modified 60-item OCSI was designed with a 5-point Likert scale, with *(Always or Almost always true of me)* as the anchor point of 5 and *(Never or almost never true of me)* as the anchor point of 1. Participants needed to put only one tick on the 5-point scale for each statement to express their opinion. As Items 6, 24, 26, 32 and 42 were regarded as negative statements purposely posited in the inventory, these items were reversed in the scoring analysis of the OCSI (Brown & Rodgers, 2002; Gay et al., 2006). This questionnaire typically took participants about 10 to 15 minutes to complete.
The quantitative data collected from this instrument were analysed to see whether the significance of any difference showed up between the OCSs used by the two groups in terms of variety and frequency of OCS usage, as well as within-group differences for individuals across testing times.

### 4.4.2 Oral Tests

This instrument tested what OCSs participants used in real situations. Both pre- and post-oral tests (see Appendix B) were conducted face to face by the teacher-researcher. The tests were administered and videotaped before and after the intervention. Ten participants from each group received oral tests and then immediately completed a self-report reflection survey. The oral tests contained 4-picture cartoon strips and questions that were asked by the teacher-researcher.

Two sets of 4-picture cartoon strips were used (Grant, 1972; Perry & Aldridge, 1975) (see Appendix B). First, each participant needed to create and tell a story based on the set of strips they were given. Second, they were asked questions related to stories invented for each set. “Wh-” questions were asked for each set in order to induce participants’ creative thinking and in view of probabilities concerning limitations in their English proficiency, to provide some basis for evaluating their capacities for telling stories and answering questions with OCSs. In other words, the questions for each set of strips offered to each participant were open-ended in an attempt to reveal participants’ oral descriptive and responsive ability through authentic contexts. Questions for Grant’s (1972) cartoon strip were, “What meal do you think the boy is having?”, “Why do you think so?”, “Where does the monster come from?” and “What happened to the boy at the end?” For Perry and Aldridge’s (1975) strip,
questions such as “Who are bad people in this strip?”, “Why do you think so?” and “How do they feel at this time?” were asked by the teacher-researcher.

It took approximately 10 to 15 minutes to complete the oral-test. The two sets of strips were chosen from earlier work conducted in the 1970s to decrease the likelihood that participants might have seen any of the strips before the tests. All participants at the time of testing confirmed that they had not seen the strips previously. Moreover, with one eastern and one western background story, the choice of strips was designed to be culture-balanced for the EFL participants who might or might not be familiar with either culture.

There were three reasons for using 4-picture cartoon strips. First, the Taiwanese participants were familiar with the format of that kind of cartoon strips because it is seen in most local, regional and national newspapers or magazines. Therefore, it took little time for the teacher-researcher to explain how to read the strips. Moreover, strips had already been arranged in order by the authors. This helped the participants focus on how to communicate their stories to the teacher-researcher instead of on how to arrange shuffled pictures in chronological order for a story to be told. Third, four pictures usually provided sufficient resources for participants to create a short story. (2 to 3 minutes) Had only one picture been provided, it might have been inadequate material for participants to create their stories and for the teacher-researcher to evaluate. Thus, I considered these strips as effective in testing the participants’ oracy with OCSs.

An observation check-list for any meaningful data to be recorded about OCS verbal and nonverbal occurred in the pre- and post-oral tests was created based on the OCSI inventory for coping with speaking and listening problem (see Appendix M). The
video recording and data were to be reviewed and analysed by the teacher-researcher for the participants’ use the OCS frequency in authentic speech acts.

4.4.3 After-Task Reflection Survey

This instrument was used to gather participants’ self-reflections about the variety and frequency of OCSs they had been using in authentic oral communication, namely in the oral tests. The structure of this survey was based on the modified OCSI. The difference between the OCSI questionnaire and this survey lies in how the 60 strategies were grouped. In this survey, those strategies were grouped by the 15 sub-categories in the two major groups of listening and speaking strategies. It was designed so that both participants and the teacher-researcher could check what sub-categories they used most often while communicating in English. A section for tracking participants’ thoughts was provided at the end of each sub-category; this was not part of the OCSI questionnaire. Participants could tick certain strategies they had applied and write down their opinions and thoughts about their OCS use in this survey. It took about 5 to 15 minutes for them to complete this survey. If a participant only finished ticking the survey, it would usually only take them about 5 to 10 minutes. Writing about their thoughts on the thought-tracking sections in either English or Chinese might take about 3 to 5 extra minutes. This instrument provided two ways to capture the participants’ review and reflection upon their OCS used in oral tasks. Thus, I considered data generated from this tool would reveal participants’ genuine viewpoints. A sample survey is attached as Appendix C.
4.4.4 The Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale (FLCAS)

Horwitz, Horwitz and Cope’s (1991) 33-item FLCAS (see Appendix D) with a 5-point Likert Scale was administered to explore whether there were differences in the participants’ anxiety levels before and after the intervention, and what value participants placed on the facilitation of the intervention. The FLCAS has been widely used for testing anxiety levels while learning various foreign languages in classrooms. Since participants in this study were EFL students, this instrument was chosen because it was especially designed for evaluating anxiety in foreign language classrooms. It took about 15 to 20 minutes for participants to complete this questionnaire. Data generated by this instrument were used in answering Research Question 2 (c): Where process drama successfully induces OCS actions from participants, what value do the participants place on their increased variety and/or frequency of OCSs?

4.4.5 Semi-Structured Group Interviews

Semi-structured group interviews (see Appendix E) were conducted to collect qualitative data about participants’ motivations for using strategies in oral communication; their perceptions of integrating process drama or scripted role play in English oral communication strategy training, and, their perceptions of any changes in how they valued the oral communication strategies. Each group was comprised by six to 10 participants. Since it was not easy to have individual interviews because of participants’ tight course schedules, interviews were arranged based on what time participants had available and when groups could be convened. An interview usually took about 20 minutes. Interviews were recorded with digital recording facilities and were conducted both before and after the intervention.
4.4.6 Journals

All participants as well as the teacher-researcher were required to write logs over the nine weeks when the drama interventions were conducted. Each participant had at least nine log entries. The teacher-researcher also wrote nine journal pieces about her teaching and observations. The purpose for keeping a teacher’s journal entries was to provide perceptions about the participants’ class performance and to reflect the interventions conducted by the teacher. Journal writing sheets (see Appendix F) contained different pre-set questions for the participants and the teacher-researcher. Writing sheets in different colours (blue for the control, green for the experimental group and yellow for the teacher-researcher) were prepared for participants to use in the last five minutes of the two 50-minute sessions during all of the nine weeks. They also could use their break time to finish their journal entries.

Students used their journal entries to help reflect on the interventions and reveal as much information about their thoughts as possible. There was no limitation for the length of each question on a log. Due to the level of the participants’ language proficiency and their time, bullet points, drawings and Chinese characters were all allowed in the logs as long as the messages were clearly expressed to the teacher-researcher. It usually took participants 5 to 10 minutes to complete one log. Data gathered by journal writing mainly informed the teacher-researcher’s answers to Research Question 2 (a-c):

Where process drama successfully induces OCS actions from participants,

1. how do the participants describe its operation?
2. how do the participants account for its facilitation of more variety and/or more frequency of OCSs?
3. what value do the participants place on their increased variety and/or frequency of OCSs?
4.4.7 Video Recording

A camcorder was used to videotape one session of the intervention and the treatment of the third drama module. Due to constraints on human resources for videotaping in class, only one class of the third drama module was observed. When an intervention or treatment was applied to the third drama module, it was expected that there might be more to observe about class learning and interactive behaviours. Participants might be more conscious of what was happening in class and their own reaction to it. The data collected by this instrument helped answer the primary research question and to supplement the subset question of the third research question: “What value do the participants place on their increased variety and/or frequency of OCSs?” It was also expected that from repeatedly and objectively examining the video recording, subtle behaviours related to OCS use could be further noted. Also, if the videos demonstrated limited or no use of English by the participants, there would be no need to assess explicit oral or nonverbal use of OCSs. The protocol used for the analysis of the classroom observation videos was as follows:

1. Levels of interaction between the teacher and participants in the intervention in terms of the amount of inquiring and answering
2. Levels of interaction between peers in the intervention in terms of the amount of the target language and body language used
4.5 Intervention

A semester at the College consists of 18 weeks. However, excluding official mid-term and final exam weeks, there were 16 weeks available for conducting the intervention. Azar’s (2004) *Understanding and Using English Grammar* was the textbook used in the two research classes. To implement the OCS training in an elective English Grammar course, only the first four chapters from the textbook were used to improve participants’ knowledge due to time constraints. Additional academic assistance was offered to both classes after school hours and during lunch breaks. The amount of accessible time for this extra academic assistance was allocated equally to both classes. There were two 50-minute sessions of the English Grammar course every week. Only one of the sessions was allotted for instructing in OCSs. The other session was used to instruct in the English grammar curriculum.

For both classes, three weeks were designated for the first drama module. Four weeks were allocated to the second module, and the third module took two weeks to finish. Explicit teaching of the strategies of the modified OCSI took place before starting each drama module. It was expected that the explicit teaching, explanation or modelling of strategies would help reduce the participants’ anxiety and promote their use of English in terms of fluency and accuracy of interlocution (Chamot, Barnhardt, El-Dinary, & Robbins, 1996; Dadour & Robbins, 1996). Moreover, all pre-tests were held before the intervention started, and post-tests were set up after all the intervention was completed. Two student assistants were hired to assist in collecting questionnaires of pre- and post-tests, journals and manipulating audio and videotaping equipment for the two groups. A mixture of Mandarin and English was used to demonstrate how to use OCSs in order for the non-English major participants
understand the purposes of the application in context as well as to eliminate obstacles and hesitancy in relation to using strategies in the interlocution.

Kao and O’Neill’s (Kao & O'Neill, 1998) experience researching process drama in Taiwan was referred to for setting the amount, topics and types of modules for this research. Thus, both experimental and control groups had the same topics for their three drama modules. Two realistic and one imaginary topic were designed for both groups’ drama activities. The three topics were chosen based upon how easily they might be elaborated by the teacher, as well as to provide reasonably uniform likelihood of familiarity that the participants might have with the topics. The three topics for these two groups were “Pets and Pet Owners”, “Hosting Foreign Guests” and “The Three Little Pigs and the Big Bad Wolf”. The first two modules were close to the learners’ real life events, and the last module was based on a famous fairy tale.

For the same topics, the experimental group received process drama-assisted interventions to practise OCSs and grammatical structures learned from the course. The control group practised OCSs and grammar with scripted role-play, a drama approach frequently seen in Taiwan’s foreign language classes. A pivotal task for the teacher-researcher to accomplish before intervening differently was to lower all learners’ “affective filters” (Krashen, 1985) because the teacher, the curriculum and the pedagogy were unfamiliar to them. According to Aoki (1999) and Coleman (1996) when experimenting with innovative pedagogy, power in the classrooms needs to flow freely between teacher and learners in order for all to bring their creativity and interactions into full play. Usually, teacher-student relationships in many Asian language classrooms are hierarchical and domineering, which was not encouraged in this experiment. Learners also had to adjust to various roles and
relationships generated from the drama activities in the confined classroom space. Therefore, the teacher-researcher needed to be patient with the learners to give them time to digest the new pedagogy and strategies and to create a workable space within the classrooms for them to perform.

To reduce learners’ anxiety, in the first week of the semester the teacher-researcher explained what chapters of a grammar textbook would be covered, how the course would be developed for the purpose of the research, and how all the learners’ academic grades would be marked. New vocabulary and sentences used in both process drama and role-play conversations were introduced to both groups and examined in their mid-term and final exams since learning vocabulary was also part of the curriculum and course aims. The same mid-term and final exams were conducted in both classes by the teacher-researcher. More details about the two groups’ drama-assisted OCS intervention follow.

4.5.1 The Experimental Group Intervention

4.5.1.1 The First Drama Module

Given the large size of the class (38 people), the participants in the experimental group were divided into seven subgroups to better implement drama activities. The experimental group’s course was assisted with process drama. A topic called “Pets and Pet Owners” was used for the first drama module. The reason for working on this topic was because many teenage students in this college loved to share their experience of having pets with others based on the teacher-researcher’s observations. With a passion for pets, it was hoped that this topic would help shorten any engagement distance between the teacher and students as well as between students and their learning tasks. It was anticipated that this topic would be intriguing for the
learners. With a desirable topic or theme, drama activities could then unfold with a high degree of engagement.

Some frequently used process drama techniques were explained to the participants before the intervention started. The intervention began with a narration made by the teacher either in or out of roles as a pretext for developing drama plots and activities. Specifically, the techniques of teacher-in- or out of roles and group role-play were used at the beginning. In this module, the initial narration was given by a crippled man (played by the teacher). The group with the treatment was told that the teacher-researcher needed to go out of the classroom to talk to someone for a moment, and then a crippled man who has just lost his pet in a park, would enter and ask some favours from them. The teacher-researcher shared with the students that she was confident that the class would be pet experts – and professional and kind to help the crippled man. The teacher-researcher went out of the classroom to transform herself into a crippled man who would seek the help of the class. She made her role clear to the students with the assistance of simple props (e.g., a rod for the crippled man). However, since the crippled man spoke only English, the class had to listen and reply to his enquiries in English, even if this was with simple words or sentences. After the students promised to help him, the teacher-researcher came out of her role and helped them to recall what help they had promised him. During all the drama activities, both teacher and students needed to use as many oral communication strategies taught earlier as possible to resolve communicative barriers.

In the second week, seven groups worked on their individual paper in the role of pet experts and wrote down what new pet should be suggested to the crippled man if his lost pet was not found. The students had to list all the advantages of getting the pets
they recommended in simple English sentences. The teacher-researcher then helped
them to complete the tasks with questions written on the blackboard, such as “What
pets do you suggest to the crippled man?”, “How can the pet help the crippled
man?”, “What does the pet eat every day?”, and “How many meals a day does the
pet need to have?”

In the third week, a process drama activity, *hot-seating*, was used. Half of a group’s
members played the pet they recommended to the crippled man, and the others
played pet owners. Pets and pet owners took turns to sit in the hot seat in front of the
class. The people in the hot seat needed to answer whatever questions the others
asked. By referring to what they had previously written on the paper, they had more
confidence communicating with each other in English. Later, the students could
supplement or modify what they wrote on the paper after the *hot-seating*. All
students were told that through the activity, the pet experts would then have a strong
justification for their recommended choice of pets. Finally, the teacher-researcher
collected each group’s paper and told the students that the crippled man would make
his decision based upon each group’s opinions and recommendations. A detailed
intervention plan of this module is in Appendix G.

4.5.1.2 The Second Drama Module

There were two weeks set up for revision and the college’s official mid-term exams
after the first week of the second module. In order to help learners review and
reinforce the drama plot and activities developed during the first week after the
revision period and mid-term exams, one more week was allocated to this module.
The module took four weeks in total to be completed.
The topic was “Hosting Foreign Guests”. This module started with the technique, *teacher-in-role*. During the first week, the teacher-researcher acted in role as a school secretary holding a large file folder and announcing that foreign guests from Canada were coming to visit the college soon. The school secretary told the class that one of the seven groups from the class would win the chance to host the guests. This depended on which group could negotiate a better deal for a trip with the guests. The winning group would be offered the opportunity to take the guests around after school hours. For that, the seven groups were given a difficult task when the school secretary told them that there would only be a limited budget sponsored by the school board. The secretary also emphasised that it was the first time for the college to permit non-English major students to host foreign guests, so it would be quite an honour for the winning group. Each group in the class was then asked to act as a travel agent to design an itinerary with the given budget. With the task assigned to them, each group researched and collected as much data as possible in their free time.

In the second week, time was allotted to each group in the role of travel agents to discuss and arrange sightseeing spots and transportation based on their knowledge and the data they had collected. They would need to present their travelling proposals to the whole class in English PowerPoint slides or posters. If their discussions seemed passive or weak, the teacher-researcher in the role of the school secretary could create dramatic tension by throwing them some challenges. These challenges included questioning their budgets or itineraries or creating more trouble for them. For instance, the secretary could tell them that the school board had just called her and requested them not to travel to any islands during this trip. This kind of stimuli was meant to increase the tension of the drama as well as their attention to the
activities. The secretary also told the class that she had two foreign friends who were accountants. They were willing to help them check their budget proposals and travel plans, and they would come to the class in two weeks. The class therefore had to be prepared for future inspection.

In the third week, each group had to do a tableau of a moment when they found they had insufficient money for their trip. They had to discuss and present a struggling or unforgettable moment as a group in front of the whole class. Each group then took turns to present their still image for that moment, and everyone in the group needed to say one sentence or some words in English, which could best portray their group’s image or moment. Everyone had to deliver different sentences or words to express their thoughts or emotion of that moment.

In the last week for this module, two Canadian exchange students came to the class and acted as accountants. In the class they watched each group’s PowerPoint or poster presentation for the trip. Their budgets and travel plans were carefully checked by the two accountants as well as the other competing travel agencies. Meanwhile, the teacher-researcher jumped in and out of her role as the school secretary and played a facilitator whenever she felt it was needed. After discussing with the two foreign accountants, each group got to vote for an ideal travel and budget plan, which would satisfy customers’ needs. Members of the winning group would later be recommended by the teacher to become the college representatives and host foreign friends for real school events in the future. A more detailed intervention plan of this module is shown in Appendix H.

To cope with what had been embedded in the college agenda, the second module was specifically designed to closely match real college events. Because there were two
Canadian exchange students visiting the college for three months while conducting this module, the teacher-researcher hoped to use this opportunity to create an authentic dramatic background for the students to increase their learning motivation as well as their practice of the English language. English major students in this college were usually designated to host foreign guests due to their higher English proficiency. Yet, it also was hoped that after this module was completed, non-English major students would be able to communicate with foreign guests in English more freely than before.

4.5.1.3 The Third Drama Module

A well-known fairy tale, “The Three Little Pigs and the Big Bad Wolf”, was used for the third module, although the tale’s ending was left open for the class to construct through brainstorming and discussion. First, the teacher-researcher narrated the beginning of the story as follows:

“One year after the wolf fell into the three pigs’ pot of boiling water, he hid on the other side of the forest and started his own family. He just had a newborn baby, and he loved his baby boy so much that he hoped to feed him with the best food in the whole world. Then he recalled how delicious pork tasted, so he decided to attack the three little pigs’ families again. The wise owl heard that news and hoped to reconcile both parties. After all, the animals had tried hard to keep one year of peace and harmony in this forest...”

The class was then divided into four groups in the first week. Three of the groups in the role of Pig Brothers 1, 2 and 3 respectively had to convince the wolf not to attack them. The fourth group which played the wolf also needed to defend himself for his acts (e.g., for the sake of his beloved son’s health and well-being). The teacher-researcher played the owl, as a mediator, to reconcile both sides. The basic characteristics of the three pigs were provided in the first week to the students for the
class to develop and mould their roles and to create dramatic conflict. In this module, Pig Brother 1 was very timid while confronting strong and powerful figures. The second brother was very successful in doing business and had made a lot of money for the forest fund. The youngest brother was very hard working and willing to sacrifice for his relatives. In role, the groups discussed and prepared their strongest rationales which were to be presented in an oral defence.

In the second week, the students debated their positions in English. Since their English debating proficiency levels were quite low, the teacher-researcher often needed to encourage them to use oral communication strategies and simple English syntax to carry on with the interactions. This module was shorter than the previous two. It took only two weeks because it had to fit in with the college’s academic calendar. The last second week was used for post-tests and reviewing for the final exams. A detailed intervention plan of this module is attached in Appendix I.

4.5.2 The Control Group Intervention

The time allocated to the control group for their role-play intervention was the same as for the experimental group. The control group also had three modules and the same three topics as the experimental group. The control group class was divided into seven groups for conducting the role-play intervention. For the first module, “Pets and Pet Owners”, a conversation was offered to all the students (see Appendix J). The teacher-researcher explained some sentence structures and helped students understand the meaning and pronunciation of words and sentences. In the second week, they began to role-play their conversations and later exchanged roles to practise different lines within their own groups. In the third week, they presented
their conversations either with or without memorising them in front of the whole class.

The second module, “Hosting Foreign Guests”, took the control group four weeks to complete as well. There were three sets of short conversations provided (see Appendix K). In the first week of this module, new vocabulary or particular sentence structures of the scripted conversations were explained. The conversations were first role-played by the teacher-researcher and then by the class as a whole. In the second week, the conversations were role-played among the students themselves. In the third week, students in pairs selected one conversation from the three short conversations, memorised the lines and acted out the conversation in front of the class. In the last week, the two Canadian exchange students were invited to work as part of the class. The class had to host them, to introduce Taiwan to them, and to communicate everything in English with them.

Two weeks were then spent on completing the third module. One long conversation was provided (see Appendix L). The class was divided into four groups, each of which played the three pigs and the wolf. The teacher-researcher was also involved, playing the owl as a facilitator in the conversation. In the first week of this module, new vocabularies were introduced and longer sentences were analysed. Then the teacher-researcher role-played the conversation with all groups. In the second week, the teacher-researcher practised the conversation with the class for a while and then asked for volunteers to substitute for the teacher’s role and try reading and playing the lines of the owl as well.
4.6 The Procedure

Given that the research involved two study groups and seven instruments, the full process is presented in Table 2.

The two groups of Dental Laboratory Technology major students were told before the course started that they would learn and practise grammar and oral communication strategies through drama activities. However, they did not know which class was designated as the control and which as the experimental group. The teacher-researcher briefly explained what process drama was to the students of the experimental group before conducting the pre-test measures. By the end of the semester students of both groups would have had a clear idea about the kind of drama styles they had been using. All the measures were administered in the same order and the same way with the two groups. Both groups received the same number of sessions for each drama module.

Specifically, participants were notified about their rights and freedom to withdraw from this research at any time. Information sheets and informed consent sheets were distributed in the first week of the semester. Two research assistants were hired to help collect the informed consent sheets from the students and their parents in the same week.

In the second week, questionnaires of the OCSI and the FLCAS were completed within 50 minutes of class time. By the end of Week 3 interviews, oral tests and self-report reflection surveys after oral tests were all administered in the participants’ lunch time, self-study sessions or after-school hours, and the data collected. Meanwhile in Week 3, five of the 15 categories of strategies from the OCSI were introduced and modelled in both classes.
Pre-designed and coloured journal sheets were distributed to all the participants in the last five minutes of each class session for nine weeks (Weeks 4, 5, 6, 10, and 11 - 15). According to Prendiville and Toye’s (2007), the principle of using drama in teaching oracy too often restricts the ability to examine and to reflect on what has happened. To offset this, the teacher-researcher had each class’s assistant help collect participants’ journals at the end of class time. The teacher also wrote journals for each of the nine weeks.

The first module of process drama and role-play spanned Weeks 4-6. In Week 7 instruction happened for another five categories from the OCSI. Four weeks of the second module did not start until Week 10 since Weeks 8 and 9 were used as the revision week and the mid-term exam week, respectively. Week 13 was the last week for the second module, and then the instruction of the last five categories of the OCSI took place in Week 14. The third module only took two weeks, Weeks 15 and 16, to accomplish. Both Weeks 17 and 18 were taken up with conducting post-tests of the OCSI and FLCAS questionnaires as well as interviews, oral-tests and self-report reflection surveys.
## Table 2: The Process for the Current Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weeks</th>
<th>Phases</th>
<th>Procedure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1     | Ethical Issues          | 1. Briefly explain what the research is about and how it is to be integrated with the grammar course.  
2. Distribute Information and informed consent sheets.  
3. Collect the informed consent sheets. |
| 2     | Pre-test                | Instruments used:  
1. The modified OCSI questionnaire  
2. The FLCAS questionnaire  
(Conducting No. 1 + 2 in class time)  
3. Oral tests  
4. Self-report reflection surveys  
5. Group interviews  
(Conducting Nos. 3, 4 & 5 in the participants’ free time in Weeks 2 & 3) |
| 3     | Pre-test & OCS instruction | 1. (Continued) Conducting instruments No. 3, 4 & 5.  
2. Teaching and modelling of OCSs and their application. |
| 4     | Intervention            | Module 1 of process drama for the experimental group & Module 1 of role-play for the control group.                                                                                                      |
| 5     | Intervention            | Module 1 of process drama for the experimental group & Module 1 of role-play for the control group.                                                                                                      |
| 6     | Intervention            | Module 1 of process drama for the experimental group & Module 1 of role-play for the control group.                                                                                                      |
| 7     | OCS instruction         | Teaching and modelling of OCSs and their application.                                                                                                                                                  |
| 8     | Revision Week           | N/A                                                                                                                                                                                                     |
| 9     | Official Mid-term Exam Week | N/A                                                                                                                                                                                                  |
| 10    | Intervention            | Module 2 of process drama for the experimental group & Module 2 of role-play for the control group.                                                                                                      |
| 11    | Intervention            | Module 2 of process drama for the experimental group & Module 2 of role-play for the control group.                                                                                                      |
| 12    | Intervention            | Module 2 of process drama for the experimental group & Module 2 of role-play for the control group.                                                                                                      |
| 13    | Intervention            | Module 2 of process drama for the experimental group & Module 2 of role-play for the control group.                                                                                                      |
| 14    | OCS instruction         | Teaching and modelling of OCSs and their application.                                                                                                                                                  |
| 15    | Intervention            | Module 3 of process drama for the experimental group & Module 3 of role-play for the control group.                                                                                                      |
| 16    | Intervention            | Module 3 of process drama for the experimental group & Module 3 of role-play for the control group.                                                                                                      |
| 17    | Post-test               | Instruments used:  
1. The modified OCSI questionnaire  
2. The FLCAS questionnaire  
(Conducting Nos. 1 + 2 in class time)  
3. Oral tests  
4. Self-report reflection surveys  
5. Group interviews  
(Conducting Nos. 3, 4 & 5 in the participants’ available time) |
| 18    | Official Final Exam Week | N/A                                                                                                                                                                                                     |
4.7 Ethical Considerations

Permission to conduct this research was obtained by the researcher and approved by both Griffith University’s Human Research Ethics Committee and the Junior College in Taiwan in November, 2008. All prompts or forms distributed to the students were in a bilingual format. All participants and their parents or guardians were provided with information and informed consent sheets in English and Mandarin. Because students in the two classes were 16 years old, on average, the researcher needed both their permission and the consent of their parents or guardians for them to participate. All information and data offered by or about the participants and relevant to the study remained anonymous and locked in a cabinet which could only be accessed by the researcher. Pseudonyms or codes were used by all the participants when putting their names on measurement instruments.

Students who did not wish to participate in the study still received the same instructions and participated in the drama activities with their classmates. The only difference was that non-participants did not get involved in any research tests, interviews, questionnaires or recordings and were not informed of final research results by the researcher. Whether the students participated in the study or how well they performed in the course did not influence their semester grades in any way. Moreover, all the participants were aware of their freedom to withdraw from the research at any time without any penalty. The researcher had no previous contact or encounters with any of the students from the two groups before the study began.
4.8 Data Analysis

Data were submitted to a number of initial analyses to make the dataset more manageable. The OCSI and FLCAS as the oral communication strategy and psychometric measurement instruments of this study were examined first for their internal consistency. When necessary, the number of instrumental variables was reduced but only to a few values that still contained most of the information found in the original variables. Analytic techniques of the Statistical Packages for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 17.0 were used to analyse quantitative data, and functions of Nvivo 8 software were used to facilitate qualitative data for transcription, analysis and synthesis. Comparison of the data between pre- and post- tests was carried out in order to best address the research questions.

Before starting data analysis, the reliability and validity of measurement instruments was required. If there are no opportunities for elaborate validation exercises, Dörnyei (2003) claimed that at least internal consistency is a prerequisite for any scientific survey measurement so overall reliability can be attained. Moreover, a researcher cannot feel safe about data analysis unless the reliability coefficient of instruments is identified. Nunnally (1978) also contended that reliability estimated from internal consistency is close to that estimated from other sources. In short, the Cronbach Alpha Coefficient was used to measure internal consistency reliability for this study.

By computing correlation coefficients for each item and retaining the items with the highest correlations shown on item-total statistics tables, scale uni-dimensionality was achieved. With highly correlated items reserved, computing techniques of the SPSS could then be used to transform and group the items into factors with high reliability. Besides, because there can be inherent shortcomings with different
instruments, two to four instruments were used to fully address each research question.

### 4.8.1 Answering the Primary Research Question

In relation to the primary research question, this study used descriptive statistics, independent *T*-test, Mann-Whitney Test, and analysis of variance (ANOVA) to examine the data. The reason for using the function of descriptive statistics in the SPSS was to transfer and calculate the statistical data as fundamental data. Since the sample of this present study was rather small, two computing techniques, Independent Samples *T*-test and Mann-Whitney Test, were used to cross-validate the results to answer the primary question. Independent Samples *T*-test, a parametric test, was first used to generate results for both groups as well as for the two categories: the speaking and listening parts of the OCSI. It was used to measure any significant change of frequency between the two groups after intervention. The Mann-Whitney Test, a nonparametric test, examined changes of frequency by measuring a central tendency, the medians.

Moreover, because the Independent Samples *T*-test was specifically designed to measure only two dependent variables on an independent variable, the experimental and control groups were able to be tested in comparison concerning both the frequency of OCS use, as well as the variety of OCS used. Also, comparison of levels of anxiety amongst participants within and across groups was possible. In addition, one-way ANOVA was used to examine the relationships between the variables (e.g., 15 sub-categories of the OCSI) and the overall OCS use of each participant group. Since an ANOVA on these data could test how three or more independent variables related to one dependent variable, the 15 sub-categories of
OCSI could then be efficiently compared with the dependent variable, namely, the average score of the overall use for frequency or variety of OCS.

4.8.2 Answering the Secondary Research Question-a, b and c

The secondary research question was designed to be answered primarily by qualitative methods. The qualitative research, such as journals and video excerpts for interventions, oral-tests, after-task reflection surveys and group interviews generated information that could supplement quantitative results elicited from the questionnaires. Qualitative data reflected participants’ real voices regarding their respective interventions.

EFL learners in Taiwan are generally shy and inhibited in expressing their feelings and opinions in public; therefore, semi-structured group interviews and students and teacher’s journal writing were used to explore hidden perspectives about process drama and role-playing, as well as students’ opinions about their OCS use before and after intervention, and any changes in language-learning anxiety levels after the intervention. Other than that, video-taping of drama activities in class aimed to capture the various nuances of class interactions and to supplement data from other instruments. The observational results of the pre- and post- oral tests were calculated for counts and categories of the participants’ use of oral communication strategies in tasks and then compared.

To answer the sub-parts of Q2 (a & b), three instruments, semi-structured group interviews, self-report reflection survey, and journals were used. For Q2c, besides semi-structured group interviews and journals, the FLCAS questionnaire and video excerpts of class activities was implemented to capture relevant information. It was
expected that the data from such mixed-method research would increase the reliability of the answers to the research questions. A conceptual framework of the current study is graphed to provide a better idea about threads of thoughts for this research design (see Figure 2).

Figure 2: A Conceptual Framework of the Study
5 Results

5.1 Introduction

In this chapter findings for the primary and secondary research questions are presented. For the primary research question, instruments such as the OCSI questionnaire (see Appendix A), oral tests (see Appendix B), and self-report reflection surveys (see Appendix C) were used. These three instruments generated quantitative results. The self-report reflection surveys consisted of two parts. The first part entailed the participants checking a list of categorised 60-items on the OCSI immediately after they finished taking their pre- and post-oral tests. The second part involved them writing down their own thought-tracking remarks under each strategy category as a qualitative record. The second part was optional.

For the secondary research questions, instruments such as semi-structured group interviews, journals, the Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale (FLCAS) (see Appendix D), thought-tracking comments (see Appendix C) and video-taping (Appendix M) were used to explore the impact that process drama and scripted role-play had on the participants from their own perspectives. It was expected that the three sub-questions of the secondary research question could be answered by analysing and synthesising data from the insiders’ voices. The results from the factor analyses of the two quantitative instruments will be discussed first. Then, the findings from the control group and the experimental group will be presented in the order of the research questions.
5.2 Factor Analyses Results

A SPSS computing function, the Varimax solution, was chosen for both quantitative instruments. Kaiser rule of Eigen Values greater than 1.0 and factor loadings greater than or equal to .690 were considered acceptable for this study. Results of factor analyses showed that 52 out of 60 items of the OCSI categorised in 11 factors and 29 out of 33 items of the FLCAS grouped in 6 factors were identified reliable for further data analyses.

Once data cleaning (e.g., correcting impossible or incorrectly entered values) and data manipulation (e.g., handling missing data and recoding values prior to the analyses) were completed, examination of the obtained data began. The following statistical analyses show the reliability levels of the two quantitative instruments used in this study, the OCSI and the FLCAS, with their respective Cronbach’s alpha coefficients. First, because the results of the item-total statistics table of the OCSI reveal low or negative figures for corrected item-total correlation on items No. 06, 24, 32, 42, and 58, recoding the values of these items on the 5-point Likert Scale (scoring 5 to 1, 2 to 4, 4 to 2, 1 to 5 and 3 remaining 3), helps increase reliability.

In addition, because Factors 7 and 8 of the OCSI for coping with speaking strategies have low internal consistency reliability (namely, 0.642 and -0.220), they were omitted from the inventory. Factor 6 for coping with speaking strategies contains three items, Questions 06, 19 and 21, with a low alpha coefficient, 0.654, but when the Q06 data are removed from this factor, the reliability increases to 0.790. For this reason, Q06 has been eliminated in order to maintain higher reliability for this factor. Therefore, there are six reliable new factors, conveying 29 items, generated for coping with speaking strategies after factor analysis in the OCSI.
For coping with listening strategies, there were originally 7 new factors after operating factor analysis, but because the sixth factor had a low Cronbach alpha figure (0.508), and the last factor contained only one item (see Table 3), these two factors have been removed from the inventory in order to maintain high reliability of the instrument. The remaining five factors all gained figures above 0.7 for their Cronbach Alpha coefficient. The OCSI reduced its number of variables to 11 reliable factors from the original 15 factors and 52 items in total from 60 items. After recoding, the modified OCSI generated a high Cronbach Alpha coefficient for the total scale (0.962).

As for the FLCAS, 9 items were originally designed to be negatively worded (namely, Questions 2, 5, 8, 11, 14, 18, 22, 28 and 32), so their scoring was also reversed on the 5-point Likert Scale, using the same reversing done for the recoding of the OCSI. The eighth factor of the FLCAS has been removed because it contained only one item (Wu, 2005). Thus, the FLCAS generated 7 new factors after factor analysing. As a result, the Cronbach Alpha coefficient of the total scale of the FLCAS expectably generated a high figure, 0.933, which shows strong internal consistency reliability of the instrument. Lists of names and the Cronbach Alpha coefficients of the new factors of the OCSI and the FLCAS are presented in Table 3 and Table 4.

Table 3, titled “The Cronbach Alpha Coefficients for the Total Scale and Each New Factor of the OCSI on Factor Analysis”, contains six groupings for strategies coping with both speaking and listening problems. These groupings or factors have been renamed to assist in discussion of results (Chapter 6). They are Factor 1 “More active speaker strategies”, Factor 2 “Caution strategies”, Factor 3 “Fluency-oriented
strategies”, Factor 4 “Confidence-building strategies”, Factor 5 “Extremes strategies”, and Factor 6 “Social affective strategies” for coping with speaking problems. These six factors all gained figures about or above 0.7 for their Cronbach Alpha coefficient. The Cronbach Alpha figures for coping with speaking and listening problems are 0.816 and 0.864, respectively. Table 3 shows the high reliability of the instrument, the OCSI. Table 4, titled “The Cronbach Alpha Coefficients for the Total Scale and Each New Factor of the FLCAS on Factor Analysis”, reveals figures of Cronbach Alpha Coefficients for the whole inventory of FLCAS and for each of the seven factors.
Table 3: The Cronbach Alpha Coefficients for the Total Scale and Each New Factor of the OCSI on Factor Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cronbach Alpha coefficient of the total scale of the OCSI: 0.962</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha of the total 6 factors for coping with speaking problems: 0.816</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaking—Factor 1: More active speaker strategies</strong></td>
<td><strong>Item Description</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q7 I pay attention to grammar and word order during conversation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q8 I try to emphasise the subject and verb of the sentence.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q9 I change my way of saying things according to the context.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q11 I pay attention to my pronunciation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q17 I correct myself when I notice that I have made a mistake.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q22 I make comprehension checks to ensure the listener understands what I say.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q27 I try to enjoy the conversation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q29 I actively encourage myself to express what I want to say.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaking—Factor 2: Caution strategies</strong></td>
<td><strong>Item Description</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1 I think first of what I want to say in my native language and then construct the English sentence.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2 I think first of a sentence I already know in English and then try to change it to fit the situation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3 I use words which are familiar to me.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4 I reduce the message and use simple expressions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q10 I take my time to express what I want to say.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q16 I use gestures and facial expressions if I can’t express myself.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaking—Factor 3: Fluency-oriented strategies</strong></td>
<td><strong>Item Description</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q15 I try to make eye-contact when I am talking.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q18 I notice myself using an expression which fits a rule that I have learned.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q20 I give examples if the listener doesn’t understand what I am saying.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q23 I try to use fillers (e.g., well, you know…) when I cannot think of what to say.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q33 I make up a new word in order to communicate a desired concept (e.g., “airball” for “balloon”).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q34 I use a foreign word to adjust it to English pronunciation and/or morphology, for example, saying “chocoli” (Mandarin pronunciation) for the English word “Chocolate”).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaking—Factor 4: Confidence-building strategies</strong></td>
<td><strong>Item Description</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q12 I try to speak clearly and loudly to make myself heard.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q13 I pay attention to my rhythm and intonation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q14 I pay attention to the conversation flow.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q25 I try to give a good impression to the listener.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaking—Factor 5: Extremes strategies</strong></td>
<td><strong>Item Description</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q24 I leave a message unfinished because of some language difficulty.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q26 I don’t mind taking risks even though I might make mistakes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q32 I give up when I can’t make myself understood.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaking—Factor 6: Social affective strategies</strong></td>
<td><strong>Item Description</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q19 While speaking, I pay attention to the listener’s reaction to my speech.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q21 I repeat what I want to say until the listener understands.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cronbach’s Alpha of the total 5 factors for coping with listening problems: 0.864</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| Listening—Factor 1: Interaction strategies | <strong>Item Description</strong> | <strong>Cronbach’s Alpha of Factor 1</strong> |
| Q38 I pay attention to the words spoken by the speaker with an emphasis or at a slow speed. | | |
| Q53 I ask the speaker to slow down when I can’t understand what the speaker has said. | | 0.840 |
| Q54 I ask the speaker to use easy words when I have difficulties in comprehension. | | |
| Q55 I make a clarification request when I am not sure what the speaker has said. | | |
| Q56 I ask for repetition when I can’t understand what the speaker has said. | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q57</th>
<th>I make clear to the speaker what I haven’t been able to understand.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Listening—Factor 2: Getting the gist strategies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha of Factor 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q37</td>
<td>I guess the speaker’s intention by picking up familiar words.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q41</td>
<td>I guess the speaker’s intention based on what he/she said so far.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q43</td>
<td>I anticipate what the speaker is going to say based on the context.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q45</td>
<td>I try to translate into my native language little by little to understand what the speaker has said.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q46</td>
<td>I try to catch the speaker’s main point.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Listening—Factor 3: Fluency-maintaining strategies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha of Factor 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q47</td>
<td>I pay attention to the speaker’s rhythm and intonation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q48</td>
<td>I give feedback (e.g., sounds like “Ah-ha!” or “hmm. . .”) to show my understanding in order to avoid communication gaps.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q50</td>
<td>I pay attention to the speaker’s pronunciation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q52</td>
<td>I pay attention to the speaker’s eye contact, facial expression and gestures.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Listening—Factor 4: Move active listener strategies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha of Factor 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q44</td>
<td>I ask the speaker to give an example when I am not sure what he/she said.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q49</td>
<td>I use circumlocution to clarify some unknown words or phrases that the speaker has used. For instance, when a speaker says “Can you get me the corkscrew?”, I may ask the speaker “Do you mean the thing we use to open a bottle?”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q51</td>
<td>I use gestures when I have difficulties in understanding.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q56</td>
<td>I pay attention to the subject and verb of the sentence when I listen.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Listening—Factor 5: Word-oriented strategies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha of Factor 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q35</td>
<td>I pay attention to the first word to judge whether it is an interrogative sentence or not.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q36</td>
<td>I try to catch every word that the speaker uses.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q39</td>
<td>I pay attention to the first part of the sentence and guess the speaker’s intention.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q59</td>
<td>I especially pay attention to the interrogative when I listen to WH-questions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 1 (12 items)</td>
<td>Item Description</td>
<td>Factor 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>I tremble when I know that I’m going to be called on in language class.</td>
<td>0.920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>It frightens me when I don’t understand what the teacher is saying in English.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q7</td>
<td>I keep thinking that the other students are better at language than I am.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q13</td>
<td>It embarrasses me to volunteer answers in my language class.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q16</td>
<td>Even if I am well prepared for language class, I feel anxious about it.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q19</td>
<td>I am afraid that my language teacher is ready to correct every mistake I make.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q24</td>
<td>I feel very self-conscious about speaking English in front of other students.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q25</td>
<td>Language class moves so quickly I worry about getting left behind.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q29</td>
<td>I get nervous when I don’t understand every word the language teacher says.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q30</td>
<td>I feel overwhelmed by the number of rules I have to learn to speak English.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q31</td>
<td>I am afraid that the other students will laugh at me when I speak English.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q32</td>
<td>I would probably feel comfortable around native speakers of English.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor 2 (6 items)</th>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>I don’t worry about making mistakes in language class.</td>
<td>0.920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q8</td>
<td>I am usually at ease during tests in my language class.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q9</td>
<td>I start to panic when I have to speak without preparation in language class.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q18</td>
<td>I feel confident when I speak in English class.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q23</td>
<td>I always feel that the other students speak English better than I do.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q28</td>
<td>When I’m on my way to language class, I feel very sure and relaxed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor 3 (4 items)</th>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q5</td>
<td>It wouldn’t bother me at all to take more foreign language classes.</td>
<td>0.920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q12</td>
<td>In language class, I can get so nervous I forgot things I know.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q26</td>
<td>I feel more tense and nervous in my language class than in my other classes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q27</td>
<td>I get nervous and confused when I am speaking in my language class.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor 4 (2 items)</th>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Factor 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q11</td>
<td>I don’t understand why some people get so upset over English classes.</td>
<td>0.920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q22</td>
<td>I don’t feel pressure to prepare very well for language class.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor 5 (2 items)</th>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Factor 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>I never feel quite sure of myself when I am speaking in my English class.</td>
<td>0.920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q10</td>
<td>I worry about the consequences of failing my English class.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor 6 (3 items)</th>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Factor 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q14</td>
<td>I would not be nervous speaking English with native speakers.</td>
<td>0.920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q20</td>
<td>I can feel my heart pounding when I am going to be called on in language class.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q21</td>
<td>The more I study for a language test, the more confused I get.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor 7 (3 items)</th>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Factor 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q6</td>
<td>During language class, I find myself thinking about things that have nothing to do with the course.</td>
<td>0.920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q17</td>
<td>I often feel like not going to my language class.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q33</td>
<td>I get nervous when the language teacher asks questions which I haven’t prepared in advance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor 8 (1 item)</th>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Factor 8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q15</td>
<td>I get upset when I don’t understand what the teacher is correcting.</td>
<td>Eliminated due to only one item left in this factor.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.3 Results for the Primary RQ

5.3.1 Control Group- Pre-Intervention: Frequency of OCSs

5.3.1.1 Quantitative results

5.3.1.1.1 OCSI Findings

Before conducting the intervention in the control group, the OCSI questionnaire was used to elicit the control group participants’ understanding of how often they thought they used the oral communication strategies listed in the OCSI according to their past experience. Table 5 shows means and standard deviations for perceived use of each strategy factor under speaking and listening categories before the intervention. This table compares the descriptive analyses of both the control and the experimental groups. The means of these two groups for listening and speaking strategies all increased after intervention, except for speaking strategies of the control group.

5.3.1.1.2 Oral Test Findings

Counting OCS use from the videotaping of oral tests for the control group participants, Table 6 shows the amounts of OCS used to cope with speaking and listening problems by participants of both groups. Nine participants of the control group and 10 from the experimental group showed the strategies they used before and after the interventions when coping with speaking and listening problems.
Table 5: Control and Experimental Groups: Mean and Standard Deviation of OCS Factors Before and After Intervention on the OCSI Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Experimental</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Experimental</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Descriptive</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCS categories</td>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 1</td>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td>3.3182</td>
<td>.9003</td>
<td>3.0227</td>
<td>.7967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 2</td>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td>3.8333</td>
<td>.7506</td>
<td>3.7424</td>
<td>.6857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 3</td>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td>3.1288</td>
<td>.8115</td>
<td>3.1515</td>
<td>.7505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 4</td>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td>2.8864</td>
<td>.9152</td>
<td>2.7045</td>
<td>.7967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 5</td>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td>3.0000</td>
<td>.9315</td>
<td>2.9848</td>
<td>.5923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 6</td>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td>3.4545</td>
<td>.7701</td>
<td>3.2273</td>
<td>1.1097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Listening</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCS categories</td>
<td>Listening</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 1</td>
<td>Listening</td>
<td>3.9318</td>
<td>.6894</td>
<td>3.7576</td>
<td>.9368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 2</td>
<td>Listening</td>
<td>3.6273</td>
<td>.7388</td>
<td>3.7273</td>
<td>.7547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 3</td>
<td>Listening</td>
<td>3.4318</td>
<td>.6554</td>
<td>3.4205</td>
<td>.9801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 4</td>
<td>Listening</td>
<td>3.3295</td>
<td>.8877</td>
<td>3.3750</td>
<td>.7971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 5</td>
<td>Listening</td>
<td>3.7273</td>
<td>.6496</td>
<td>3.5795</td>
<td>.9075</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: Control and Experimental Groups: Frequency of OCS Use for Coping with Speaking and Listening Problems and Change of Frequency after the Intervention on the Pre- and Post-Oral Tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Oral Tests</th>
<th>Pre-oral test</th>
<th>Post-oral test</th>
<th>No. of strategies increased or decreased after the intervention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of Strategies</td>
<td>No. of speaking strategies</td>
<td>No. of listening strategies</td>
<td>No. of speaking strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject's Names</td>
<td>Control Group</td>
<td>Experimental Group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wu</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marisa</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timmy</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candy</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danny</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Did not complete all the tests.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total numbers of columns</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Strategies</td>
<td>No. of speaking strategies</td>
<td>No. of listening strategies</td>
<td>No. of speaking strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject's Names</td>
<td>Control Group</td>
<td>Experimental Group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chloe</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christine</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mini</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JanJun</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lora</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clare</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivy</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total numbers of columns</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.3.1.1.3 After-task reflection survey findings

In this survey the nine control group participants reported how many OCSs they had used during their pre-oral tests from their own perspectives. Table 7 and Table 8, compare each participant’s self-reported number of OCSs used for coping with speaking and listening problems before and after their intervention. Participants of the control group used slightly more OCSs for coping with both speaking and listening problems at pre-self-report survey than at post-self-report survey.
Table 7: Control Group: Frequency of OCSs Used for Coping with Speaking Problems on the Self-Report Reflection Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Number of OCSs used for speaking problems at pre-self-report survey</th>
<th>Number of OCSs used for speaking problems at post-self-report survey</th>
<th>Differences in the numbers of OCSs used between pre- and post-self-report survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wu</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>+10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marisa</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>+3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timmy</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candy</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danny</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8: Control Group: Frequency of OCSs Used for Coping with Listening Problems on the Self-Report Reflection Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Number of OCSs used for listening problems at pre-self-report survey</th>
<th>Number of OCSs used for listening problems at post-self-report survey</th>
<th>Differences in the numbers of OCSs used between pre- and post-self-report survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>+3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wu</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>+14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marisa</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>+4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timmy</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candy</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danny</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.3.2 Control Group- Post-Intervention: Frequency of OCSs

5.3.2.1 Quantitative results

5.3.2.1.1 OCSI findings

After a semester of intervention for the control group, the OCSI questionnaire was administered again in order to determine if there had been any change of frequency of OCS use by the participants. The post-OCSI questionnaire generated higher means for all the strategy factors for coping with speaking problems than the pre-OCSI questionnaire. For coping with listening problems, the post-OCSI questionnaire showed higher means on Factor 3 “Fluency-maintaining strategies” and Factor 4 “More active listener strategies” but revealed lower means or no difference on Factor
1 “Interaction strategies”, Factor 2 “Getting the gist strategies” and Factor 5 “Word-oriented strategies”.

5.3.2.1.2 Oral test finding

Table 6 shows the number of OCSs used by each participant for coping with speaking and listening problems respectively at post-oral tests. Nine control group participants completed both the pre- and post-oral tests and were observed using fewer OCSs for coping with listening problems than with speaking problems after the intervention of scripted role-play. The control group used 28 more strategies in total after the intervention.

5.3.2.1.3 After-task reflection survey findings

Table 7 and Table 8 show each control group participant’s self-report on how many OCSs they had used immediately after their post-oral tests. Most of them reported using fewer OCSs for coping with speaking and listening problems after intervention.

5.3.3 Experimental Group- Pre-Intervention: Frequency of OCSs

5.3.3.1 Quantitative results

5.3.3.1.1 OCSI findings

Means and standard deviations of all the strategy factors for frequency of OCSs used before the intervention are listed in Table 5. Most means of OCS factors for coping with both speaking and listening problems before intervention on the OCSI Questionnaire are slightly higher in the control group than in the experimental group. However, after intervention, the means of OCS factors for coping with both speaking and listening problems were higher in the experimental group than in the control.
5.3.3.1.2 Oral test findings

The numbers of OCSs used for coping with speaking and listening problems on the pre-oral test are presented in Table 6. Ten experimental group participants completed both pre- and post-oral tests and were observed using more OCSs for coping with speaking problems than with listening problems after the intervention of process drama.

5.3.3.1.3 After-task reflection survey findings

Table 9 and Table 10 display the 10 experimental group participants’ number of OCSs used for coping with speaking and listening problems respectively before and after the intervention. Most reported using 21 strategies fewer OCSs for coping with speaking and 16 strategies fewer for coping with listening problems after intervention.
Table 9: Experimental Group: Frequency of OCSs Used for Coping with Speaking Problems on the Self-Report Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Number of OCSs used for speaking problems at pre-self-report survey</th>
<th>Number of OCSs used for speaking problems at post-self-report survey</th>
<th>Differences in the numbers of OCSs used between pre- and post-self-report survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amy</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chloe</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christine</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mini</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JunJun</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lora</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>+5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clare</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>+6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivy</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total Change</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>-21</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10: Experimental Group: Frequency of OCSs Used for Coping with Listening Problems on the Self-Report Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Number of OCSs used for listening problems at pre-self-report survey</th>
<th>Number of OCSs used for listening problems at post-self-report survey</th>
<th>Differences in the numbers of OCSs used between pre- and post-self-report survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amy</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>+6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chloe</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christine</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mini</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>+4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JunJun</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lora</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clare</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>+6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivy</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total Change</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>-16</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.3.3.2 Qualitative results

5.3.3.2.1 After-task reflection survey findings

Joseph from the experimental group was the only male subject who completed the thought tracking sections of the survey. He commented on three factors of Nakatani’s (2006) OCSI after finishing his pre-oral test. Under “Social affective strategies” he wrote, “Sometimes when I can’t think of proper words or phrases, I would try to use antonyms.” For the “Message reduction and alteration strategies” to cope with speaking problems, he recorded, “When I was able to use accurate wording, I would feel better and relaxed”. For one of the listening strategy factors, the “Scanning strategies”, he remarked that, “Paying attention to stresses in a conversation could help get the gist of others’ talking”.

5.3.4 Experimental Group-Post-Intervention: Frequency of OCS Use

5.3.4.1 Quantitative results

5.3.4.1.1 OCSI findings

Means and standard deviations of all the strategy factors for frequency of OCSs used after the intervention on the OCSI questionnaire are presented in Table 5. The means of all the strategy factors coping with speaking and listening problems generated from the post-OCSI questionnaire are higher than the ones from the pre-OCSI questionnaire.

5.3.4.1.2 Oral test findings

The numbers of OCSs used for coping with speaking and listening problems after the intervention are displayed in Table 6. All experimental group participants were
observed using 45 more oral communication strategies in total, except for Mini, who showed no difference on her use quantity of OCSs.

5.3.4.1.3 After-task reflection survey findings

Each experimental group participant’s number of OCSs used for coping with speaking and listening problems for their post-oral tests are reported in Table 9 and Table 10. Interestingly, the participants viewed themselves as using fewer strategies for coping with both speaking and listening problems after the intervention of process drama.

5.3.4.2 Qualitative results

5.3.4.2.1 After-task reflection survey findings

JunJun was the only female subject who offered her comments for the thought tracking sections of the survey after the intervention. She revealed that she had used seven strategies to cope with speaking problems and two other strategies while listening to English. The following statements were written under strategy factors.

Under the “Social affective strategies” factor she wrote that, “I was so extremely nervous that I didn’t even know what to say. Yet, the teacher kept telling me to relax. I felt less nervous when I got to the last strip picture. I even felt the whole thing was a bit interesting.” Under the “Fluency-oriented strategies” she commented that, “I would use body language to express the words that I don’t know how to say. For instance, if I don’t know how to say ‘laugh’ in English, I would directly laugh in front of people to let them know what I try to say.” She put, “I really used ‘airball’ to replace the word ‘balloon’ because I didn’t know how to say ‘balloon’, and surprisingly, that person understood what I was trying to say! I was very happy!”
Under the factor “Negotiation for meaning while speaking” she remarked that, “I was so nervous while talking in English. I couldn’t care much about the accuracy of grammar or word spelling. The only thing in my mind was to make what I said comprehensible for others. That would be good enough”. For the factor “Accuracy-oriented strategies” she commented that, “I used the vocabulary that I knew in my conversation”. For another factor “Attempt to think in English strategies” she stated, “Because I couldn’t say most of the things in English, I would think about them in Chinese first.”

Furthermore, for coping with listening problems she stated that, “The teacher would restate things in simpler sentences or with examples when noticing my confusion.” for the factor “Negotiation for meaning while listening” and a comment like “I love to listen to English pronunciation.” for the factor “Fluency-maintaining strategies” factor.

5.3.5 Comparison of Pre- and Post-Intervention Findings Between the Control and Experimental Groups

5.3.5.1 Quantitative results

5.3.5.1.1 OCSI findings

To present the extent to which process drama successfully induced greater frequency of OCS use, comparison of means, results of Independent Samples T-test and comparison of medians with the Mann-Whitney Test are illustrated in both tables and graphs.

First of all, all mean and standard deviations generated before and after the intervention of both the control and experimental groups have been synthesised in Table 5.
Secondly, the comparison of means changed for speaking and listening strategies from pre- to post-OCSI findings of both groups is graphed. Figure 3 shows the means of the OCS factors for coping with speaking problems by both groups, and Figure 4 shows the means of the factors for coping with listening problems by both groups.

Moreover, the Independent Sample T-tests generated significant effects with Factor 1 of speaking strategies, the “More active speaker strategies” and Factor 1 of listening strategies, the “Interaction strategies” (see Table 11) for change of frequency of OCS use. These two strategy factors show significant differences for the frequency of OCS use of the experimental group. With an effect $p=.016 \ (p<.05)$, the t-test result show a significant difference in the frequency of use for the “More active speaker strategies” with the experimental group participants. For the “Interaction strategies”, the results also suggest a significant difference in an effect $p=.024 \ (p<.05)$ for the experimental group.

For a sample as small as the one of this study, a non-parametric test, Mann-Whitney Test (see Table 12), was used to supplement the validity of the results of the Independent Samples T-test. The median-comparison test of the Mann-Whitney Test also shows two significant differences with Factor 1: speaking strategies with a significant effect $p=.020 \ (p<.05)$, and a significant effect $p=.018 \ (p<.05)$ with Factor 1 of the listening strategies.
Figure 3: Control and experimental groups: Change in frequency of OCS use for speaking problems on the OCSI questionnaire
Change of frequency of OCS use for listening problems after the intervention

Figure 4: Control and Experimental Groups: Change in frequency of OCS use for listening problems on the OCSI questionnaire
Table 11: Control and Experimental Groups: Change in Frequency of OCS Use by Comparing Both Groups on the OCSI Questionnaire: Independent Samples T-Test Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Levene’s Test for Equality of Variances</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking Factor 1</td>
<td>1.193</td>
<td>.281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking Factor 2</td>
<td>.141</td>
<td>.709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking Factor 3</td>
<td>.158</td>
<td>.693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking Factor 4</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking Factor 5</td>
<td>1.927</td>
<td>.172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking Factor 6</td>
<td>1.730</td>
<td>.196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening Factor 1</td>
<td>3.464</td>
<td>.070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening Factor 2</td>
<td>.163</td>
<td>.689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening Factor 3</td>
<td>.679</td>
<td>.414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening Factor 4</td>
<td>1.657</td>
<td>.205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening Factor 5</td>
<td>2.705</td>
<td>.107</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p< .05

Table 12: Control and Experimental Groups: Change in Frequency of OCS Use by Comparing Both Groups on the OCSI Questionnaire: Mann-Whitney Test Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Mann-Whitney</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaking Factor 1</td>
<td>143.000</td>
<td>.020 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking Factor 2</td>
<td>167.000</td>
<td>.077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking Factor 3</td>
<td>223.000</td>
<td>.654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking Factor 4</td>
<td>215.000</td>
<td>.524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking Factor 5</td>
<td>191.000</td>
<td>.224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking Factor 6</td>
<td>214.500</td>
<td>.512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening Factor 1</td>
<td>141.500</td>
<td>.018 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening Factor 2</td>
<td>206.000</td>
<td>.395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening Factor 3</td>
<td>229.500</td>
<td>.768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening Factor 4</td>
<td>207.500</td>
<td>.415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening Factor 5</td>
<td>173.000</td>
<td>.103</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p< .05

5.3.5.1.2 Oral test findings

Subtracting the number of OCSs used before the intervention from those after the intervention helps see the change in frequency of OCS use (see Table 6). Based on the researcher’s evaluation standards, the experimental group was observed using more OCSs for coping with speaking problems than the control group did. The findings also show that more OCSs for coping with listening problems were used by the experimental group than the control group after the intervention.
5.3.5.1.3 After-task reflection survey findings

From Table 7 and Table 8 it can be seen that there were three control group participants who reported increasing their use of OCSs for coping with speaking problems, and there were also three who reported using more OCSs for coping with listening problems after the intervention. In the experimental group, four participants reported an increase in their use of OCSs for coping with speaking problems, and five participants increased their use of OCSs for coping with listening problems after the intervention. In short, more experimental group participants increased their use of OCSs after the intervention than the control group participants.

5.3.6 Control Group- Pre-Intervention: Variety of OCSs

5.3.6.1 Quantitative results

5.3.6.1.1 OCSI findings

The control group’s means of all the strategy factors on the pre-OCSI questionnaire can be seen in Table 5.

5.3.6.1.2 Oral test findings

The control group participants were observed in the oral test video recordings to use OCSs from all the strategy factors, except for the last factor for coping with listening problems (see Table 13).
Table 13: Control Group: Variety of OCSs Used on the Pre-Oral Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Subjects’ Names</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking Factor 1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking Factor 2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking Factor 3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking Factor 4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking Factor 5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking Factor 6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening Factor 1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening Factor 2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening Factor 3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening Factor 4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening Factor 5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.3.6.1.3 After-task reflection survey findings

The numbers of all the strategy factors for coping with speaking and listening problems on the pre-self-report survey are listed in Table 14. The participants of the control group reported to use more of Strategy Factor 1, 2 and 3 for coping with speaking problems as well as of Strategy Factor 1 and 2 for coping with listening problems.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OCS Factors</th>
<th>Subjects' Names</th>
<th>Pete</th>
<th>Wu</th>
<th>Amy2</th>
<th>Manisa</th>
<th>Timmy</th>
<th>Candy</th>
<th>David</th>
<th>Danny</th>
<th>Amy1</th>
<th>Total No. for each factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaking Factor 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking Factor 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking Factor 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking Factor 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking Factor 5</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking Factor 6</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening Factor 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening Factor 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening Factor 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening Factor 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening Factor 5</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.3.7  Control Group- Post-Intervention: Variety of OCSs

5.3.7.1  Quantitative results

5.3.7.1.1  OCSI findings

Means and standard deviations for all the strategy factors on the post-OCSI questionnaire are listed in Table 5.

5.3.7.1.2  Oral test findings

After the intervention, the control group participants were observed using all the strategy factors. However, the variety of OCSs used for coping with speaking problems appears to be greater than that for coping with listening problems (see Table 15).
Table 15: Control Group: Variety of OCSs Used on the Post-Oral Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OCS Factors</th>
<th>Subjects' Names</th>
<th>Total No. for each factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>Wu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking Factor 1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking Factor 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking Factor 3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking Factor 4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking Factor 5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking Factor 6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening Factor 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening Factor 2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening Factor 3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening Factor 4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening Factor 5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.3.7.1.3 After-task reflection survey findings

The total numbers of all strategy factors for coping with speaking and listening problems in the post-self-report survey are listed in Table 16. The participants of the control still reported more use of Strategy Factor 1, 2 and 3 for coping with speaking problems and of Factor 1 and 2 for coping with listening problems, but the number of use of these factors decreased in the post-self-report survey.
Table 16: Control Group: Variety of OCSs Used on the Post-Self-Report Reflection Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OCS Factors</th>
<th>Subjects’ Names</th>
<th>Peter</th>
<th>Wu</th>
<th>Amy2</th>
<th>Mansa</th>
<th>Timmy</th>
<th>Candy</th>
<th>David</th>
<th>Danny</th>
<th>Amy1</th>
<th>Total No. for each factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaking Factor 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking Factor 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking Factor 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking Factor 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking Factor 5</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking Factor 6</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening Factor 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening Factor 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening Factor 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening Factor 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening Factor 5</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.3.8 Experimental Group- Pre-Intervention: Variety of OCSs

5.3.8.1 Quantitative results

5.3.8.1.1 OCSI findings

Means and standard deviations of all the strategy factors for speaking and listening problems in the pre-OCSI questionnaire can be seen in Table 5.

5.3.8.1.2 Oral test findings

To cope with listening problems, the experimental group participants were observed using OCSs from all the factors, except the last factor, Word-oriented strategies (see Table 17).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OCS Factors</th>
<th>Subjects’ Names</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking Factor 1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking Factor 2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking Factor 3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking Factor 4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking Factor 5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking Factor 6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening Factor 1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening Factor 2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening Factor 3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening Factor 4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening Factor 5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.3.8.1.3 After-task reflection survey findings

Table 18 shows the experimental group participants’ use of each strategy factor. The table suggests that all factors were used by at least one subject of the experimental group.

Table 18: Experimental Group: Variety of OCSs Used on the Pre-self-Report Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OCS Factors</th>
<th>Subjects' Names</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking Factor 1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking Factor 2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking Factor 3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking Factor 4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking Factor 5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking Factor 6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening Factor 1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening Factor 2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening Factor 3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening Factor 4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening Factor 5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.3.9 Experimental Group- Post-Intervention: Variety of OCSs

5.3.9.1 Quantitative results

5.3.9.1.1 OCSI findings

Means and standard deviations of all the strategy factors on the post-OCSI questionnaire for speaking and listening problems are presented in Table 5.

5.3.9.1.2 Oral test findings

After the intervention, the participants from the experimental group were observed using OCSs from all the strategy factors, except the fourth factor, *More active listener strategies*, for coping with listening problems. Table 19 illustrates that the number of different OCSs used for coping with speaking problems is greater than that for coping with listening problems.
Table 19: Experimental Group: Variety of OCSs Used on the Post-Oral test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OCS Factors</th>
<th>Subjects’ Names</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking Factor 1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking Factor 2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking Factor 3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking Factor 4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking Factor 5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking Factor 6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening Factor 1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening Factor 2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening Factor 3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening Factor 4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening Factor 5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.3.9.1.3 After-task reflection survey findings

Table 20 shows the number of OCSs used by the experimental participants in the post-self-report survey. The table suggests that all the strategy factors were used by at least one subject of the experimental group while doing the post-oral test.
Table 20: Experimental Group: Variety of OCSs Used on the Post-Self-Report Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OCS Factors</th>
<th>Subjects’ Names</th>
<th>Amy</th>
<th>Kelly</th>
<th>Chloe</th>
<th>Christ-like</th>
<th>Mini</th>
<th>Junjun</th>
<th>Lora</th>
<th>Clare</th>
<th>Ivy</th>
<th>Joseph</th>
<th>Total No. for each factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaking Factor 1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking Factor 2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking Factor 3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking Factor 4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking Factor 5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking Factor 6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening Factor 1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening Factor 2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening Factor 3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening Factor 4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening Factor 5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.3.10 Comparison of Pre- and Post-Intervention Findings between the Control and Experimental Groups

5.3.10.1 Quantitative results

5.3.10.1.1 OCSI findings

By computing the Paired Samples T-test and referring to the differences in changes in the means between pre- and post-OCSI questionnaires by both groups, the data in Table 21 suggest scripted role-play for OCS training did not help the control group induce a greater variety of OCS use for coping with either speaking or listening problems. A significant effect p=.038 (p<.05) in the use of the first factor of listening strategies for the control group is evident however for the pre-OCSI questionnaire
since the mean of that factor in the post-OCSI questionnaire is smaller (Mean: 3.6439) than that in the pre-OCSI questionnaire (Mean: 3.9318) (see Table 5). The experimental group reported significant effects for three factors when coping with speaking problems in terms of the variety of OCSs used: Factor 1 with a significant effect \( p = .006 \) (\( p < .05 \)), Factor 3 with a significant effect \( p = .38 \) (\( p < .05 \)) and Factor 4 with a significant effect \( p = .004 \) (\( p < .05 \)), and there was one factor for coping with listening problems (Listening Factor 5) with a significant effect \( p = .028 \) (\( p < .05 \)). In short, the experimental group reported using a greater variety of OCSs after the intervention of process drama.

Table 21: Control and Experimental Groups: Changes in the Variety of OCSs Used Between the Pre- and Post-OCSI Questionnaires: Paired Samples T-Test Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Speaking Factor 1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speaking Factor 2</td>
<td>.827</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>.417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speaking Factor 3</td>
<td>-1.644</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>.115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speaking Factor 4</td>
<td>-1.771</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>.091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speaking Factor 5</td>
<td>.368</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>.716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speaking Factor 6</td>
<td>.576</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>.571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Listening Factor 1</td>
<td>2.217</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>.038 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Listening Factor 2</td>
<td>-.273</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>.788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Listening Factor 3</td>
<td>-1.324</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Listening Factor 4</td>
<td>-.718</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>.481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Listening Factor 5</td>
<td>-.154</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>.879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>Speaking Factor 1</td>
<td>-3.066</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>.006 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speaking Factor 2</td>
<td>-2.052</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>.053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speaking Factor 3</td>
<td>-2.217</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>.038 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speaking Factor 4</td>
<td>-3.185</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>.004 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speaking Factor 5</td>
<td>.488</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>.631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speaking Factor 6</td>
<td>-1.055</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>.303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Listening Factor 1</td>
<td>-1.319</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>.201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Listening Factor 2</td>
<td>-1.728</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>.099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Listening Factor 3</td>
<td>-1.037</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>.312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Listening Factor 4</td>
<td>-1.601</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>.124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Listening Factor 5</td>
<td>-2.367</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>.028 *</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05  
**p < .01
5.3.10.1.2 Oral test findings

By conducting a Paired Samples T-test with the numbers for all the strategy factors before and after the intervention in the oral tests, Table 22 shows significant effect on change of variety of OCSs used by the control group participants in Factors 2 and 3, *Caution strategies* and *Fluency-oriented strategies*, for coping with speaking problems. Factor 2, *Caution strategies*, generated a significant effect $p=.010$ ($p<.05$), and Factor 3, *Fluency-oriented strategies*, a significant effect $p=.023$ ($p<.05$). On the hand, the experimental group gained a significant effect $p=.008$ ($p<.01$) in Factor 1, *More active speaker strategies*, for coping with speaking problems and a significant effect $p=.045$ ($p<.05$) in Factor 3, *Fluency-maintaining strategies*, for coping with listening problems.
### Table 22: Control and Experimental Groups: Changes in the Variety of OCSs Used Between Pre- and Post-Oral Tests: Paired Samples T-Test Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Speaking Factor 1</td>
<td>-2.309</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speaking Factor 2</td>
<td>-3.355</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.010 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speaking Factor 3</td>
<td>-2.800</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.023 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speaking Factor 4</td>
<td>-1.512</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speaking Factor 5</td>
<td>.686</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speaking Factor 6</td>
<td>-2.294</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Listening Factor 1</td>
<td>-426</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Listening Factor 2</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Listening Factor 3</td>
<td>.359</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Listening Factor 4</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Listening Factor 5</td>
<td>-1.000</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>Speaking Factor 1</td>
<td>-3.431</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.008 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speaking Factor 2</td>
<td>-1.964</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speaking Factor 3</td>
<td>-2.212</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speaking Factor 4</td>
<td>-2.250</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speaking Factor 5</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speaking Factor 6</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Listening Factor 1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Listening Factor 2</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Listening Factor 3</td>
<td>-2.333</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.045 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Listening Factor 4</td>
<td>1.500</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Listening Factor 5</td>
<td>-1.000</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.343</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p< .05  
**p< .01

#### 5.3.10.1.3 After-task reflection survey findings

By conducting the Paired Samples T-test with all the strategy factors before and after intervention for both groups, no significant differences were found for change of variety of OCSs used for either group (see Table 23).
Table 23: Control and Experimental Groups: Changes in the Variety of OCSs Used Between Pre- and Post-Self-Report Reflection Surveys: Paired Samples T-Test Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Speaking Factor 1</td>
<td>.365</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speaking Factor 2</td>
<td>2.135</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speaking Factor 3</td>
<td>-.686</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speaking Factor 4</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speaking Factor 5</td>
<td>-.263</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speaking Factor 6</td>
<td>-.894</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Listening Factor 1</td>
<td>.567</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Listening Factor 2</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Listening Factor 3</td>
<td>.155</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Listening Factor 4</td>
<td>-1.644</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Listening Factor 5</td>
<td>.958</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>Speaking Factor 1</td>
<td>.269</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speaking Factor 2</td>
<td>.688</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speaking Factor 3</td>
<td>1.993</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speaking Factor 4</td>
<td>.712</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speaking Factor 5</td>
<td>.318</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speaking Factor 6</td>
<td>.557</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Listening Factor 1</td>
<td>1.247</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Listening Factor 2</td>
<td>-1.260</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Listening Factor 3</td>
<td>1.103</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Listening Factor 4</td>
<td>1.413</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Listening Factor 5</td>
<td>.133</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.897</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05
5.4 Secondary RQ: a. Where Process Drama Successfully Induces OCS Actions From Participants, How Do the Participants Describe Its Operation?

The three sub-questions under the secondary research question can be best answered by results of data analyses from three instruments: semi-structured group interviews, students’ journals and the Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale (FLCAS). Accordingly, the answers to each sub-question are synthesised and presented under headings for these three instruments.

5.4.1 Control Group- Pre-Intervention: Description of Operation of Scripted Role-Play

5.4.1.1 Group interview findings

First of all, before the intervention, four control group participants said that they related OCSs with interlocution, communication or speaking, and three participants had pessimistic associations when they first heard about oral communication strategies (OCSs). David said “OCSs seem to associate with nervousness.” ChenFat thought OCSs were related to anxiety, and Tim expected that “OCSs might be troublesome”. Secondly, in the pre-group interview, all participants reported that they did not have any ideas about what process drama was. However, 17 control group participants agreed that OCSs could be trained. Among the 17 participants, 16 control group participants thought scripted role-play could assist in the training of OCSs. Two other control group participants disagreed on the teachability of OCSs.
5.4.2 Control group- Post-intervention: Description of operation of scripted role-play

5.4.2.1 Group interview findings

After a semester-long intervention, all 24 interviewees of the control group believed that OCSs could be trained. However, only 7 interviewees thought scripted role-play could help assist OCS training. The other 11 participants did not feel much difference about their intervention or did not think the scripted role-play they received was the best way to learn or use OCSs. Some of the reasons that they liked scripted role-play as their intervention were as follows. Ben said “Role-play helps us get involved in the conversations. Practising or repeating the lines more would help speaking English. I would feel more interested in the course while learning by playing drama”. Amy2, Timmy and Sylvia stated that, “I like the intervention”. Jenny asserted that, “The intervention helps me remember English conversations easily because it is pair work”. Peter and William presented another perspective when they said that talking directly with native English speakers would be the best and the most efficient way to enhance the English oral proficiency, David supplemented this with the remark, “I can also talk to native Taiwanese English teachers as to foreigners”. From this viewpoint William agreed with David’s opinion, but Peter did not. Amy1 hoped the scripted conversations offered could be easier. Smart and Lin expressed that, “It’s better to practise conversations that are already made by teachers or books”.

5.4.2.2 Students’ journal findings

About half of the control group participants remarked that making their own script for the first drama module was interesting or that the self-made scripts impressed them a lot. Canned thought it would be a good idea if everyone offered at least two sentences for the group script writing. Seven participants claimed that they liked to read vocabulary and sentences with the
teacher besides working with their partners. Adam said that by doing this he could read English conversations with skills learned from the teacher. Many more participants expressed their liking of pair or triad work. Canned said she liked to sit in pairs or groups and appreciated pair or group work for producing a conversation. Marba, Snail, Amy1, Ben, Candy and David had similar opinions to Canned’s. At least 10 people wrote about being impressed by going to the front to act out memorised conversations or to read conversations in front of everyone. Some said watching how other people made mistakes would help them learn.

Amy1, Adam, Brad and David complained about the noise created by role-play activities and said they would be happier with the class if the noise level could be kept down. Fish and Love Rain thought role-play was a bit monotonous, and it had no special attraction to them. Fish, How are you?, Lin and Sylvia stated strongly their dislike of memorising a lot of vocabulary through practice of scripted conversations. Lin protested in her journal saying, “Can we not do role-play?” She did not like her partners’ passive attitudes toward cooperation, discussions or participation because such attitudes had seriously impacted on her own learning. Sylvia remarked that she did not like to act. NaiNai said, “Keeping practising conversations made me a bit sleepy”.

However, except the preferences and an interest in talking to foreign visitors in class by all the participants, David, Candy and Frank of the control group also expressed that they liked the whole course. Peter further stated that he liked brainstorming at the end of a drama module. In his journal, Pride of Shu Zen complimented the teacher’s facilitation during the drama activities.

Only NaiNai, Sylvia and Timmy indicated the name of the third module in their journals and this was only once. No one else from the control group reflected on any characters, content or
plots of the three drama modules in their journals. Instead, the participants of the experimental group usually clearly indicated what their feelings were in terms of their comments about certain drama figures, content or plot developments in their writing.

5.4.3 Experimental Group- Pre-Intervention: Description of Operation of Process Drama

5.4.3.1 Group interview findings

Before the intervention, all experimental group participants said that they had no ideas about what process drama was and five participants had negative impressions about it. Another five participants related OCSs with interlocution, communication or speaking and one subject held a positive attitude towards OCSs. In the pre-group interview 16 experimental group participants expressed their interest in using process drama to help train their use of OCSs. Some of their positive thoughts or expectations toward process drama were: “It should be interesting, helpful or effective. It should help oral expression. I am looking forward to experiencing it”. Joseph hoped to make progress with communication and expression, and Lora wished to be able to understand her classmates easily through process drama training. They said that it would be alright to communicate through simple vocabulary or sentences as long as they could communicate with others. D and Joseph stated their concerns due to their unfamiliarity with process drama. However, they stated that they would like to try the intervention but hoped the teacher’s instructions and guidance about drama could be clear. They said that after all, they had never experienced process drama in the past.

5.4.4 Experimental Group- Post-Intervention: Description of Operation of Process Drama

5.4.4.1 Group interview findings

All the experimental group interviewees agreed that OCSs could be trained using process drama after the intervention, and they also expressed their intention of trying process drama
again in their future classes. Fourteen participants revealed their liking for process drama. D especially liked the third drama module, “The Three Little Pigs and the Big Bad Wolf.” Some of the 14 participants’ statements were as follows.

“I like process drama”, said Da.

“The class became more interesting by using process drama”, exclaimed Kelly.

“I like the three little pig drama”, stated D.

“I like process drama. It’s more fun”, expressed Bread.

Many of the interviewees said that process drama was interesting. Chloe said that, “the teacher was a good actress”. There were 23 experimental group participants reporting that they would like to try process drama in the future. Thirteen participants said that they did not think process drama was noisy. Yet, there were still two participants, Christine and Chao, who stated that they preferred to talk to native English speakers directly to enhance their English oral proficiency rather than use drama. Christine and JunJun complained about the frequent noise generated by group activities with process drama.

5.4.4.2 Students’ journal findings

The dramatic techniques of process drama, such as hot-seating, teacher-in-role, group role-play, frozen-image, warm-up games, creating tension and conflicting topics or issues for discussions, were commended by most of the experimental group participants. For instance, four participants, Christine, D, Da and Amy claimed that warm-up activities, such as the hand-touching game, quickly led them to the theme of the second drama module. Chloe, Clare, Lora, Melissa, Mini and Z, all recorded that hot-seating would help them ask and answer questions among the classmates from multiple perspectives. “Doing activities of
‘frozen-image’ and introducing touring information were great fun”, stated Christine and Z. Nine participants said that activities of group role-play helped them create clear and vivid characters for each role that the groups were assigned to play, and the activities helped them engage in the drama. Moreover, about half of the participants indicated that teacher-in-role with props helped them quickly engage in drama development. Ivy, Da and Joseph said that process drama contained problem-solving, which could be very useful and practical for their real life problem-solving in the future.

Besides descriptions of these process drama operations, the experimental group participants also observed the following for process drama: abundant interactions and discussions within and among groups, presentations for other groups, flexibility in classroom setting changes, open endings for each drama topic and the overall fun and energy flowing in class. For example:

“The change of our classroom setting impressed me most”, said D.

“The class is fun and special”, exclaimed DonDon, Tung and Z.

“Group discussions and activities helped me understand issues”, stated Joseph.

“I like to create stories and express my own ideas in the intervention”, JunJun and Lora declared.

“Having my own ending is great”, said Tung.

“Discussing what sentences and OCSs we could use while talking to English speakers was helpful”, said Mini, Y and Z.
Compared to the control group’s journals, the experimental group participants provided more detailed and plentiful descriptions in their weekly journals about the intervention they experienced.

5.5 Secondary RQ: b. Where Process Drama Successfully Induces OCS Action From Participants, How Do the Participants Account for Its Facilitation of Greater Variety and/or More Frequency of OCSs?

5.5.1 Control Group- Pre-Intervention: Accounts of Facilitation of Scripted Role-Play

5.5.1.1 Group interview findings

Before the intervention, there were 16 control group participants who considered they were motivated to use OCSs and English through the scripted role-play.

5.5.2 Control Group- Post-Intervention: Accounts of Facilitation of Scripted Role-Play

5.5.2.1 Group interview findings

After the intervention, 10 control group participants felt motivated to use OCSs and English. Eight participants felt slightly motivated to do so. The remaining five did not really feel motivated by the intervention. Jenny, Timmy and Candy commented that talking to foreigners would motivate them more since they would have to use English with them. Thus, role-play only made them feel slightly motivated. Six control group participants contended that they would like to have more authenticity in the drama, and they did not like fairy tales. They stated that, “Fairy tales are boring. Reality topics are better.” Tim and ChenFat hoped to have more interactions in class and hoped the class could have been more interesting. Snail criticised the intervention in that more props were needed for the drama, and she wanted more drama to happen in class. Lin strongly opposed the intervention by saying that, “I hope
to have less drama. The teacher should directly instruct whatever she wants to teach. That would be better”.

### 5.5.2.2 Students’ journal findings

Six points have been synthesised from the control group participants’ journals for this sub-research question. First, some participants explained that scripted role-play helped them to learn, rehearse and memorise useful sentences or English usage efficiently. When they needed to talk in English, they felt there would be less pressure using English. Secondly, through pair or triad work in the scripted role-play, most of the control group participants claimed that they learned from their partners’ mistakes and by observing others’ performances. They reported using OCSs and having more fun while practising English and discussing conversation sentences with their group members or partners. Thirdly, one subject, Jimmy, said that role-play activities made the students learn in a relaxing class atmosphere. He believed that learning by playing would help them learn better. Fourthly, Adam, stated that because of the role-play, he got to use more body language to help him express what he wanted to say while communicating in English. Then, two participants, Smart and Canned, stated that they became more engaged in class because of the fun which role-play generated. Lastly, Timmy realised that she could use simple English to communicate well with others just as she did in the conversations. She said she then used OCSs such as asking for repetitions or using words she was familiar with to answer questions.
5.5.3 Experimental Group- Pre-Intervention: Accounts of Facilitation of Process Drama

5.5.3.1 Group interview findings

Before the intervention, 11 experimental group participants considered that they would be motivated by the process drama intervention. For instance, Shou said, “I would hope to use as many OCSs as possible.

5.5.4 Experimental Group- Post-Intervention: Accounts of Facilitation of Scripted Role-Play

5.5.4.1 Group interview findings

Thirteen experimental group participants reported that they felt motivated to use OCSs after the intervention. Seven participants felt a little bit motivated, and three participants did not feel motivated at all to use OCSs due to the intervention. Here are their remarks. Chloe liked to have even more props used in the process drama: “More props would bring even more fun, I think.” Joseph also thought that the teacher playing teacher-in-role with special props and costumes was cool and special and even inspired some of his undiscovered potentialities. He said: “The techniques of process drama were very cool, especially teacher-in-role. That the teacher wore special props and costumes impressed me a lot. I found some of my undiscovered potentiality”.

Shou and Clare both claimed that the authentic context of process drama helped them learn things easily. They remarked that process drama gave them the chance to talk in an authentic context, to learn things at any point while processing drama activities and to learn English easily. Ma and Tony loved the abundant opportunities to interact with others in process drama activities. They stated that process drama provided opportunities to interact with others. They like the interactive way of learning. Lora commented that, “Process drama can help critical thinking and brainstorming”. Shark complemented Lora’s remarks by saying,
“The intervention of process drama is very good and very dynamic”. D expressed that, “I became braver to speak English if I were in drama activities.” However, Mini emphasised that it is better to speak directly with foreigners to enhance oral communication competence. Nine other participants reported learning from their peers through process drama.

5.5.4.2 Students’ journal findings

Nine points were synthesised for how the experimental group accounted for the facilitation provided by process drama. First of all, eight participants stated that the authentic and spontaneous scenarios in process drama helped generate near-real life situations and issues so that they could practise using OCSs. In other words, process drama provided more opportunities for them to discuss issues and face dilemmas which were practical and useful for their real needs. The participants then gained the confidence to solve problems or deal with specific encounters. Secondly, by practising in English through process drama, three participants felt that they dared to use English more after the intervention. Thirdly, six participants declared that process drama helped them become engaged in learning and in using more vocabulary in order to communicate better. Fourthly, process drama pedagogy was observed by another six experimental group participants to be more dynamic than what they had experienced in past didactic English classes. Next, the drama tension created through process drama had helped draw and focus participants’ attention on carrying out conversations in order to brainstorm solutions. Thus, the English conversations were usually extended and more OCSs were used to help achieve that goal. Furthermore, one participant, Amy, said that the group work of process drama helped her observe others’ modelling their use of OCSs and English grammar. Lastly, it was fun for participants to use OCSs through various dramatic challenges and dilemmas. Christine stated that, “Equipping with OCSs made me feel like speaking English more in the class”.
Many participants also recorded the strategies they had been using in the classes. JunJun, Lora and Z said they often used the strategy. Lora stated that, “I try to translate into native language little by little to understand what the speaker has said” while encountering listening problems. Z and Lora used the strategy, “I guess the speaker’s intention based on what she said so far”. Clare listed the following strategies, “While speaking, I pay attention to the listener’s reaction to my speech”, “I make comprehension checks to ensure the listener understands what I want to say”, “I made up a new word in order to communicate a desired concept (e.g., ‘airball’ for ‘balloon’), “I change my way of saying things according to the context”, “I take my time to express what I want to say.”

Christine stated that she had been using the following strategy categories based on Nakatani’s (2006) OCSI - “Social affective strategies”, “Fluency-oriented strategies”, “Negotiation for meaning while speaking strategies”, “Negotiation for meaning while listening”, “Fluency-maintaining strategies”, “Getting the gist strategies” and “Word-oriented strategies”. She also applied the strategies, such as reflected in her comment, “I try to relax when I feel anxious”, “I actively encourage myself to express what I want to say”, and “I change my way of saying things according to the context”. Tung also recorded a lot of strategies used. They are as follows. “I ask the speaker to slow down when I can’t understand what the speaker has said”, “I ask the speaker to use easy words when I have difficulties in comprehension”, “I ask for repetition when I can’t understand what the speaker has said”, “I pay attention to the first part of the sentence and guess the speaker’s intention”, “I try to catch the speaker’s main point”, “I try to respond to the speaker even when I don’t understand him/her perfectly”, and “I don’t mind if I don’t understand every single detail”. Z reported using the following strategies. “I guess the speaker’s intention by picking up familiar words”, “I try to translate into my native language little by little to understand what the speaker has said”, and “I only focus on familiar expressions.”
5.6 Secondary RQ: c. Where Process Drama Successfully Induces OCS Action From Participants, What Value Do the Participants Place on Their Increased Variety and/or Frequency of OCSs?

5.6.1 Control Group- Pre-Intervention: Value Placed on Facilitation of Scripted Role-Play

5.6.1.1 Group interview findings

Thirteen participants from the control group announced that they would feel a bit anxious or self-conscious while talking in English. One reported that he or she did not pay much attention to how their emotions changed while using English.

5.6.2 Control Group- Post-Intervention: Value Placed on Facilitation of Scripted Role-Play

5.6.2.1 Group interview findings

Twenty control group participants claimed that they still felt the same anxiety as before the intervention. Sylvia, Jenny, Ben and William expressed feeling less anxious after the intervention. Adam was the only one who reported feeling worse than before, saying he was becoming very nervous while using English. Moreover, 14 control group participants concluded that OCSs were useful to them after the intervention. One said OCSs were very useful. Nine others claimed that they were more or less useful to them. Only David reported that he did not feel much one way or the other about OCSs. Here are statements made by some participants who thought OCSs were useful. Timmy said, “Some strategies are helpful but some are dreadful. For instance, why does one need to look at others’ eyes while speaking English? Others might get offended”. Jenny agreed with Timmy’s ideas. Ben stated that he would use body language if he couldn’t express something in English.
5.6.2.2  Students’ journal findings

Five points were offered by control group participants in their journals. First of all, Adam thought such an intervention could really enhance communicative ability. Secondly, a change in learning attitudes was signalled. For example, Canned, Sylvia and Yo made similar statements about the fun they had when using English although they had made some embarrassing mistakes. In other words, they would feel less anxious or fearful about making mistakes while using a foreign language. Furthermore, not only did the three participants feel it was fun to talk to English speakers, but in fact all the control group participants expressed keen interest in contacting native English speakers. Yo even wrote, “I recommend everyone to speak out in English. Don’t be shy”. Fourthly, after the intervention, one subject revealed his expectation that English oral proficiency would be enhanced. Lastly, Jimmy and Yo wished they could have had more interactions. Yo remarked that ,“More interactions will be better. I like everyone to exchange opinions”.

5.6.2.2.1  FLCAS findings

The results of the Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale (FLCAS) generated by the Paired Sample Test for changes in anxiety after the intervention did not show any significant differences for the control group (see Table 24).
Table 24: Control and Experimental Groups: Significance in Anxiety Changes After the Intervention Based on Paired Samples Test: FLCAS Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Paired Differences</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Pre-Post Factor1</td>
<td>0.212 1.184</td>
<td>0.840</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-Post Factor2</td>
<td>-0.015 1.219</td>
<td>-0.058</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-Post Factor3</td>
<td>0.000 1.380</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-Post Factor4</td>
<td>-0.205 1.297</td>
<td>-0.740</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-Post Factor5</td>
<td>0.272 1.461</td>
<td>0.875</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-Post Factor6</td>
<td>0.379 1.165</td>
<td>1.525</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>Pre-Post Factor1</td>
<td>-0.038 1.027</td>
<td>-0.173</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-Post Factor2</td>
<td>0.189 1.037</td>
<td>0.857</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-Post Factor3</td>
<td>0.114 1.133</td>
<td>0.470</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-Post Factor4</td>
<td>0.114 0.975</td>
<td>0.547</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-Post Factor5</td>
<td>-0.068 1.621</td>
<td>-0.197</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-Post Factor6</td>
<td>-0.136 1.242</td>
<td>-0.515</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.612</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p<.05

5.6.3 Experimental Group- Pre-Intervention: Value Placed on Facilitation of Process Drama

5.6.3.1 Group interview findings

There were 18 participants from the experimental group who participated in this interview. Thirteen of them expressed that they did not really feel anxious while communicating in English. Another five reported feeling anxious while talking in English (see Table 25). The remarks of some of these five participants are as follows. Bread said, “I feel anxious or self-conscious if others use difficult English. If they don’t, I wouldn’t feel so. If they do, I would become so nervous that I have to look away”. Chloe stated that, “My physical and facial expressions would become tense and awkward”. Joseph remarked that, “Learning OCSs could help communication even when we have low language proficiency”.
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5.6.4 Experimental Group- Post-Intervention: Value Placed on Facilitation of Process Drama

5.6.4.1 Group interview findings

Twenty five participants from the experimental group were interviewed after the intervention. Fourteen of them reported feeling less anxious while using English and another nine said they felt the same as before. For instance, “Comparatively, I am less anxious now than before. Yet, for some vocabulary that I don’t know how to pronounce, I would still get nervous” (Clare). Among the nine participants, four reported feeling as anxious as before the intervention, but the other five claimed that they had not ever felt anxious anyway. Such an interview result conflicted with the one collected before the intervention, in which 13 participants said that they never really had felt anxious.

Eleven experimental group participants commented that OCSs were useful to them. For instance, Da stated that, “I know more about how to express my opinions now. If I encounter some communicative barriers, I would know how to solve the problems.” Mini said, “OCSs helped with speaking fluency”. Besides, Lora remarked that, “OCSs are very useful to me. Especially, the inventory contains possible strategies I could use”. Another six experimental group participants reported that OCSs were a bit helpful to them. Tung and Shark reported paying more attention to participants, verbs and nouns of sentences while talking in English. Yen said she would pay attention to grammar and intonation while listening to English now. Ivy also stated that she would pay attention to grammar, intonation and people’s facial expression while listening to English. Gi reported paying attention to people’s pronunciation, and Amy said she paid attention to people’s gestures. Only Clare and D remarked that they did not feel much either way about OCSs.
However, Christine, Amy and Tung emphasised that they still needed to practise speaking in English more in order to better use OCSs. Some experimental group participants also claimed that they would like to use the following strategies more often in the future to help with their English communication, “making words (e.g., “air ball” for balloon)”, “getting the gist while listening”, “guessing for the rough ideas”, “using eye contacts, facial expression and gestures”, “guessing”, “speaking slowly”, and “using familiar words to make oneself more understood”.

Table 25: Number of Participants Who Joined in Group Interviews and Who Reported Feeling Anxious While Using English after the Intervention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Control Group</th>
<th></th>
<th>Experimental Group</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. of</td>
<td>No. of participants</td>
<td>No. of</td>
<td>No. of participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>participants</td>
<td>reporting feeling</td>
<td>participants</td>
<td>reporting feeling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>in group</td>
<td>anxious</td>
<td>in group interviews</td>
<td>anxious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>interviews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before intervention</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After intervention</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.6.4.2 Students’ journal findings

Seven points were synthesised from the collective journals of the experimental group participants. First of all, participants expressed passionate opinions about the process drama intervention and its value to their English learning and oral communication competence. Ten made the following comments:

- I like today’s class. The class is great.
- I love the class and the teaching very much!
- I’ve never had any interesting English course like this before.
- I like to talk to native English speaking guests visiting our class. It was my first time feeling relaxed and carefree about English classes. I felt very satisfied with the teacher’s teaching method! I hope in the future Basic English Grammar course could all be instructed by drama methods. I felt good about being able to use OCSs. I hope we could keep having this kind of pedagogy for our classes in the future. It was great fun. The class enhanced my conversation ability.

These remarks suggest that the participants valued the intervention highly and the ability it had fostered for them to use OCSs for better communication. Moreover, Chloe proposed an interesting viewpoint that, “such a teaching could turn what we have learned into long-term memory”. In other words, with the use of process drama techniques, the variety and frequency of OCSs had increased and the whole learning process had improved her learning efficacy. Joseph reported, “I am happy that I am able to talk about details with English speakers.” Namely, he had started not only to have English conversations but also to have more profound ones. As a result, his confidence in talking English to real people had increased. This can be seen also in Joseph’s statement that, “I found I could learn ‘real English’ from having ‘real conversations’ with English speakers. Electronic dictionaries really can’t be trusted. It’s better to learn English from real contact with real people.”

Another two experimental group participants commented that, “OCSs are very useful when we try to talk to English speakers”. One declared that, “We have more engagements in this class than in other English classes”. Shao-Yi said that she really liked the energetic
interactions in this intervention class. There are similar responses to those stated above by the 10 participants who felt positively about the intervention.

5.6.4.3 FLCAS findings

The results of the Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale (FLCAS) generated by the Paired Sample Test for changes in anxiety after the intervention did not show any significant differences for the experimental group (see Table 24).

5.6.5 Value Placed on Facilitation of Process Drama from the Teacher’s Viewpoint: Findings by Teacher’s Journal

5.6.5.1 Impressions about the intervention

5.6.5.1.1 Control Group

The teacher’s journal revealed that, “After the first couple of weeks of the intervention, the control group participants did not show much emotion toward the scripted role-play” (Journal, Week 3). The participants generally reported that they liked to go to the front of the classroom and perform their conversations in front of everyone. “The participants welcomed and showed a great interest in the visiting foreign students, who came to role-play with them for the second drama module” (Journal, Week 11). They were overwhelmed by being able to use English with the English speakers. In addition, “Although some of the participants complained about conversations being too hard to read or practise, they still felt excited while seeing their teacher playing a dramatic role with them” (Journal, Week 13). The control group participants seemed to be impressed by the third drama module (namely, “The Three Little Pigs and the Big Bad Wolf”). One possible explanation might be that they were familiar with the story. A second could be that playing animal roles was a rare experience for them.
5.6.5.1.2 Experimental Group

Comparatively, the reactions of the experimental group participants toward their intervention at the beginning of the intervention were rather strong. Many of them were excited about and surprised at the change of pedagogy for the semester. “Unlike the complaints of the control group participants, I never heard the experimental group participants complain that the conversations they had in the course were too hard even though those conversations were all impromptu” (Journal, Week 11). However, this was not because of the participants’ high language proficiency. Instead, I was shocked by how much lower their language proficiency was than what I first expected.

The most annoying problem during the experimental group’s intervention might have been the noise and chaos created from group work. A small number of participants chatted often about things that were irrelevant to the drama topics or play with their own group members. “The noise from discussions or practices could sometimes be loud or look chaotic, which could seriously violate official requests for classroom order” (Journal, Week 5). Nevertheless, according to the overall journal entries, the participants expressed their appreciation for most of the process drama techniques, such as hot-seating, teacher-in-role or warm-up activities.

Because of the process drama, the experimental group participants seemed to pay greater attention to what sentences might be useful for the theme activities, and they also started to think critically and brainstorm for some plans they made or endings of drama plots. This group of participants was also very excited about the visit and engagement of the foreign students. “They tried hard to communicate with these English-speaking guests” (Journal, Week 10). “The participants especially developed and performed their roles well for the third drama module (namely, “The Three Little Pigs and the Big Bad Wolf”)” (Journal, Week 15).
5.6.5.2 Whether learning goals of the week have been achieved

5.6.5.2.1 Control Group
“Yes. The control group participants behaved themselves in class. Some of them asked questions about the OCSs they had learned. They worked hard on the conversations” (Journal, Week 4).

5.6.5.2.2 Experimental Group
“The experimental group participants needed some discipline. The class seemed to be a bit chaotic” (Journal, Week 5). Another phenomenon the teacher-researcher observed was that the power in the classroom seemed to shift from the teacher to the students. “I strongly felt that I didn’t need to be an omnipotent instructor, but a facilitator for their learning” (Journal, Week 13). “The participants got to use their imagination and thought deeply and widely about some issues raised in the drama. They also started to use their limited English ability and OCSs to ask and answer their peers’ questions” (Journal, Week 15). Many participants reported that the OCSs they learned were useful to them. The teacher-researcher also observed that they did their best to provide their creative ideas, and some inattentive participants were attracted by brainstorming activities.

5.6.5.3 Atmosphere in class and participants’ affection

5.6.5.3.1 Control Group
“The control group participants were excited in taking on roles for their conversation practice. Some of the control group participants doubted their ability to present their conversations in front of everyone” (Journal, Week 5). They were also afraid of talking with foreigners with their limited English language proficiency. Moreover, the teacher-researcher recorded that the participants and the teacher became closer to each other while she was playing a role with them.
5.6.5.3.2 Experimental Group

“The experimental group participants got excited in every class. They never fell asleep. Each time they seemed to be excited to report their group discussion results in the front of everyone. They always passionately discussed among themselves, especially with the activity, *hot-seating*” (Journal, Week 13). According to the teacher’s journal entry of Week 14, “there were intense interactions between people sitting on *hot-seating* and the other classmates. The teacher became a real facilitator of the class, not a dominant instructor”. Moreover, “the participants seemed to like the third module topic, ‘Pets and Pet Owners’ a lot. This might have been because the topic was familiar to their real life experiences. Most of the experimental group participants were attentive and engaged in activities, such as group discussions and role-play” (Journal, Week 17). The class atmosphere was tense and attentive while having debates and defences for the third drama module. Other than that, they also had serious attitudes toward their travelling and budget planning in the second drama module, according to the journal entries.

5.6.5.4 What to improve for today’s lesson or intervention

5.6.5.4.1 Control Group

“Maybe I should make the OCS instruction more interesting. The conversations made by the participants themselves seemed to be too simple in terms of sentence structure and wording. Moreover, it could be very easy for me to hold on to the talking time for most of the class”(Journal, Week 5). The teacher-researcher’s journal showed her recognition that being able to facilitate the participants’ work and letting them have more time to perform was important. Yet, through scripted role-play it was not easy for the participants to use OCSs because the conversations were all set. “There was little chance for them to discuss or debate any interesting issues with their peers. The control group participants seemed to be more anxious than the experimental group participants while interacting with foreigners” (Journal,
Week 7). Yet, toward the end of the semester, the control group participants were observed to be less afraid to perform in front of everyone compared to earlier. Lastly, a statement regarding teaching skills was recorded, “I should probably pay more attention to the students who really wanted to learn instead of those who didn’t want to learn” (Journal, Week 16).

5.6.5.4.2 Experimental Group

Regarding some side-effects of this intervention of process drama, it was recorded that, “The loudness of the experimental group worried me. I should probably encourage more passive and shy participants to go on the stage and try to give them the chance to feel the fun of learning and using English and OCSs”. And “As a facilitator, I should help build up and reinforce the differences and characteristics of each group’s role” (Journal, Week 13). The teacher reflected that she should give more time to reviewing what strategies each participant used during the intervention.

5.6.6 Excerpts of Module 3: Findings by Video-Recording of Class Activities

5.6.6.1 Control group

On the video students were practising pronunciations of unfamiliar words. They also chatted in Mandarin a lot. They could easily just have practised by themselves while they were supposed to work in groups or in pairs. A lot of the participants held onto their scripts and read all the time. Body language was seldom used to help communication. Other people’s lines were pre-scripted, so it was not necessary to guess or observe others’ body language or reactions for better understanding of their partners’ meanings. There were few English conversations between pairs or among groups besides reading the scripts. These scripts could also cover the students’ faces. It was a quieter class compared to the experimental class.
5.6.6.1.2 Experimental group

“Students paid full attention to the teacher’s body language and oral expressions while she explained or reviewed stories or drama plots in English on the blackboard. Students kept silent while the teacher was telling stories in English.

Different groups played different roles in the drama module. The teacher helped build up the characters and provided background information for each role. Students got to change their sitting positions for different activities. For example, they could walk around for group discussions or tableaus, or go to sit at the front of the class for hot-seating. They had the chance to use their bodies to help express their intentions. The teacher’s questions for each group were always varied and spontaneous based on different situations for different roles. The participants would then have to use English to talk to the teacher in order to resolve some problems created within the drama or by the roles.

It was challenging for the participants to relax their bodies, but they were encouraged to use body language to help themselves express their intentions or feelings. The participants were excited about and attentive to their group work. The participants in role also had the opportunity to discuss and write down English sentences, which they would use to interact with or interrogate other participants.

The teacher could play a creative or an inspiring role in the process drama instead of only helping them correct pronunciation or being a live translator who provided the vocabulary they needed. For instance, when the teacher played a silly wolf (for teacher-in-role activities) who pretended to have less knowledge and intelligence than the pigs played by the participants, this apparently elicited spontaneity and creativity from the participants in resolving dilemmas or conflicts. They keenly discussed a lot of sensible and viable solutions that the teacher did not even think of. In order to communicate with the teacher-in-role wolf,
the participants willing used English because they felt the need to give the wolf a lesson or to persuade it not to eat them. The teacher in low-status or a facilitating role then had the chance to let the participants brainstorm and solve problems while interacting with her.
6 Discussion & Conclusion

6.1 Introduction

The study described in this thesis was experimental and interventionist in design and was used to investigate the following primary and secondary research questions:

1. Primary research question:
   To what extent does process drama successfully induce greater frequency and/or greater variety of OCSs?

2. Secondary research questions:
   Where process drama successfully induces OCS action from participants,
   a) how do the participants describe its operation?
   b) how do the participants account for its facilitation of greater variety and/or more frequency of OCSs?
   c) what value do the participants place on their increased variety and/or frequency of OCSs?

In general, most findings from quantitative data suggested that the experimental group used a greater frequency and variety of OCSs than the control. As revealed in the preceding chapter, participants involved in the process drama intervention reported that they were highly engaged in their class activities and enjoyed learning and using English and OCSs. These are very positive outcomes from the experimental intervention in comparison with the ones from the control. However, the level of anxiety for all the participants using English in classrooms did not change significantly despite interventions used for the experimental and the control groups. These findings inform the two sets of questions that framed the research and are discussed in the following sections.
6.2 Primary Research Question: To What Extent Does Process Drama Successfully Induce Greater Frequency of Use and/or Greater Variety of OCSs?

Results collected by the three instruments are discussed in terms of the extent of frequency and variety of OCSs used before and after the intervention. After a semester of intervention, the participants’ viewpoints changed regarding the efficacy of the drama interventions used in promoting their use of OCSs. In the post-group interviews, all the participants, except seven from the control group, agreed that the drama approach helped promote their use of OCSs. All of the experimental group participants agreed that OCSs could be used to improve their English communication. Every participant trained in process drama observed an increase of their use of OCSs. In short, more of those participants taught using process drama had positive belief in its effect on their use of OCS, compared to those in the control group, and as outlined below, this related to both frequency and variety of OCS usage.

6.2.1 Frequency of OCSs

First of all, those participants who received process drama had significantly greater use of two strategy factors for coping with speaking and listening problems. The factors were “More active speaker strategies” and “Interaction strategies”. This suggests that process drama had been particularly helpful for students to be both more active generally with OCSs in their English language usage and more interactive. On the other hand, the scripted role-play was not associated with any significant change in OCS use.

Second, although one experimental group participant’s reporting of oral tests was not complete, the rest revealed the important message of their much greater use of OCSs. Specifically in relation to speaking, participants with process drama training showed 23 times more use of OCSs for coping with speaking problems after the intervention than those whose learning vehicle had been scripted role-play. The total number using OCSs for coping with
listening problems for the experimental group after the intervention was 25 and it was 16 for the control group (see Table 6).

Usage for dealing with listening problems was generally much less across both groups. However, this may have been due to a methodological issue since it is possible that OCSs for coping with listening problems were more difficult to observe in video recordings, than those for coping with speaking problems. In this study, the intervention of process drama helped create abundant opportunities for using English and OCSs in class, while scripted role-play provided comparatively less. Those trained in the pedagogy of process drama used OCSs while confronting communicative obstacles. For instance, process drama activities like hot-seating and group role-play provided the chance for participants to deal with drama tension and conflict. Such classroom activities also placed participants in natural interaction situations in English – and there were more immediate responses from them and less hesitation and fewer concerns about how their performances might turn out. With such practice in class, participants easily recognised their communicative weaknesses and used available and effective OCSs to elevate their levels of English oral accuracy and fluency.

Even though the OCSI questionnaire and oral tests suggested similar findings for frequency of OCS use, the after-task reflection survey showed different findings. In their after-task reflections, participants of both groups reported decreased frequency of OCS use after their oral tests. Those who participated in process drama surprisingly reported greater decreases of OCSs during oral tests than the ones with scripted role-play. Three factors are offered to explain these conflicting results.

Conceivably, those trained with process drama had a broader experience of drama than those with scripted role-play, and if so they probably conformed to this general finding better in gaining higher confidence, language proficiency and skills in how to use OCSs in various
scenarios. They might then have been in a better position to be selective about their OCSs and this might have been the basis of reports on their more discriminating appraisal of what to use rather than on what they were able to use. This possibility has some support in the generally more positive feedback they provided about their OCSs. For example, Joseph’s remark that, “I found I could learn ‘real English’ from having ‘real conversations’ with English speakers. Electronic dictionaries really can’t be trusted. It’s better to learn English through real contact with real people” (Journal, Week 14) is clearly a very positive endorsement. As are those of others such as Show (“The class enhanced my conversation ability”) and Mini (“Not bad. The OCSs were very useful … The strategies were very practical, and I am very happy … I used some OCSs and I felt they were quite useful. I like them a lot. I feel good about everything. I also got to use some strategies”).

Many who had the assistance of process drama commented that after the intervention they tended to pay more attention to sentence structure, grammar, intonation and pronunciation while speaking or listening to English. For example, Joseph reflected in his journal for Week 4 that:

I feel really great to be able to practise English in spontaneous drama scenarios. The roles in the drama all had unique characteristics and so their reactions to events were very interesting. I could practise pronunciation and conversations in English and I feel really good about that.

In contrast to such remarks as Joseph’s, some participants whose intervention training had been scripted role-play expressed that potentially positive changes in learning attitudes had not happened. For instance, Yo reported that “I recommend everyone to speak out in English. Don’t be shy” (Journal, Week 4). Ben from the same training intervention contended, “If I could apply the OCSs taught, my English shall be improved greatly.” Both Yo’s and Ben’s reflections show a positive expectation of what could be achieved –yet neither of them clearly
indicated whether they had been using English the OCSs taught. Ben used the word “shall” to show what he expected would result from using OCSs, and Yo talked not about current achievements, but only about potential achievements if people engaged in English oracy and were not shy.

Another possible explanation of why participants trained in process drama might decrease their use of OCSs are that they might not be aware of having used certain strategies as Nakatani (2006) has suggested for low-proficiency students. Thus, it might be that the participants reflected upon their oral tests without much awareness of the OCSs they had used. Besides, Cohen (1996) too, had asserted that people often underestimate their use of negative behaviours on a questionnaire. If that was the case, then some participants in my study knowing that a purpose of OCSs was to supplement communicative competence, might regard using OCSs would see any delay in being fully aware or confident as a negative behaviour. Thus, they may have reported lower usage of OCSs to prevent being regarded as incompetent in their English oral communication on the after-task reflection survey.

A third possible explanation is that low-proficiency participants may use ineffective strategies more frequently because of their limited language competence and greater likelihood of using passive strategies such as reducing or minimising messages or using mime to replace verbal output as Gao (2000) and Paribakht’s (1985) studies have shown.

6.2.2 Variety of OCSs

Results indicated significance in wider variety of OCSs associated with treatment effects that favoured process drama. Participants involved in the process drama intervention significantly expanded their use of OCSs on four strategy factors after the intervention, whereas those trained with scripted role-play did not improve significantly from what they had done before
training on any strategy factor. In fact, participants with training in scripted role-playing showed higher means for Factor 1 in the pre-test than they did after the training. These participants before the intervention used a greater variety of strategies from Factor 1, “Interaction strategies”, for coping with listening problems. After the intervention, they surprisingly reduced the variety of listening strategies used to cope with listening problems. One possible explanation is that the participants’ listening ability was enhanced after the intervention, so they did not need to use as many strategies as they did beforehand. An alternative explanation is that scripted role-play classes might have provided only a narrow strategic corridor for participants to play through their scripted roles. If so, then in comparison with the more spontaneous and serendipitous context of process drama, there would have been fewer opportunities for them to explore a variety of strategies and their applications, and to consciously or subconsciously store their experience of a wider set of OCSs for future use. In either case, it seems that the intervention of scripted role-playing did not encourage participants to expand their variety of OCSs.

There is some support for this from the literature. For example, it appears consistent with an assertion from Tsang and Wong (2002) that speaking usually requires instant interactions between two people. Related to this argument is Chafe’s (1986, p. 16) observation that conversation requires a speaker to, “face temporal constraints and the social pressures of face-to-face interaction” and scripted role-play usually does not feature either time constraints or immediate and spontaneous oral interactions. Rather, language learners such as those in my study only need to memorise and practise pre-established lines for a pre-established character for a rather simple and brief conversation. In short, this commonly seen and used drama pedagogy in language classes is not well set up to expand language learners’ understanding and use of variety in the oral communication strategies but rather to reinforce specific and familiar ones such as memorising lines and practicing in character.
Findings of change in the oral tests were rather different from those on the OCSI questionnaire in relation to the variety of OCSs used before and after training. Although oral-tests showed something positive for scripted role-play, in that both interventions were significantly associated with two strategy factors, there were important differences. Video tapings of the oral-tests showed that those in scripted role-plays had more strategies pertaining to Factor 2 (“Caution strategies”) and Factor 3 (“Fluency-oriented strategies”) while process drama training showed significant positive changes for Factor 1 (“More active speaker strategies”) and Factor 3 (“Fluency-maintaining strategies”).

These differences from the two sets of data may be explained by a difference in the time frame in which each of the test instruments was applied. Whereas the OCSI questionnaire checked participants’ use of OCSs over the whole semester, the oral tests explored OCSs during a couple of oral instances. Further, results from face-to-face oral tests may have introduced the examiner-researcher as an interacting and perhaps contributing influence on what participants came to say and do. If so, this would have been an extraneous variable in what was measured as OCS-use.

As Chuang (2011) suggested, subjective judgement on the part of raters of oral tests might not have high or consistent reliability. Certainly, it was administratively challenging to manage two live-raters at every test. However, notes from the teacher-researcher’s journal help to explain some of the discrepancies in the two data sets.

These revealed an observation that those with scripted role-play frequently had pauses in their language or switched language codes between Mandarin and English during their storytelling tests when encountering a communicative break-down.

Four participants who received training in scripted role-play, Amy1, Wu, Danny and Timmy, had decided to terminate their post-oral tests if the examiner did not provide consistent
encouragement as well as reminders about using OCSs. In comparison, three participants of
process drama, Kelly, Lora and Chloe, attempted to use Mandarin - and rationalised doing so
by asking whether they could do this for explaining things. Although pausing or using
Mandarin also occurred among those in the process drama, the frequency of breaking speech
acts was much less, and none of them were noted in the teacher’s reflection journal as
intending to stop their story-telling. Moreover, those with process drama training were
observed in the oral tests to tell stories more completely, to hear the examiner’s questions
better and to answer them with more creativity, compared to their peers from the scripted
role-play class.

Performances in the oral tests illustrated the contrasting effects of different interventions. For
instance, after the intervention of process drama, participants used more of their creativity
and imagination. The variety of OCSs they used belonged to more active strategies. To be
specific, among the twelve strategies of Factor 1 “More active speaker strategies” for coping
with speaking problems and Factor 3 “Fluency-maintaining strategies” for coping with
listening problems, there was only one passive strategy: “I pay attention to the speaker’s eye
contact, facial expression and gestures”. The rest required participants to pay attention and to
think considerably about subtleties of the language expressed in interlocution, such as “I pay
attention to grammar and word-order during conversation”, “I try to emphasize the subject
and verb of the sentence” and “I actively encourage myself to express what I want to say” for
coping with speaking problems, and as well as “I pay attention to the speaker’s rhythm and
intonation” and “I pay attention to the speaker’s pronunciation” for coping with listening
problems. However, participants with scripted role-play training used four passive strategies
among the twelve of Factor 2 “Caution strategies” and Factor 3 “Fluency-oriented strategies”
for coping with speaking problems.
Three passive strategies belonged to Factor 2: “I use words which are familiar to me”, “I reduce the message and use simple expressions”, and “I use gestures and facial expressions if I can’t express myself”, and the other passive strategy was from Factor 4: “I try to make eye-contact when I am talking” for coping with speaking problems. In short, participants trained with scripted role-playing seemed to show more timidity in their oral-tests than the ones trained with process drama. Besides, they did not show any significant change in the variety of OCSs used for coping with listening problems while those with process drama training revealed significant strategic use on the oral tests for coping with both speaking and listening problems.

In Wu and Gitsaki’s (2009) study, Taiwanese EFL learners used most OCSs for the purpose of making more friends. Participants in their study also had better interactions with others by using more active strategies. In the present study, process drama did help create opportunities and reasons for participants to interact, and to use more OCSs in order to communicate better.

Data from another instrument, the after-task reflection survey, showed no statistically significant changes in the variety of OCSs for both interventions. Such a result conflicted with the results on the OCSI and the oral tests in providing a basis for answering the same research question. This warrants further exploration. The difference might have their source in the different levels of cueing about strategies and strategic behaviour in the different data-collecting instruments used in the study, or in participants’ skills in self-reporting themselves as being strategic, and of labels they put on strategies they were using and of how conscious they were of strategies that they had begun to use autonomously.

Nonetheless, within these limitations and plausible explanations, the study has provided evidence to address the primary research question. This evidence supports an answer that
process drama is successful as a teaching intervention to induce greater frequency and variety of oral communication strategies with learners of English as a Foreign Language from the VET Junior College.

6.3 Secondary Research Question (a). Where Process Drama Successfully Induces OCS Actions from Participants, How Do the Participants Describe Its Operation?

6.3.1 Training in Impromptu Speaking or Memorization

Spontaneity is a quality inherent in the authentic nature of process drama. That meant that in comparison with those in the alternative treatment where scripts were provided, these participants had to be far more spontaneous, having little time to prepare what they would say and how they would say it in their English conversations with others. Their speaking with another required more immediate thinking and response between two people while they worked on what Anderson and Vandergrift (1996) suggested as an intention to apply English language in conversations by using one’s native language. Various activities in process drama created spontaneous opportunities for EFL learners to explore acting at normal speed when speaking English. Many of these were impromptu situations for conversations.

Those involved in process drama offered many positive comments and descriptions about its operation and benefits. It seemed have a greater variety of drama activities, beyond the line-reading that their peers spoke of in relation to their scripted role play intervention. For example, four participants in process drama showed their excitement about warm-up activities including the “hand-touching game”. Process drama activities require a mixture of movement, interactions and language generation (in English) that may have worked to bring forward emerging skills and confidence with the language in a way that left little time to become anxious about how they would perform when using English. The participants’ positive affective responses also reflect a motivational state that promises good learning
about OCSs for what would follow in the body of their lessons. Other descriptions of particular facets of process drama provided by participants featured specific techniques such as *hot-seating*, *tableau* and *group role-play* as useful tactics for focussing their spontaneity, learning and confidence.

Conversely, scripted role-play lacked both spontaneity and impromptu speaking, and thus gave fewer chances for participants to expand the variety of OCSs they were attempting to learn and use. Because of the fewer opportunities, it also restricted the likely frequency with which any OCSs might be practiced. Smart illustrated this when expressing her disappointment that, “I didn’t have many people to talk to in English. How could I possibly use those strategies?” She had observed the shortcomings of scripted role-play for promoting OCS use and her comment reveals both intellectual and motivational frustration that contrast with the more positive reflections of her peers in the process drama class.

In general, participants who had been taught with scripted role-play evaluated their English communication by how well they memorised vocabulary, phrases or sentence structures. For instance, when Jenny reported in the interview that, “The intervention helps me remember English conversations easily because it is pair work”, her positive comment was not centred on engagement or usage, but rather on “remembering” the conversations and on the assistance that “pairing” had given to this memory function. Ben and NaiNai complimented their scripted role play as a learning method, but any perception of an immediate benefit for immediate usage was at best implicit in their journal observation that, “It’s good to learn, rehearse and memorize some useful sentences or usages that we could use when we want to talk to native English speakers.” Amy1, Amy2, Amy3, Frank, Marba, Peter, Timmy, Yo, however, did include responses about the talk they had been doing in class, and were positive “Through discussing sentences of the conversations, we talked to our partners and had much
fun.” Thus, where responses from the group were positive about scripted role-play, the focus of their accounts was on memorisation routines without showing much evidence of higher order thinking abilities that are suggested in Kelly, Lora and Chloe’s (from the process drama intervention) rationale for a request to code-switch to explain things. And, the applications of code-switching ranged across the class activities to possible future uses.

There was also negative feedback as evident in NaiNai’s comment that, “Keep practising conversations made me a bit sleepy.” Lin and Sylvia showed dislike of the method in their journals, for example, “I don’t like to memorize a lot of vocabulary from the scripted conversations.” In contrast, no similar references were recorded from their peers who were involved with process drama. Although from the taped class video, we might see more process drama participants interacted with each other in drama activities with less hesitation physically than the ones in the other group, they did not show enough explicit oral use of OCSs in English from the footage for further assessment.

6.3.2 Dynamic Interactions

Process drama participants, Ma and Tony, said at the group interviews that they loved the abundant chances to interact with others in process drama activities. Although process drama as pedagogy for language learning took teachers more time to prepare and plan before classes began, once started, students usually led classroom activities with teachers facilitating their usage and practice instead of lecturing on these things.

Several of Ma and Tony’s class friends provided some insights into why this was productive for helping them use more OCSs. Their observations about the differences between the intervention of process drama and their past didactic English classes reflected explanations that are already part of the literature. For example, this is seen in journal entries where Shark, ABC, Joseph, Nothing, Amy, A He He and Mosquito stated that the intervention was more
dynamic, fun and interesting than didactic English classes they had before. Shao-Yi was even more explicit. She said, “I really like the energetic interactions”.

These perceptions of dynamic, energetic features are consistent with views expressed by researchers that drama approaches as non-conventional pedagogical techniques are different from conventional one-way instruction (Auerbach, 1995; Byron, 1986; McCaslin, 2006) and that the direction of a class’ energy flow in drama classes is usually unpredictable. This was confirmed in the contrast in reports between how differently pre-written scripts and spontaneous, impromptu discussion linked with students’ development of OCSs.

Scripted role-play as pedagogy is much more predictable and easy to prepare than process drama (Bolton & Heathcote, 1999; Bowell & Heap, 2001; Dunn, 2000; Kao & O'Neill, 1998). Tim and Super who had received it as their intervention, noted at the post-group interview that they wanted more interactions in class, feeling this would have made the class more interesting and productive. When the only way to use English for learners was to take a scripted role from a scripted conversation and to finish delivering one’s lines with a partner, it is not difficult to see why they would feel this way. In short, without process drama they lacked opportunities that their peers had through greater flexibility of characters, plots and space changes, creativity and high engagement. They did not have the same scaffolding for dynamic interaction that was established through the intervention of process drama.

### 6.3.3 Learning from Peers

Process drama participants learned from each other by getting in or out of role freely, expressing their personal opinions as well as defending group decisions about issues raised in each scenario. As data from the group interviews showed that Amy said she had learned from the peer interactions because “from observing other groups’ presentations, more OCSs were modelled for usages.” It was an important function of process drama that helped Amy and
others to scaffold their learning and to increase their strategic autonomy and learning efficacy. It is consistent with the abundant research on modelling (Aoki, 1999; Bialystok, 1978; Dörnyei & Murphey, 2003; Hadaway et al., 2001).

Participants in the scripted role-play worked with partners as well. However, as Lin, revealed when interviewed after the intervention, “I don’t like my partner’s passive attitude. No participation in discussion or conversations at all”, there was less choice in who did the modelling and greater restriction in peer discussions.

This difference perhaps reflects part of the reason that Kao and O’Neill (1998) placed scripted role-play and process drama on opposite ends of a continuum of drama approaches for L2 teaching and learning, differences which I had anticipated in selecting to study process drama in association with OCSs.

6.3.4 Dramatic Tension

One essential feature of process drama is dramatic tension. It either comes along with natural dramatic development or is created by a facilitator for a specific occasion. Conflicts and dilemmas are two major components used for creating tension in class. A teacher who implements process drama utilises such tension for sustaining students’ learning, and tension generated from the development of plots was expected to be an impetus for the participants of this study to focus and sustain their English communication.

Participants in the study liked the tension very much. They became engaged in learning and using vocabulary, brainstorming solutions and carrying on English conversations when they were involved in dramatic tension. Their journals showed that it was fun to use OCSs in various dramatic scenarios (e.g. see comments from DonDon, Amy, Bu, JunJun, Tung and Mosquito in their journals for Week 15 and 16 about drama plots they themselves had created for “The Little Three Pigs and the Big Bad Wolf” and how this drew and maintained their
attention). The disparity between groups can be seen in the many positive reflections about process drama, with only two from scripted role-play. This indicates that the dramatic tension inherent in process drama may have helped those in this class engage and profit better in the targeted learning and use of OCSs.

6.3.5 Use of Body Language

One further difference between the two treatments was participant attitudes around body language as a means to help convey their messages when using English. Attitudes for those who had scripted role-play were variable - with, Ben demonstrating a positive attitude in the post-group interview when he commented that, “If I can’t express something, I would use body language”, and Adam’s journal note for Week 16 that, “Using body language helps express what I want to say.” Yet, Sylvia, expressed dislike, reporting in her post-group interview that, “I don’t like to act”, and Lin seemed impatient in her journal entry for Week 16 by stating, “Can we not do role-play?”

However, those trained with process drama tended to be very positive about using what some (H.-H. Gao, 2000; Wu & Gitsaki, 2009) have termed a passive strategy more likely to be used by EFL learners with low language proficiency. For example, Chloe, Mosquito and Z claimed that using body language gave them courage to communicate with English speakers more. This suggests that it may have proven helpful as the participants were developing their confidence and were at a stage closer to what Gao (2000) and Wu and Gitsaki (2009) had described. Further research is needed to check this explanation, i.e., whether these data reflect an early point of development, or if as Joseph (Journal, Week 16) and Chloe (Journal, Week 14) seemed to suggest, that body language as part of process drama routines has enduring strategic advantage for EFL learners – as illustrated for example by Chloe’s note that, “I tried to put all the words I knew and tried use body languages for communication”.
6.4 Secondary Research Question (b). Where Process Drama Successfully Induces OCS Action from Participants, How do the Participants Account for Facilitation of Greater Variety and/or More Frequency of OCSs?

6.4.1 Motivated by Authenticity

Only four participants were positive in their post-group interview feedback about scripted role-play. The others either had no special opinions about it, or reported preference for more authentic activities and interactions for helping them to use English. William remarked that, “I think directly talking to native English-speakers would be the most efficient for learning and using English.” Tim added that, “I hope there were more interactions in class and hope it could be more interesting.” Love Rain gave a straightforward comment that, “It was a bit boring” (Journal, Week 6).

On the other hand, the participants from process drama class were highly motivated by their intervention treatment. Several gave examples about how authentic scenarios motivated their learning. Among them, Christine talked in her journal for Week 13 about “Introducing Kaohsiung’s sightseeing spots impressed me most”, and DonDon noted in her journal (Week 10) that, “Learning how to introduce some sightseeing spots and some tips of talking to foreigners impressed me most.” Shou reported in the post-group interview that, “I like it (process drama). It gave us a chance to talk in authentic context. I could learn things whenever I feel like, for example, from the process of preparing and collecting data.” Clare in the same group interview agreed, saying that “I think more authentic context will help us learn English easily.” Joseph had commented on his journal for Week 4 that “I feel really great to be able to practise English in spontaneous drama scenarios” and his classmate, Chloe, said that in her journal for Week 5, “It was my first time to have such an interesting English class . . . Today’s class was really great! Making the teaching more authentic would really help us to learn and turn what we have learned into long-term memory. So much fun!”
Interestingly, some participants from the scripted role-play, Smart, Annie, Dav, Tim, Super and Amy1 revealed their dislike for non-reality topics such as the third module, “The Three Little Pigs and the Big Bad Wolf” (See their post-group interview). They hoped they could have more realistic topics. Smart wished she had more authenticity in the drama and indicated her preference in the post-group interview that, “I don’t like fairy tales. Fairy tales are boring. Reality topics are better”. Moreover, most in their journals expressed their preference for talking to foreign visitors who came to visit the campus rather than practising scripted conversations in the classroom.

In general terms, 14 of those who received the scripted role-play intervention felt more motivated to use English or OCSs as an outcome of the intervention, and the other 12 participants did not. On the other hand, 20 participants from the process drama intervention felt more motivated to use English or OCSs after their intervention, while the other four did not. An explanation for the higher level of engagement involving process drama may lie in the novelty associated with using controversial or conflicting circumstances such as taking the side of different characters (e.g., the wolf vs. the pigs), and the spontaneity afforded by encouraging participants’ impromptu thoughts and speech that were purposefully scaffolded for those in the experimental group. This rarely happens in conventional English classes and had not occurred for those in the other class where scripted role-play was the treatment. There was something real and familiar about these scenarios, too. This authenticity may have impelled participants into better OCS learning because it made impromptu thoughts easier, with the authentic frameworks bringing the lesson content close to their own experiences, lightening the cognitive load needed to cope with the format and increasing the freedom and space to think about the strategies and their use.
Six participants from the intervention of scripted role-play presented an additional clue to the above arguments about spontaneity and authenticity. Their interview comments included a request to have more authenticity in the drama when being. Yet, the conversations they practised in class were all preset. The space for them to develop impromptu thought and speech was limited by this more structured framework and any authenticity relied on chance rather than on a creative milieu.

6.4.2 Power Shifting

In contrast to the open communication of process drama, scripted role-play produced fewer chances for participants to communicate in a more random way. The teacher’s role in the scripted role-play was more an instructor than a facilitator as was the case in the other class. The participants’ performances in the scripted role-play seemed to be predictable in that it was very similar to the way classes had been taught at Junior College in the past. Conversely, their counterparts’ outcomes with process drama were not as easily predicted because the dominant power in the classroom was often shared or shifted between the facilitator and the participants. Researchers have often suggested teachers who used process drama start with a weak or low social status role (Liu, 2002; O’Toole & Dunn, 2002). Learners would usually attempt to put more effort and do better if they possess the power to lead the direction that the class would take in a lesson, and to expand scopes of learning, with teachers’ in a support role (Aoki, 1999; Auerbach, 1995). This makes for a new context within which to explore associations with OCSs.

Discussing the scripted role-play, William said that the cooperative work impressed him a lot, but he seemed to also complain about some uncooperative situations that had happened in his class “When everyone cooperated, thought and read sentences together it impressed me most. I like to read English sentences together with the class. I don’t like when others don’t
cooperate” (Journal, Week 5). Yo’s remarks resonated with William’s, “I like everyone to exchange opinions. I don’t like it when people don’t cooperate” (Journal, Week 5). Furthermore, Marisa commented that, “I like to read conversations and understand what others were saying in a conversation. I don’t like it that only a few people were participating in reading conversations” (Journal, Week 5). There was little similar feedback about being reluctant to cooperate from participants involved in the process drama. Adam in the scripted role-play wrote in his journal for Week 12 that “The role-play helped us to memorize the English content efficiently. I like to read English with the methods or tips that the teacher taught us” (Journal, Week 12). From comments like Adam’s, it is not difficult to infer that participants from scripted role-play were satisfied with their learning - but, they were satisfied mainly because they could read their scripts in English better after the intervention. They did not particularly feel a sense of achievement about other kinds of learning, such as problem-solving or cooperation.

Moreover, at least ten participants commented in their journals that they liked to go up to the front to present conversations and watch others making mistakes because that would help them learn. Yet, those who presented at the front of the classroom were temporarily replacing the teacher’s position, not really functioning as leaders of discussions or designers of drama plots and characters. There was no real power shifting. Occasions for problem solving were also very few in their intervention. What is more, these participants did not report learning from interacting with their partners in roles, which was a significant discrepancy between the two types of training. Lin reported in the post-group interview that “I don’t like my partners’ passive attitude. No participation in discussion or conversations at all.”

In process drama, learners usually have the chance to take a lead in developing a plot since a teacher can share power. The teacher facilitates learning, privileging learners to do and think
whatever they prefer in the drama world. The teacher of process drama is encouraged not to limit the learners’ learning level, pace, scope and objects. Besides, with power shifting or flowing in class, students could learn easily from their peers instead of their teacher. Participants from both intervention classes revealed that they liked to work with their peers, but different interventions provided them with different dimensions of learning from classroom work.

The results of power shifting in the process drama classroom are seen in Amy’s journal entry for Week 4 when she wrote “The drama pedagogy was very impressive. It helped create more interactions between the teacher and the students. Students would then feel less sleepy. The learning efficacy would be better. This kind of class was very different from other didactic English classes.”

Amy’s comment speaks eloquently to a range of advantages aligned with the intervention from a student’s perspective. Importantly, her words bring out its highly interactive and engaging properties and place students involvement in the context of what had made it impressive. Her term, “efficacy”, is a delightful, if surprising, description of how the important factors of confidence and expectation of learning success in EFL are increased with the method. Significantly, Amy recognised a major difference in learning her English in this way.

6.5 Secondary Research Question (c). Where Process Drama Successfully Induces OCS Action from Participants, What Value Do the Participants Place on Their Increased Variety and/or Frequency of OCSs?

6.5.1 Increasing Self-Confidence and Recognition of One’s Own Potentiality

It is common for many EFL students in Taiwan who are trying to acquire English skills to rely on electronic translators. However they may not be valued as highly as other forms of
scaffolded learning as suggested in Joseph’s conclusion, “I could learn ‘real English’ from having ‘real conversations’ with English speakers. Electronic translators really can’t be trusted. It’s better to learn English from real contact with real people. That the teacher wore special props and costumes impressed me a lot. I found some of my undiscovered potentiality” (Journal, Week 14). He highlighted the value of pedagogical support and personal development.

Both outcomes are most likely associated with what process drama had done to induce Joseph’s improved OCS action, though he had not mentioned this explicitly. There is similar inference throughout the data from Joseph’s classmates in this study (e.g. see D’s journal note that “I became braver to speak English if I were in drama activities” and similar ones from JunJun, Lora and Tung). On the other hand, few from the scripted role-play class indicated increased confidence or better recognition of their capabilities.

6.5.2 More Involvement in the Learning Environment

Another outcome was that participants trained in process drama became more involved in their learning environment. They often claimed that they studied in a fun, relaxing, special or carefree environment. Almost all reported satisfaction with process drama as shown in Bu’s observation, “There is higher participation in today’s class than in former classes” (Journal, Week 6), and JunJun’s that, “We should have similar activities like today’s more often” (Journal, Week 14).

Perhaps a key part of this connection with the learning environment was the engagement it provided in terms of the strategic element in OCSs as reflected most obviously in Joseph and JunJun’s use of socially affective strategies, message reduction and alteration strategies for coping with speaking problems. Joseph’s new strategic confidence and competence was clear in his comment, “Sometimes when I can’t think of proper words or phrases, I would try to
use antonyms”. JunJun, too, showed something of her strategic growth in her record of thoughts before and after the intervention when she remarked that, “I was so extremely nervous that I didn’t even know what to say. Yet, the teacher kept telling me to relax. I felt less nervous when I got to the last strip picture. I even felt the whole thing was a bit interesting toward the end”. Their comments suggest a realisation of positive effects OCSs were having for them in their affective stability and the influence such things had upon the quality of an English conversation.

As for message reduction and alteration strategies for coping with speaking problems, participants of both interventions seemed to recognise that it would be important to focus on how they could better use the vocabulary they had already learned for English conversations. Ellis (1995) contended that beginners tend to pay more attention to words or lexical issues. After all, without adequate linguistic competence oral communication competence would be hard to achieve. Joseph expressed this when he said, “When I was able to use accurate wording, I would feel better and relaxed”. JunJun stated after the intervention that, “I used the vocabulary that I knew in my conversation”. Doing so reduced the pressure of balancing speaking in perfect English with managing limited language proficiency, and by using this reduction strategy they kept their respective conversations flowing. With so much interactional involvement in their intervention, the participants trained with process drama observed and recognised their increased use of strategies and strong outcomes. Yet, on the other hand, nothing was reported in the thought-tracking reflection by their peers from the scripted role-play class.

6.5.3 Activities and features of process drama

In recording their thoughts before and after intervention participants perceived activities of process drama such as hot-seating, tableau and group role-play as useful tactics had assisted
them in developing creativity, brainstorming from different perspectives and engaging in their different drama modules. For instance, in *hot-seating*, they reported that they asked and answered questions in roles among themselves, and it was great fun for them to create *tableaus* physically as well. In the journals, they showed their pleasure at being able to develop characters for their assigned roles. For example, in Module 3: “The Three Pigs and the Big Bad Wolf”, every group’s “Pig” prototype was different. Each group’s pig role was an ensemble, which naturally guaranteed the uniqueness of each individual role, in terms of the different backgrounds, thoughts and decision-making brought to the activity. Thus, with the original creation of roles, process drama maintained its features of spontaneity and authenticity for participants to play within. Other than these features, participants believed that group activities had helped engage them in developing dramatic plots quickly and in sharing their opinions and knowledge with each other in English. In other words, those with training in process drama seemed to become much involved in spontaneous and dynamic interactions in class.

### 6.5.3.1 Teacher as a facilitator and in role

Another technique, *teacher-in-role*, influenced most of the participants’ involvement. Ten participants from the process drama intervention had reported in their journals that they felt satisfied with the teacher’s teaching method and performance. Their valuing is again apparent. For instance, Chloe said that, “I love the class and the teaching very much!” Both Joseph and Ivy stated that, “The teacher is a very good performer and facilitator, who could manage the class atmosphere quite well” while Joseph also observed that, “It’s hard to manage the class”.

One of the unusual teaching methods for process drama is for teachers to facilitate or even to inspire instead of instructing the class in more typically didactic mode. *Teacher-in-role,*
guides a teacher to explore his or her own creativity and to step down from formality. That teachers play in role as an impaired figure or one with a lower social status than others, invited students’ help or advice. And, they gave it.

Many participants from the intervention of process drama praised their teacher’s performance and involvement in their classes. Mini, Amy and Mosquito commented in their journals that the teacher’s introductory skit was great, and they hoped to see more skits in class in the future. Another eight participants also indicated that the teacher’s role as a travel agent assistant in Module 2 had helped them engage in authentic conversations and had led them into the drama quickly. In short, although those involved in process drama knew that it was hard to manage an active class like theirs, the innovative teaching roles in and out of drama had helped them engage in their learning in a significant way.

Instead of complimenting the teacher on how she helped their involvement in learning, participants from the scripted role-play intervention commented only on how much they could repeat after the teacher’s reading. Six from the scripted role-play remarked that they liked to read vocabulary and sentences with the teacher. In particular, William journaled that, “I like the teacher using English all the way through the class, and she could try to understand what her students were thinking about.” Pride of Shu Zen expressed excitedly in his journal, “The teacher was fantastic”. The role of the teacher in the intervention of scripted role-play was leading or inspiring instead of facilitating. Interestingly, participants did not think the role the teacher played was improper in any way since it matched exactly the conventional kind that had been used in most of their junior high classes and in their current college schooling. The teacher was regarded as a direct instructor. Thus, where she was valued, it was for different reasons in the two different interventions.
6.5.3.2 Pre-text

Pre-text activities of process drama tactfully induced students to engage in oral class activities on drama themes. In process drama, warm-up games or activities got students to associate with drama themes before carrying out main drama modules, much as (Heathcote & Bolton, 1995, 1998) had suggested. However, this preliminary purpose is not as typically part of scripted role-play.

By implementing such a step before all the other drama activities, it became more likely that participants would engage in effective learning than for those in scripted role-play. For instance, four of the process drama class students, Christine, D, Da and Amy said that the warm-up activities, such as hand-touching games, had quickly introduced them into the theme of the second drama module. No related comments were made by participants in scripted role-play, except liking the teacher drawing on the blackboard to introduce the third module story. It is obvious that conducting warm-up activities was helpful for the language learners who received them, and in this study such pedagogical design was valued by the participants.

6.5.3.3 Group role-play

Generally, role-play is an essential element of classroom drama. Undoubtedly the key drama component in scripted role-play interventions, it is merely one of many drama techniques in area of process drama (Bowell & Heap, 2001; Dunn, 1995; Kao & O’Neill, 1998). Generally, those involved in process drama showed greater appreciation of the group role-play of process drama than the participants of the scripted role-play intervention. In their journal entries, many in the scripted role-play class reported that they had fun and learned in a relaxing class atmosphere, but their fun seemed to be based on repeating what the teacher said or in doing well in the competition for better translation of their scripted English
conversations. Yet even then, only two participants claimed that they had become more engaged in class because of the scripted role-play.

In contrast, participants involved in process drama were engaged and enjoyed their learning. Nine expressed that group role-play helped them create dynamic and vivid characters for each role and thus also helped them quickly get engaged in the process drama activities. Christine, DonDon and Z specified in their journals that process drama helped create more opportunities for them to use English, and Ivy, Da, Mini, Clare were very impressed playing tour guides for native English speakers.

The literature (Jackson, 1993; McCaslin, 2006; O'Toole, 1992) helps us to understand that fear and anxiety caused by building up a role from scratch and playing it by oneself is reduced where learners like these had the social advantages of group as support. More ideas came from brainstorming a character together. Because of this process, learners like Christine, DonDon and Z engaged in role-play creatively, and had fun doing so. They become involved in their learning targets without their teacher’s or peers’ demands that they do so.

An example of this from Module 3 of the process drama intervention was Joseph’s motivated by and engagement with the development of the drama plot. He recorded that, “Trying to make up questions to ask the Big Bad Wolf (Mr. Wolf) and thinking about how to defend ourselves if having a debate with Mr. Wolf impressed me the most”. Clare, BB and Toast reported in their post group interview that through role-play they had opportunities to speak and listen to English. Joseph, JunJun, Lora, Mini and TEA commented in their post group interview that group discussions and activities helped them understand issues discussed in class better. With the group’s efforts and support, participants valued participating in class activities, regardless of whether it was about plot-development or problem-solving.
6.5.3.4 *Tableau*

Another feature of group cooperation in process drama was the treatment’s drama technique, *tableau*. In *tableau* activities, each small group participant was asked to form a *tableau* of a designated moment and to offer one or two English sentences to describe the postures they posed, or to express how they felt about that frozen moment in their action.

Christine (Journal, Week 13) and Z (Journal, Week 15) commented that doing language activities by applying the *tableau* technique was fun. From observing the journal data, this drama technique encouraged even the most timid participants who had not even dared to speak any English before to deliver one or two words at least to describe their frozen actions or feelings. However, their similarly shy peers from the scripted role-play group had no such alternatives. They had to stay with role-playing the scripted lines to trigger their courage to communicate with others in English.

6.5.3.5 *Use of props*

Props were important elements for the participants in process drama. Although the teacher was the only person who actually needed props to implement the *teacher-in-role* technique, many participants strongly expressed their appreciation for the props she used. For instance, in the post group interview, Chloe said that, “More props would bring even more fun, I think.” Five other participants also stated in their journals that the teacher’s props were impressive and engaging. From their feedback, it was clear that those in process drama had recognised the positive effects of props on their involvement in drama activities, which had then elicited a huge amount of verbal English language.
6.5.4 Increased Interest in Fine-Tuning Newly-Learned English

After the interventions, participants from both classes said they were interested in using more English. While this may reveal an underlying general motivation associated with any pedagogical approach, the comparison of the two treatments in this current study is interesting. Participants from the process drama intervention demanded higher accuracy in grammar and vocabulary in order to capitalise on what they had learned. This contrasts to the usual behaviour of EFL learners from this Junior College who traditionally tended not to actively initiate English conversations.

Such psychology is greatly influenced by socio-cultural background (Chu, 2005; Sommers, 2009). However, many participants’ remarks about how they would value using English with others were revealed in the research results of this study. For instance, “It’s better to speak directly with foreigners. OCSs helped the fluency of speaking” (Mini, process drama post group interview). “I know more about how to express my opinions now. If I encounter some communicative barriers, I would know how to solve the problems” (Da, process drama post group interview). “I dare to speak up more now . . . I still think the opportunities for us to use English are still too few.” (Christine, process drama post group interview).

All participants seemed to overcome their timidity when facing people of different races or using a foreign language, but this differed in relation to opinions toward their respective training in the two different interventions. Some negative comments about the scripted role-play intervention were reported. For instance, Fish commented in his journal for Week 15 “It was a bit monotonous. There was no special attraction, but we did learn something”. Lin stated: “Can we not do role-play?” (Journal, Week 4). In contrast, few negative comments were made about process drama as an intervention.
Participants’ change of language proficiency in this study was not measured, the increased variety and frequency of OCSs in the process drama intervention was shown not only to induce participants’ increased interest in using English but also to further enhance their awareness of English grammar and intonation while using the language. Six participants trained with process drama emphasised this in their post group interviews, saying that they paid more attention to English grammar while speaking, and to intonation while listening to English than they had done before. For instance, Tony and Shark reported in the post group interview that they paid more attention to speakers’ verbs and nouns while they were talking in English. Yen also said in her post group interview that she would now pay attention to grammar and intonation while listening to English. Ivy remarked that she would pay attention to grammar and intonation when interviewed after the process drama intervention. Gi also said in her post group interview that she now concentrated on people’s pronunciation.

Although similar ideas about talking to foreigners in English were reported by the scripted role-play participants, they did not pay the same attention to structures or sounds of the language they used as their counterparts did. None mentioned paying attention to grammar or phonics, while a few spoke of body language – both positively and negatively e.g., “If I can’t express something, I would use body language” (Ben, post group interview). Timmy however doubted the appropriateness of some body language in the Taiwanese context. He said, “Some strategies are helpful but some are dreadful. For instance, why does one need to look at others’ eyes while speaking English? Others might get offended” (Timmy, post group interview). Comparatively, fewer participants with scripted role-play training had such marked interest in improving their English. For instance, Amy1 complained about the difficulty in presenting scripted conversations when in comparison several counterparts from the process drama class enjoyed applying fine-tuned English for their impromptu English conversations using the same vocabulary bank. She did not look forward to the challenge
underpinning improving her competence with more difficult English conversations. [“I hope the conversations could be easier” (Amy1, post group interview)].

In conclusion, while participants from both interventions were interested in using more English after their interventions, those trained in process drama were happier and less anxious with the treatment-related OCSs. They were able to use what Krashen (1985) would describe as more serviceable affective filtering of what they could do and might do, and were far more specific in saying what they wanted to fine-tune, perhaps framing better, in what Bartlett (2010) described as the metalinguistic gifts in cognitive processing.

6.5.5 Acceptance of Drama Pedagogy for Language Learning

After the interventions, fewer than half the class from the scripted role-play intervention considered that this form of training would assist their learning and practise of OCSs in using English. Only seven participants, compared to 16 who had been positively optimistic about scripted role-play when the study began, had positive attitudes and interest in their treatment becoming part of their future pedagogy. This suggests no great valuing of the technique.

This finding contrasts with that for the process drama class. All who received process drama pedagogy believed that their OCSs were enhanced after their intervention. Prior to the intervention 16 participants had predicted a positive outcome, and by the end of the intervention this had increased to 23 participants. In contrast to the diverse attitudes of scripted role-play participants, those in process drama were consistently interested in trying this type of drama. Many from the process drama class commented positively in their weekly journal entries. “The drama pedagogy was very impressive . . . The learning efficacy would be better . . . It is a great idea to use drama to assist the instruction. It made me less sleepy” (Amy, Journal, Week 4). “I like today’s English class” (Mini and Z, Journal, Week 4). “It was my first relaxing and carefree feeling about English classes” (Lora, Journal, Week 4).
“The class was very interesting” (Shao-Yi, Journal, Week 13). “I like it all” (A-He-He, Journal, Week 6). “Everything was very good” (Han, Journal, Week 6). “We should have similar activities like today’s more often” (JunJun, Journal, Week 14). Lora reported in her journal for Week 4 that “I hope in the future the Basic Grammar course could all be instructed by drama methods”. These positive remarks were consistent across members of the process drama class, and this was not seen in the reports of those involved in scripted role-play.

Another feature of both pedagogical treatments that drew specific comments from participants was the noise level associated with drama activities. Few trained with process drama were negative about the high noise level generated from drama activities. Two complained in their post group interview with four doing so from the scripted role-play class. Noise could signify a range of activities from off-task behaviour to active interaction and positive energy flowing among learners, and further study is needed to test the extent to which it is an essential part or unnecessary by-product of drama activities in a language class.

### 6.5.6 Different Metacognition

Results of this study indicate that those in the process drama intervention not only learned OCSs, but also recognised how OCSs could be practised well in the process of solving real life issues and overcoming communicative barriers in English. Since it was an essential in process drama for the facilitator and participants to jump in and out of roles, the cognition about drama techniques and OCSs in helping their application of oral English was cultivated. Students learned to think about their thinking and to talk about it. Namely, metacognition was part of what participants used as process drama affected changes in their oral communication strategic approaches.
Lora noticed this, reflecting on her overt knowledge of higher-order thinking processes and consciousness-accessing procedures in her comment that, “I think process drama can help critical thinking and brainstorming” (post group interview). Ivy, Da and Joseph offered similar observations concerning problem-solving in the post group interview while Chloe made a meta-connection with memory, “Such teaching could turn what we have learned into long-term memory” (Journal, Week 5). All were aware of the effects process drama had upon their strategic applications in English language activities. However, it was not only the participants’ cognition of OCSs that was established, but also a value-added metacognition concerning how these elements could be utilised to help them to engage, persist in and benefit from language learning and language practice activities.

Evidence of this value-added benefit, however, was not revealed by many participants in the scripted role-play intervention. In the post group interview, while almost all participants in the process drama class reported that they thought OCSs were useful, only three from the scripted role-play class, Ben, Jenny, and Timmy, mentioned this. “Practising or repeating lines more would help speaking English. “Role-play helps us get involved into the conversations” (Ben, post group interview). “It helps to remember English conversations easily because it’s two people working together” (Jenny, post group interview). None of these statements reflect the perception that a scripted role-play is a pedagogical treatment with metacognition.

6.5.7 Anxiety Reduced

In the pre-group interviews, no participants from either class knew about process drama. However, while asking participants about their first impression of it, three from the scripted role-play said that they would easily associate it with nervousness, anxiety and trouble, and five from the process drama imagined the drama approach negatively before the intervention.
While enquiring about their initial impression of OCSs, four of the scripted role-play group and five from the process drama group thought OCSs might relate to interlocution, communication or speaking. In other words, before the intervention, all participants revealed that they had little knowledge and experience about their particular drama approaches and how the interventions might promote OCSs. All participants felt anxiety using English and doubted the usefulness of applying drama approaches to their strategy training and language application.

After explaining briefly what scripted role-play was, 16 participants anticipated that it might promote the use of OCSs. However, in the pre-group interview, another two from the same intervention felt that it might be impossible to teach people how to use OCSs.

On the other hand, after a brief explanation of what process drama was about, another 16 participants from the process drama intervention showed their interest in using the drama tactic and in promoting the use of OCSs. One of them in particular hoped that teachers would first give clear guidance and instructions first about how to play and learn with drama in their course.

At the pre-group interview, Joseph and Lora, from the process drama, expressed their preference for applying simple vocabulary and sentences in communication. During the intervention, other participants reported in their journals that they were using similar strategies to those used in classes. What they recorded might explain why their anxiety toward language learning and use was reduced. As an example, Christine claimed that she had used many strategies. One of them was that “I try to relax when I feel anxious” (Journal, Week 15). Clare also recorded a strategy she used to reduce her own anxiety “I take my time to express what I want to say” (Journal, Week 15). Tung and Z reported similar strategies that might help reduce their anxiety. “I don’t mind if I don’t understand every single detail”
(Tung, Journal, Week 15). “I guess the speaker’s intention by picking up familiar words” and “I only focus on familiar expressions” (Z, Journal, Week 15). The latter two participants obviously recognised their own language proficiency and chose to apply strategies to ignore specific details and pay attention to the broad meaning of a speech act. Thus, the pressure of having to speak perfect English was lessened for them and English communication could carry on.

To conclude, Mosquito’s comment on how most participants with process drama training might feel toward the intervention was, “Not bad. It didn’t make me feel stressful to have the class” (Journal, Week 4). On the other hand, no participants from scripted role-play specifically recorded strategies they used to lessen anxiety during the period of the intervention. This is in comparison to the abundant reporting from the participants of process drama intervention. It seems therefore that process drama as a pedagogical tactic might raise language learners’ awareness about how affective factors may impact on their language learning and application. According to participants’ reports, this drama approach was shown to be more likely to reduce language anxiety than the other approach.

There were also 14 participants from the process drama intervention reporting reduction of anxiety in the post group interview. In fact, many records from the teacher’s journals showed how process drama may turn language anxiety into a positive drive. For instance, the teacher described participants who received process drama as attentive to their class activities and discussions. Specifically, she noted in the journal for Weeks 10 and 16:

Students were more attentive and very involved with discussion themes. The hook of drama used in class seemed to be strong for the language learners . . . Students were rather attentive because of the debate and the defences between the wolf and the pigs.

The dynamic activities that are a part of process drama skilfully led participants to transfer their language anxiety into attention and involvement could be seen in the resolution of
dilemmas and conflicts among the characters they played with plot development. For instance, the teacher observed, “Students were more attentive and involved because they were entitled to change the ending of the story, ‘The Three Little Pigs and the Big Bad Wolf’.”

However, participants’ peers who received scripted role-play reported more about their fears and inability to communicate in English than they did about their thoughts, strategies or enjoyment of the classes. The teacher observed as follows:

Students told me that they doubted their ability to present conversations in front of everyone . . . Some students told me that they were afraid of talking to foreigners with their limited English language proficiency when there were foreign guests in class. (Journal, Week 6)

Yet, few process drama participants made pessimistic comments out front in comparison with their peers in the scripted role-play class. According to the teacher’s journal, the participants in process drama mostly showed their excitement and serious attitude toward group work rather than anxiety.

In contrast, no similar evidence of change toward lesser anxiety was recorded for participants whose pedagogical intervention was scripted role-play. None reported that the strategies they had been using during the intervention lessened anxiety or changed their pre-intervention anticipation of it. Rather, the number of participants who reported feeling anxious about using English increased from 13 to 21 following the intervention. Five participants from the scripted role-play felt less anxious after the intervention.
6.6 Implications

The advantage of using process drama as a teaching approach to help participants learn oral communication strategies in an L2 English class is that the pedagogy works. It enabled students to become more strategic more often than the scripted role-play students, and did so with the additional benefits of deferring anxiety, and in ways that participants thought were dynamic, authentic and highly interactive in oral expression. Importantly, these participants valued the process drama approach and had strong predictions of their futures as users of English. These advantages and benefits have implications for both learners and teachers of the English language in Taiwan.

The findings of this study present possibilities for policy-makers and teachers of English language in Taiwan. First, where conventionally and commonly used pedagogies in EFL classes of Taiwan such as audio-lingual methods or scripted role-play have not been significant in enhancing Taiwanese EFL learners’ language proficiency in various skills, there is now, an evidence-based reason for considering the wider implementation of process drama. In confronting the country’s current low ranking of English proficiency among all EFL nations and regions, Taiwan’s Ministry of Education (MOE) could encourage more dynamic and practical curriculum design and pedagogy, such as process drama, for its language-in-education policy.

Second, the current study reflects literature that stresses the importance of interaction, spontaneity and anxiety-reduction properties in pedagogy suitable for EFL learning-teaching contexts, and contributes an evidence-based argument that process drama as a pedagogical approach has these features and delivers a positive outcome in learners’ acquisition of oral communication strategies. Therefore, the implication of this study for teachers of English language in Taiwan is that where drama pedagogy is used, the commonly used role-play
technique should be reconsidered in relation to the comparatively better effects shown in this study for process drama.

It may be that teachers for a range of reasons prefer to stay with approaches and methods that they have used before, and this most likely will be scripted role-plays with perhaps some improvisations. However, concerns about anxiety expressed by most participants in this study were allayed by those involved in process drama because this approach generated effective coping strategies whereas they were relatively unchanged for those who received the more conventional pedagogy. Teachers are likely to have noticed students’ anxiety as a negative factor in their learning across previous years and therefore if alerted to findings from this study they might be more open to experimenting with process drama as an alternative.

There are also several implications from the study for learners. The findings in relation to the secondary research question carry the message that Taiwan’s English learners might profit from knowledge of pedagogical options, particularly the ones that their teachers are aware of their likely effects. Those for the primary question imply that process drama is a good option with its features of dynamic interaction, spontaneity, improving metacognitive awareness and a positive outlook about the application of strategies they are to learn. When conditions are similar to those described in this study, if process drama pedagogy is used, students are likely to learn OCSs that promote their use of English and help them feel comfortable rather than anxious about doing so.

6.7 Limitations and Recommendations

6.7.1 Limitations of the Present Study

This study is an experimental intervention that involved particular EFL students as research participants in a specific setting using two particular pedagogical treatment conditions. Moreover, the effects of these were observed and measured in particular ways. Further, the
study was organised conceptually and designed around a primary research question about whether one of these treatments, process drama, would induce greater frequency of use and/or greater variety of oral communication strategies (OCSs) than another treatment, namely, scripted role-play. A secondary research question in three parts aimed to determine the effects found in relation to the primary research question. While the features of sample, research questions, what was measured and what measures were used helped to structure the study, they also present limitations to interpretation and any generalisation of the study findings.

First of all, the study had a sample, focused geographically and institutionally by a group of 53, non-English major students at a Junior College in Southern Taiwan. The quantitative data on only 53 student participants were the sum of both the experimental and the control group participants. There was no special implication or purposeful design for the number of participants for this study. The Junior College may not be typical of all such colleges in Taiwan or the sample of all Taiwanese Junior College students who enrol to learn English. The reader is reminded of descriptions provided for the sample and setting and the more general educational background in earlier chapters to determine the extent to which the students in this Junior College may reflect other situations. For example, there were more female students participating in both control and experimental groups than males. While this is typical of the gender allocation in the Department of Dental Laboratory Technology at this Junior College, it may have yielded data moderated by a gender bias that is not typical of other departments in Taiwan or elsewhere.

Second, while process drama has had strong support in this study as a tactic for teaching or learning oral communication strategies for a L2 English in comparison with scripted role-play, and while scripted role-play is a commonly used pedagogy in Taiwan’s foreign
language education, there are alternatives within and outside drama-type pedagogy. Yet, alternatives also need to be studied against process drama if a more comprehensive comparison of its efficacy is to be established.

Third, measures used to gather data in the study included Nakatani’s (2006) OCSI which was created with Japanese university female learners and the FLCAS, which was derived from western educational contexts. There was no measure taken of whether those in the study sample had developed their own individual approaches to learning or if they had culturally specific views of learning. And if so, whether these may have impacted on their affective values toward foreign language education generally, English language learning particularly, and strategies applied for language use specifically (Cheng & Dörnyei, 2007). If I had done this even after completion of the data collection, I may have been in a better position to see whether those involved in the study considered there may have been an unmeasured influence of personal style and/or cultural difference on what had been measured and how.

Finally, the primary research question centred on the viability of process drama as a teaching vehicle for generating broad and deep learning of OCSs. Given that data provided significant effects for greater variety and frequency of usage after the process drama treatment in comparison with the control, further detail was provided in response to a secondary question. The three parts of this question presented participants’ accounts of what process drama had done to help them, how they believed this had happened, and what they valued of their new knowledge and skills. While data in response to the secondary question have given useful descriptions and typically have been triangulated across measures, they have been as suggestive of further questions as they have of rich description of process drama’s effectiveness. For example, what is needed to sustain a learning experience of OCSs built initially through process drama? What transference of process-drama support is
possible/necessary/desirable as individuals test themselves as L2 users in independent, authentic L2 contexts?

### 6.7.2 Recommendations for Future Research

The preceding section highlights some areas for further research that might strengthen the confidence with which findings of this study are considered. Essentially, follow-up research is needed to test the durability of these findings as students who were participants in the study move through and beyond their Junior College contexts, and with other and larger samples within Taiwan and beyond it across different cultural contexts, and notably to determine whether there is a gender issue left unmeasured in the present study.

Additionally, investigation might be made of possible effects associated with whether individuals participating in future studies have their own approaches to learning or if they had culturally specific views of learning that influence their affective values and attitudes toward the L2 they are about to learn.

Finally, more evidence-driven information is needed to compare process drama with other drama treatments or pedagogies built around highly interactive participation, such as the intensification of oral language used in L1 pedagogy or with the dialogic element of reciprocal teaching (Williams, 2010). Across any of these suggestions, it may be useful to include member-checks of whether individuals, particularly mature-aged participants in a study consider there may be personal and/or culturally-related bias issues in a treatment condition or a measure.
6.8 Conclusion

The study began with a review of existing literature that had provided an optimistic likelihood that learners of OCSs would do well where the pedagogical vehicle for learning was process drama and this has been confirmed in research which compared this treatment against a more typical pedagogy. Both primary and secondary questions were measured and answered. For instance, I have been able to report that research participants who were students in their normal classes at the college not only responded with greater output in relation to the frequency and variety of OCSs they acquired in association with the process drama approach, but also described their learning metacognitively as interactive, spontaneous, futures-oriented and enjoyable. They valued what they had done, wanted to continue learning in this way and suggested it as a good learning method for others.

These findings are important educational outcomes and within the limitations of the study are genuine contributions to the field. Those who read the thesis will have a basis for considering the empirical validation that the data from this study have given to the initial optimism I had. The data are also in line with what I had read about OCSs as processes that would strategically guide EFL learners, and about process drama in relation to other pedagogical approaches to help EFL students learn and practice OCSs. While the durability of the findings needs to be established over time with these students as they move beyond their college program, and through further studies in other settings with other students and perhaps against alternative control treatments, the outcomes are promising for those seeking tentative direction on choices of pedagogy to teach their students oral communication strategies for learning and practising English as a foreign language.
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Appendices
Appendix A: Questionnaire Based on an Adapted Oral Communication Strategy Inventory (OCSI)\(^7\)

Pseudo name/Code: 

Directions 說明
This instrument consists of 60 statements regarding strategic competence in English oral communication. Please indicate a degree to which each statement applies to you by circling whether it is (5) Always or almost always true of me, (4) Generally true of me, (3) Somewhat true of me, (2) Generally not true of me, or (1) Never or almost never true of me. This instrument is to be administered once before and after intervention, in order to explore change of your use on OCSI. There are not right or wrong answers. Work quickly, and just record your first impression.

Notes 注意事項
Confidentiality of your answers is assured. It is an anonymous research, so please do not write your name or make any recognizable marks on this survey. All the items are important. If you have any questions, please raise your hand.

---

When I speak English...

1. I think first of what I want to say in my native language and then construct the English sentence.
   在說英文句子之前，我會先用中文或其他母語先想過一遍。 5 4 3 2 1
2. I think first of a sentence I already know in English and then try to change it to fit the situation. 我會先想一個我會說的英文句子，然後想辦法找機會使用它。5 4 3 2 1
3. I use words which are familiar to me. 我會用我熟悉的英文單字。5 4 3 2 1
4. I reduce the message and use simple expressions. 我會使用簡單一點的英文表達我的意思，或儘量簡化要說的意思。5 4 3 2 1
5. I replace the original message with another message because I feel incapable of executing my original intent. 當我覺得，自己大概沒辦法溝通原本想講的意思時，我就會講些別的話題來代替。5 4 3 2 1
6. When I don’t know what to say, I just say some words that might not be grammatically well organized. 當我不知道要講些什麼的時候，就不會去想講一些有文法組織的英文句子組合，而是隨便說一些單字。5 4 3 2 1
7. I pay attention to grammar and word-order during conversation. 在講英文時，我會注意文法與單字的排列。5 4 3 2 1
8. I try to emphasize the subject and verb of the sentence. 在講英文時，我會特別注意句子裡的主詞和動詞。5 4 3 2 1
9. I change my way of saying things according to the context. 我會根據狀況隨時改變我說英文的方式。5 4 3 2 1
10. I take my time to express what I want to say. 我會慢慢地用英文表達我想說的。5 4 3 2 1
11. I pay attention to my pronunciation. 在講英文時，我會特別注意我的發音。5 4 3 2 1
12. I try to speak clearly and loudly to make myself heard. 在講英文時，我會講得清楚大聲，好讓別人聽見。5 4 3 2 1
13. I pay attention to my rhythm and intonation. 在講英文時，我會特別注意我自己講英文的節奏、韻律和語調。5 4 3 2 1
14. I pay attention to the conversation flow. 在講英文時，我會特別注意對話的流暢度。5 4 3 2 1
15. I try to make eye-contact when I am talking. 在講英文時，我會努力跟對方有眼神的交集。5 4 3 2 1
16. I use gestures and facial expressions if I can’t express myself. 在講英文時，我會特別注意自己講英文的手勢、表情和神態。5 4 3 2 1
17. I correct myself when I notice that I have made a mistake. 在講英文時，如果我發現自己講的英文有錯誤，我會自己修正自己的說法。5 4 3 2 1
18. I notice myself using an expression which fits a rule that I have learned. 我注意到自己的英文表達會儘量符合自己已學過的文法。5 4 3 2 1
19. While speaking, I pay attention to the listener’s reaction to my speech. 在講英文時，我會特別注意聽者對我所說話的反應。5 4 3 2 1
20. I give examples if the listener doesn’t understand what I am saying.
   假如對方聽不懂我所說的話時，我會舉例子解釋。5 4 3 2 1
21. I repeat what I want to say until the listener understands.
   我會一直重覆我想說的，直到對方聽懂為止。5 4 3 2 1
22. I make comprehension checks to ensure the listener understands what I want to say. 我會時常確認一下對方聽懂我在說什麼了。5 4 3 2 1
23. I try to use fillers (e.g., well, you know . . .) when I cannot think of what to say.
   當我一時想不到該說些什麼時，我會試著說一些感嘆詞或語助詞，例如，5 4 3 2 1
24. I leave a message unfinished because of some language difficulty.
   我會因為沒辦法用英文表達，所以就不再繼續講下去了。5 4 3 2 1
25. I try to give a good impression to the listener.
   在講英文時，我會想讓聽者對我有好的印象。5 4 3 2 1
26. I don’t mind taking risks even though I might make mistakes.
   在講英文時，我不在乎會犯錯。5 4 3 2 1
27. I try to enjoy the conversation.
   在講英文時，我會試著讓自己愉快地交談。5 4 3 2 1
28. I try to relax when I feel anxious.
   當我因說英文而感到緊張時，我會儘量放鬆自己。5 4 3 2 1
29. I actively encourage myself to express what I want to say.
   在講英文時，我會積極地自我鼓勵以表達想表達的。5 4 3 2 1
30. I try to talk like a native speaker.
   在講英文時，我會尽量表現得像外國人一樣。5 4 3 2 1
31. I ask other people to help when I can’t communicate well.
   在不能用英文好好溝通時，會請別人幫我。5 4 3 2 1
32. I give up when I can’t make myself understood.
   當我講英文不能被理解時，我會直接放棄。5 4 3 2 1
33. I make up a new word in order to communicate a desired concept (e.g., “airball” for balloon”).
   我會自己造新字去溝通我想講的意思，例如，不太會用英文講“巧克力”這個單字時，可能會變成用中文的發音去說。5 4 3 2 1

When I listen to English... 當我聽英文時...
35. I pay attention to the first word to judge whether it is an interrogative sentence or not.
   我會特別注意句子的第一個字，以分辨該句子是否為問句。5 4 3 2 1
36. I try to catch every word that the speaker uses.
   我會試著去抓住對方講英文時所說的每一個字。5 4 3 2 1
37. I guess the speaker’s intention by picking up familiar words.
   在聽英文時，我會去聽一些熟悉的字，以便猜想對方的意思。5 4 3 2 1
38. I pay attention to the words spoken by the speaker with an emphasis or at a slow speed.
   在聽英文時，我會去注意講者特別強調或慢下來的地方。5 4 3 2 1
39. I pay attention to the first part of the sentence and guess the speaker’s intention.
   在聽英文時，我會去注意句子的前面部分，以便猜想對方的意思。5 4 3 2 1
40. I try to respond to the speaker even when I don’t understand him/ her perfectly.
   在聽英文時，即使我不太聽得懂對方說的，我也會試著給一些回應。5 4 3 2 1
41. I guess the speaker’s intention based on what he/ she has said so far.
   突然聽不懂的時候，我會根據對方之前說的一些事情，去想像他現在要說的意思。5 4 3 2 1
42. I don’t mind if I can’t understand every single detail.
   在聽英文時，如果不能每個字都聽懂，我也不在意。5 4 3 2 1
43. I anticipate what the speaker is going to say based on the context.
   我會用當時和當場的情境去猜想，對方可能會講什麼。5 4 3 2 1
44. I ask the speaker to give an example when I am not sure what he/ she said.
   我聽不太懂對方說的話，我會要求對方舉個例子解釋。5 4 3 2 1
45. I try to translate into my native language little by little to understand what the speaker has said.
   我會試著一個字一個字地，把對方講的英文翻成中文或其他母語來了解對方講什麼5 4 3 2 1
46. I try to catch the speaker’s main point.
   我會試著抓住對方要講的重點。5 4 3 2 1
47. I pay attention to the speaker’s rhythm and intonation.
   我會特別注意說話者的節奏韻律和語調。5 4 3 2 1
48. I give feedback (e.g., sounds like “Ah-ha!” or “hmmm . . .”) to show my understanding in order to avoid communication gaps.
   我會不斷向對方表示我聽懂了他/她講的話，以避免溝通的斷層。例如，發出“啊哈!”或“嗯嗯 . . .”的聲音訊息。5 4 3 2 1
49. I use circumlocution to clarify some unknown words or phrases that the speaker has used.
   例如，當我聽不懂對方話中的真正意思時，我會舉例或用不同的方式去詢問清楚對方話語的真正意涵。(例如，說話者對我說：“你可以拿給我corkscrew嗎？”，若我不懂什麼是corkscrew，我就可以問：“你指的 是用來開酒瓶的那個東西嗎？”) 5 4 3 2 1
50. I pay attention to the speaker’s pronunciation.
   在聽英文時，我會特別去注意講話者的發音。5 4 3 2 1
51. I use gestures when I have difficulties in understanding.
   我聽不太懂別人的英文表達時，我會用動作表示我不明白。 5 4 3 2 1
52. I pay attention to the speaker’s eye contact, facial expression and gestures.
   在聽英文時，我會特別去注意講話者的眼神、表情及動作。5 4 3 2 1
53. I ask the speaker to slow down when I can’t understand what the speaker has said.
   當我聽不太懂別人說的英文時，我會要求他/她講慢一點。5 4 3 2 1
54. I ask the speaker to use easy words when I have difficulties in comprehension.
   當我聽不太懂別人說的英文時，我會要求他/她用簡易一點的字彙5 4 3 2 1
55. I make a clarification request when I am not sure what the speaker has said.
   當我聽不太懂別人說的英文時，我會跟對方說明我是哪裡聽不懂。5 4 3 2 1
56. I ask for repetition when I can’t understand what the speaker has said.
   當我聽不太懂別人說的英文時，我會要求他/她把同樣的話再說一次。5 4 3 2 1
57. I make clear to the speaker what I haven’t been able to understand.
   當我聽不太懂別人說的英文時，我會跟對方說明我是哪裡聽不懂。5 4 3 2 1
58. I only focus on familiar expressions.
   我在聽英文時，我只注意我熟悉的英文句法跟表達方式。5 4 3 2 1
59. I especially pay attention to the interrogative when I listen to WH-questions.
   當我聽到WH開頭的問句時，我會特別注意它的疑問詞。5 4 3 2 1
60. I pay attention to the subject and verb of the sentence when I listen.
   我在聽英文時，我會注意句子裡的主詞和動詞。5 4 3 2 1

This is the end of the questionnaire. For valid data, please skim through each page and make sure you have answered each question and circled each answer properly. Thank you very much!

本問卷調查結束。請您再巡視一次是否每項題目都已回答，並清楚地圈選了，以免產生因為題目未答或圈選不清，而整份作廢的情形。感謝您!
Appendix B: Strips for Oral Tests

Strip A for a Pre-Oral Test

Directions 說明
After sitting down, you will be given a 4-picture cartoon strip. Please make up a pseudo name or code and then say it and the title of this sheet to the examiner.

在坐下之後,您將會拿到一份四格連環漫畫。請想一個假名字或代號，然後向測試者說出該假名字或代號，及本張紙最上方的標題。

Please take a look at the cartoon strip you have and think for a while about what might a story of this strip conveys. Tell the examiner about the story you create for this strip in English when you are ready.

請看一下，並想一下您拿到的這張四格連環漫畫的故事內容。當您準備好時，請用英文把您想的漫畫故事內容，說給測試者聽。

Subsequently, the examiner will ask you three impromptu questions regarding the story you tell. The examiner will make some notes during the tests. Please relax and answer those questions. There are no right or wrong answers for those questions.

然後，測試者將會依照您說出的故事，問您三個即席的問題。測試者在這過程中，可能會記下一些東西，請放輕鬆回答那些問題。答案沒有絕對的對或錯。

Notes 注意事項
The whole process of the test will be videotaped, but the recording will be reviewed and analysed only by the researcher and the oral test examiner. Your recording will be kept in a locked and private cabinet for research purpose only. Confidentiality of your record is assured. It is an anonymous research. Pseudo names or codes will be used for this study.

整個測試的過程將會被錄影起來，但錄影記錄只會被研究員和測試者拿來做研究之用。您的錄影將會被妥善保存在私人上鎖的櫃子中，絕對會被保密。這是個匿名的研究，研究會從頭到尾使用您的假名字或代號。

Strip B for a Pre-Oral Test
口語測驗 前測—連環漫畫B

Directions 說明
After sitting down, you will be given a 4-picture cartoon strip. Please make up a pseudo name or code and then say it and the title of this sheet to the examiner.
在坐下之後,您將會拿到一份四格連環漫畫。請想一個假名字或代號，然後向測試者說出該假名字或代號，及本張紙最上方的標題。
Please take a look at the cartoon strip you have and think for a while about what might a story of this strip conveys. Tell the examiner about the story you create for this strip in English when you are ready.
請看一下，並想一下您拿到的這張四格連環漫畫的故事內容。當您準備好時，請用英文把您想的漫畫故事內容，說給測試者聽。
Subsequently, the examiner will ask you three impromptu questions regarding the story you tell. The examiner will make some notes during the tests. Please relax and answer those questions. There are no right or wrong answers for those questions.
然後，測試者將會依照您說出的故事，問您三個即席的問題。測試者在這過程中，可能會記下一些東西，請放輕鬆回答那些問題。答案沒有絕對的對或錯。

Notes 注意事項
The whole process of the test will be videotaped, but the recording will be reviewed and analysed only by the researcher and the oral test examiner. Your recording will be kept in a locked and private cabinet for research purpose only. Confidentiality of your record is assured. It is an anonymous research. Pseudo names or codes will be used for this study.
整個測試的過程將會被錄影起來，但錄影記錄只會被研究員和測試者拿來做研究之用。您的錄影將會被妥善保存在私人上鎖的櫃子中，絕對會被保密。這是個匿名的研究，研究會從頭到尾使用您的假名字或代號。

Strip A for a Post-Oral Test
口語測驗後測—連環漫畫A

Directions 說明
After sitting down, you will be given a 4-picture cartoon strip. Please make up a pseudo name or code and then say it and the title of this sheet to the examiner.
在坐下之後，您將會拿到一份四格連環漫畫。請想一個假名字或代號，然後向測試者說出該假名字或代號，及本張紙最上方的標題。
Please take a look at the cartoon strip you have and think for a while about what might a story of this strip conveys. Tell the examiner about the story you create for this strip in English when you are ready.
請看一下，並想一下您拿到的這張四格連環漫畫的故事內容。當您準備好時，請用英文把您想的漫畫故事內容，說給測試者聽。
Subsequently, the examiner will ask you three impromptu questions regarding the story you tell. The examiner will make some notes during the tests. Please relax and answer those questions. There are no right or wrong answers for those questions.
然後，測試者將會依照您說出的故事，問您三個即席的問題。測試者在這過程中，可能會記下一些東西，請放輕鬆回答那些問題。答案沒有絕對的對或錯。

Notes 注意事項
The whole process of the test will be videotaped, but the recording will be reviewed and analysed only by the researcher and the oral test examiner. Your recording will be kept in a locked and private cabinet for research purpose only. Confidentiality of your record is assured. It is an anonymous research. Pseudo names or codes will be used for this study.
整個測試的過程將會被錄影起來，但錄影記錄只會被研究員和測試者拿來做研究之用。您的錄影將會被妥善保存在私人上鎖的櫃子中，絕對會被保密。這是個匿名的研究，研究會從頭到尾使用您的假名字或代號。

Strip B for a Post-Oral Test
口語測驗後測—連環漫畫B

Directions 說明
After sitting down, you will be given a 4-picture cartoon strip. Please make up a pseudo name or code and then say it and the title of this sheet to the examiner.
在坐下之後，您將會拿到一份四格連環漫畫。請想一個假名字或代號，然後向測試者說出該假名字或代號，及本張紙最上方的標題。
Please take a look at the cartoon strip you have and think for a while about what might a story of this strip conveys. Tell the examiner about the story you create for this strip in English when you are ready.
請看一下，並想一下您拿到的這張四格連環漫畫的故事內容。當您準備好時，請用英文把您想的漫畫故事內容，說給測試者聽。
Subsequently, the examiner will ask you three impromptu questions regarding the story you tell. The examiner will make some notes during the tests. Please relax and answer those questions. There are no right or wrong answers for those questions.
然後，測試者將會依照您說出的故事，問您三個即席的問題。測試者在這過程中，可能會記下一些東西，請放輕鬆回答那些問題。答案沒有絕對的對或錯。

Notes 注意事項
The whole process of the test will be videotaped, but the recording will be reviewed and analysed only by the researcher and the oral test examiner. Your recording will be kept in a locked and private cabinet for research purpose only. Confidentiality of your record is assured. It is an anonymous research. Pseudo names or codes will be used for this study.
整個測試的過程將會被錄影起來，但錄影記錄只會被研究員和測試者拿來做研究之用。您的錄影將會被妥善保存在私人上鎖的櫃子中，絕對會被保密。這是個匿名的研究，研究會從頭到尾使用您的假名字或代號。

Appendix C: After-Task Reflection Surveys

Directions 說明
This instrument contains 15 subgroups of the OCSI with their respective detailed strategies. Its aim is to help participants to recall and record their thinking processes generated during their oral tests. Therefore, it is administered after pre- and post- oral tests. Participants need to tick on the strategies that they think they have been using during the oral tests and write down any process of thinking for using or not using certain strategies. There are no right or wrong answers. Participants could write on ‘Thought Tracing’ section in either English or Chinese. There is no word-limit for writing.

Notes 注意事項
Confidentiality of your answers is assured. It is an anonymous research, so please do not write your name or make any recognizable marks on this survey. All the items are important. If you have any questions, please raise your hand.

Gender 性別
□ Female 女性  □ Male 男性

Pseudo name/Code: __________________ 您的假名或代號
**Strategies for coping with speaking problems**

應用在說的問題的策略:

1. **Social affective strategies 社會情感化策略**
   1.1. I try to use fillers (e.g., well, you know . . .) when I cannot think of what to say. 當我一時想不到該說些什麼時，我會說一些感嘆詞或語助詞，例如，如，好或你知道...
   1.2. I try to give a good impression to the listener. 我試著讓聽者對我有好的印象。
   1.3. I don’t mind taking risks even though I might make mistakes. 我不在乎會犯錯。
   1.4. I try to enjoy the conversation. 我會試著讓講英文時，喜愛交談。
   1.5. I try to relax when I feel anxious. 我會因說英文時，感到緊張時，會放鬆自己。
   1.6. I actively encourage myself to express what I want to say. 我會積極地自我鼓勵以表達想表達的。

Thought Tracking 思維回溯:

2. **Fluency-oriented strategies 以流暢為目標策略**
   2.2. I change my way of saying things according to the context. 我會根據狀況隨時改變我說英文的方式。
   2.3. I take my time to express what I want to say. 我會慢慢地用英文表達我想說的。
   2.4. I pay attention to my pronunciation. 在講英文時，我會特別注意我的發音。
   2.5. I try to speak clearly and loudly to make myself heard. 在講英文時，我會講得清楚大聲，使他人聽到我。
   2.6. I pay attention to my rhythm and intonation. 在講英文時，我會特別注意我自己講英文的節奏、韻律和語調。
   2.7. I use a foreign word to adjust it to English pronunciation and/or morphology, for example, saying “chocoli” (Mandarin pronunciation) for the English word “chocolate”). 我會用母語或其他語言的音或字形想像、轉化我想講的英文字的音或形，例如，不太會用英文講“巧克力”這個單字時，可能會變成用中文的發音去說。

Thought Tracking 思維回溯:
3. Negotiation for meaning while speaking 說話時以溝通意思為主的策略

3.1. While speaking, I pay attention to the listener’s reaction to my speech. 在講英文時，我會特別注意聽者對我所說的話的反應。
3.2. I give examples if the listener doesn’t understand what I am saying. 假如對方聽不懂我所說的話時，我會舉例子解釋。
3.3. I repeat what I want to say until the listener understands. 我會一直重覆我想說的，直到對方聽懂為止。
3.4. I make comprehension checks to ensure the listener understands what I want to say. 我會時常確定一下對方聽懂我在說什麼了。
3.5. I make up a new word in order to communicate a desired concept (e.g., airball” for balloon”). 我會自己造新字去溝通我想講的意思，例如，我不會講氣球的英文，我就說airball來代替balloon這個字。

Thought Tracking思維回溯:

4. Accuracy-oriented strategies 以精確為目標策略

4.1. I pay attention to grammar and word-order during conversation. 在講英文時，我會注意文法與單字的排列。
4.2. I try to emphasize the subject and verb of the sentence in the sentence. 在講英文時，我會特別注重句子裡的主詞和動詞。
4.3. I correct myself when I notice that I have made a mistake. 在講英文時，如果發現自己講的英文有錯誤，我自己會修正自己的說法。
4.4. I notice myself using an expression which fits a rule that I have learned. 我注意到自己的英文表達會儘量符合自己已學過的文法。
4.5. I try to talk like a native speaker. 在講英文時，我會儘量表現得像外國人一樣。

Thought Tracking思維回溯:

5. Message reduction and alteration strategies 減少訊息和變更策略

5.1. I use words which are familiar to me. 我會用我熟悉的英文單字。
5.2. I reduce the message and use simple expressions. 我會使用簡單一點的英文表達我的意思，或儘量簡化要說的意思。
5.3. I replace the original message with another message because I feel incapable of executing my original intent. 當我覺得，自己大概沒辦法溝通原本想講的意思時，我就會講些別的話題來代替。

Thought Tracking思維回溯:
6. Nonverbal strategies while speaking 說話時的非言辭策略
   6.1. I try to make eye-contact when I am talking. 在講英文時，我會試著跟對方有眼神的交集。
   6.2. I use gestures and facial expressions if I can’t express myself. 在講英文時，如果我沒辦法表達要說的意思，我會用動作跟表情來傳達意思。

Thought Tracking 思維回溯：

7. Message abandonment strategies 放棄訊息策略
   7.1. I leave a message unfinished because of some language difficulty. 我會因為沒辦法用英文表達，所以就不再繼續講下去了。
   7.2. I ask other people to help when I can’t communicate well. 在不能用英文好好溝通時，會請別人幫我。
   7.3. I give up when I can’t make myself understood. 當我講英文不能被理解時，我會直接放棄。
   7.4. When I don’t know what to say, I just say some words that might not be grammatically well organised. 當我不知道要講些什麼的時候，就不會去想講一些有文法組織的英文句子組合，而是隨便說一些單字。

Thought Tracking 思維回溯：

8. Attempt to think in English strategies 試圖用英文角度思考策略
   8.1. I think first of what I want to say in my native language and then construct the English sentence. 在說英文句子之前，我會先用中文或其他母語先想過一遍。
   8.2. I think first of a sentence I already know in English and then try to change it to fit the situation. 我會先想一個我會說的英文句子，然後想辦法找機會使用它

Thought Tracking 思維回溯：

____________________________________________
Strategies for coping with Listening problems
應用在聽的問題的策略:

1. Negotiation for meaning while listening 聽話時以溝通意思為主的策略
   1.1. I ask the speaker to slow down when I can’t understand what the speaker has said. 當我聽不太懂別人說的英文時，我會要求他/她講慢一點。
   1.2. I ask the speaker to use easy words when I have difficulties in comprehension. 當聽不太懂別人說的英文時，我會要求他/她用簡易一點的字彙。
   1.3. I make a clarification request when I am not sure what the speaker has said. 當我聽不太懂別人說的英文時，我會要求他/她再解釋清楚點。
   1.4. I ask for repetition when I can’t understand what the speaker has said. 當我聽不太懂別人說的英文時，我會要求他/她把同樣的話再重覆講一次。
   1.5. I make clear to the speaker what I haven’t been able to understand. 當我聽不太懂別人說的英文時，我會跟對方說明我是哪裡聽不懂。

Thought Tracking思維回溯:

2. Fluency-maintaining strategies 維持流暢策略
   2.1. I ask the speaker to give an example when I am not sure what he/ she said. 當我聽不太懂對方說的話，我會要求對方舉個例子解釋。
   2.2. I pay attention to the speaker’s rhythm and intonation. 我會特別注意說話者講話的節奏韻律和語調。
   2.3. I give feedback (e.g., sounds like “Ah-ha!” or “hmmm . . .”) to show my understanding in order to avoid communication gaps. 我會不斷向對方表示我聽懂了他/她講的話，以避免溝通的斷層。例如，發出“啊哈!” 或 “嗯嗯 . . .” 的聲音訊息。
   2.4. I use circumlocution to clarify some unknown words or phrases that the speaker has used. For instance, when a speaker says “can you get me the corkscrew?”, I may ask the speaker “do you mean the thing we use to open a bottle?”. 當我聽不懂對方話中的真正意思時，我會舉例或用不同的方式去詢問對方話語的真正意涵。(例如，說話者對我說:“你可以拿給我corkscrew嗎?”，若我不懂什麼是corkscrew，我就可以問:“你指的是用來開酒瓶的那個東西嗎?”)
   2.5. I pay attention to the speaker’s pronunciation. 在聽英文時，我會特別去注意講話者的發音。

Thought Tracking思維回溯:
3. **Scanning strategies** 細聽策略

3.1. I pay attention to the first part of the sentence and guess the speaker’s intention.
在聽英文時，我會去注意句子的前面部分，以便猜想對方的意思。

3.2. I try to catch the speaker’s main point. 我會試著抓住對方要講的重點。

3.3. I especially pay attention to the interrogative when I listen to WH-questions. 我會特別注意它的疑問詞。

3.4. I pay attention to the subject and verb of the sentence when I listen. 我在聽別人說英文時，我會注意句子裡的主詞跟動詞。

Thought Tracking 思維回溯:

4. **Getting the gist strategies** 抓重點策略

4.1. I try to respond to the speaker even when I don’t understand him/her perfectly.
在聽英文時，即使我不太聽得懂對方說的，我也會試著給一些回應。

4.2. I guess the speaker’s intention based on what he/she has said so far. 突然聽不懂的時候，我會根據對方之前說的一些事情，去聯想他現在要說的意思。

4.3. I don’t mind if I can’t understand every single detail. 在聽英文時，如果不能每個字都聽懂，我也不在意。

4.4. I anticipate what the speaker is going to say based on the context. 我會用當時和當時的情境去猜想，對方可能要講什麼。

Thought Tracking 思維回溯:

5. **Nonverbal strategies while listening** 聽話時的非言辭策略

5.1. I use gestures when I have difficulties in understanding. 我聽不太懂別人的英文表達時，我會用動作表示我不明白。

5.2. I pay attention to the speaker’s eye contact, facial expression and gestures. 在聽英文時，我會特別去注意講話者的眼神、表情及動作。

Thought Tracking 思維回溯:

6. **Less active listener strategies** 較不主動的傾聽者策略

6.1. I try to translate into my native language little by little to understand what the speaker has said. 我會試著一個字一個字地，把對方講的英文翻成中文或其他母語來了解對方講什麼。

6.2. I only focus on familiar expressions. 我在聽別人說英文時，我只注意我熟悉的英文句法跟表達方式。
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7. **Word-oriented strategies 以字為目標的策略**

7.1. I pay attention to the first word to judge whether it is an interrogative sentence or not.

我會特別注意句子的第一個字，以分辨該句子是否為問句。

7.2. I try to catch every word that the speaker uses.

我會試著去抓住對方講英文時所說的每一個字。

7.3. I guess the speaker’s intention by picking up familiar words.

在聽英文時，我會去聽一些熟悉的字，以便猜想對方的意思。

7.4. I pay attention to the words spoken by the speaker with an emphasis or at a slow speed.

在聽英文時，我會去注意講者特別強調或慢下來的地方。

---

The End. Thank you very much for your help!
Appendix D: Questionnaire of Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale (FLCAS)

Pseudo name/Code: ___________________________ 您的假名或代號

Directions 說明
This instrument is composed of 33 statements concerning scope and severity of foreign language anxiety while you are in foreign language classrooms. Please indicate a degree to which each statement applies to you by circling whether it is (5) Always or almost always true of me, (4) Generally true of me, (3) Somewhat true of me, (2) Generally not true of me, or (1) Never or almost never true of me. This instrument is to be administered once before and after intervention to explore change of your anxiety scope and level. In order to better serve purposes of this study, wherever the term “foreign language” appears in the original scale would be adapted and changed to “English” in this scale. There are not right or wrong answers. Work quickly, and just record your first impression.

Notes 注意事項
Confidentiality of your answers is assured. It is an anonymous research, so please do not write your name or make any recognizable marks on this survey. All the items are important. If you have any questions, please raise your hand.

您回答的內容絕對保密。因為此研究採匿名方式進行，所以請勿寫上您的名字或標註其他不相干的記號。每一題均很重要，請認真作答。若作答過程有任何疑義，請立即舉手詢問。
1. I never feel quite sure of myself when I am speaking in my English class.
   我對自己在英語課講英語從來就沒把握。5 4 3 2 1
2. I don’t worry about making mistakes in language class.
   我對在語言課講話都不擔心會犯錯。5 4 3 2 1
3. I tremble when I know that I’m going to be called on in language class. 我在語言課要被叫到時，會
   感到非常焦慮不安。5 4 3 2 1
4. It frightens me when I don’t understand what the teacher is saying in English.
   不懂老師講什麼英文時，我會覺得很驚恐。5 4 3 2 1
5. It wouldn’t bother me at all to take more foreign language classes.
   我覺得多修一些外語課，沒什麼關係。5 4 3 2 1
6. During language class, I find myself thinking about things that have nothing to do with the course.
   在上語言課時，我發現我會想一些跟課不相關的事情。5 4 3 2 1
7. I keep thinking that the other students are better at language than I am.
   我一直認為其他同學的語言學得比我好。5 4 3 2 1
8. I am usually at ease during tests in my language class. 我在語言課考試時，都覺得安心自在 5 4 3 2 1
9. I start to panic when I have to speak without preparation in language class. 在語言課要沒有準備就
   發言，就會開始覺得緊張。5 4 3 2 1
10. I worry about the consequences of failing my English class. 我會擔心英語課考不及格。5 4 3 2 1
11. I don’t understand why some people get so upset over English classes. 我不曉得為什麼有些學生會對英
    語課感到心煩意亂。5 4 3 2 1
12. In language class, I can get so nervous I forgot things I know. 在上語言課時，我會緊張到忘記本來
    就知道的東西。5 4 3 2 1
13. It embarrasses me to volunteer answers in my language class. 在上語言課時，自願回答問題會讓我覺得
    尷尬。5 4 3 2 1
14. I would not be nervous speaking English with native speakers. 我跟外國人講英文時不會覺得緊張。5
    4 3 2 1
15. I get upset when I don’t understand what the teacher is correcting. 當我聽不懂老師對我糾正什麼的時
    候，會覺得很煩。5 4 3 2 1
16. Even if I am well prepared for language class, I feel anxious about it. 即使我把語言課要上的東西準備
    得很好，我還是會覺得心裡很不安。5 4 3 2 1
17. I often feel like not going to my language class. 我常常覺得不想上語言課。5 4 3 2 1
18. I feel confident when I speak in English class. 在英語課講話時，都覺得有自信。5 4 3 2 1
19. I am afraid that my language teacher is ready to correct every mistake I make. 我怕我的語言老師都
    隨時隨地都想要糾正我把錯的每個錯誤。5 4 3 2 1
20. I can feel my heart pounding when I am going to be called on in language class. 在上語言課時，
    若快要輪到或叫到我講話，我的心就跳得很快。5 4 3 2 1
21. The more I study for a language test, the more confused I get. 我越是為了考英文而讀書，就會越讀越困
    惑。5 4 3 2 1
22. I don’t feel pressure to prepare very well for language class. 我不會為了要把語言課準備得很好，而感
    到壓力。5 4 3 2 1
23. I always feel that the other students speak English better than I do. 我總覺得其他同學的英語講得比我
    好。5 4 3 2 1
24. I feel very self-conscious about speaking English in front of other students. 在其他同學面前講英文，會讓我覺得非常害羞。5 4 3 2 1
25. Language class moves so quickly I worry about getting left behind. 語言課的進度太快，我怕自己趕不上。5 4 3 2 1
26. I feel more tense and nervous in my language class than in my other classes.  
我覺得上語言課比上其他的課, 更讓我神經緊張。5 4 3 2 1
27. I get nervous and confused when I am speaking in my language class. I feel very sure and relaxed.  
我在語言課發言，會感到緊張和困惑。5 4 3 2 1
28. When I’m on my way to language class, I feel very sure and relaxed.  
我去上語言課時，會感到自信和輕鬆。5 4 3 2 1
29. I get nervous when I don’t understand every word the language teacher says.  
當我沒辦法懂英文老師所說的每個字時，我就會開始緊張。5 4 3 2 1
30. I feel overwhelmed by the number of rules I have to learn to speak English.  
我會對於有那麼多要學的文法規則，才能講出英文，覺得不知所措。5 4 3 2 1
31. I am afraid that the other students will laugh at me when I speak English.  
我怕我講英文的時候，同學會笑我。5 4 3 2 1
32. I would probably feel comfortable around native speakers of English.  
我或許會在跟一堆講英文的外國人相處時，感到自在。5 4 3 2 1
33. I get nervous when the language teacher asks questions which I haven’t prepared in advance.  
英文老師如果問我一些我事先沒準備的問題，會令我緊張。5 4 3 2 1

This is the end of the questionnaire. For valid data, please skim through each page and make sure you have answered each question and circled each answer properly. Thank you very much!
Appendix E: Semi-structured Group Interviews
半開放式團體訪談

**Purpose** 目的
Semi-structured interviews will be conducted in an attempt to determine participants’ motivation for using strategies in oral communication, their perceptions of integrating process drama or scripted role play in English oral communication strategy training and their perceptions of value change for the oral communication strategies.

實施半開放式訪談目的在於測定參與者在口語溝通時使用策略的動機，以及他們對於結合英文口語訓練和過程戲劇或有稿的角色扮演的看法，還有，他們對於口語溝通策略評價的改變。

**Directions** 說明
There will be 5 or 6 people sitting in a circle with the researcher for both pre- and post-group interviews conducted before and after an intervention. A semi-structured interview will be administered for about 15 minutes. The process of each interview will be recorded with digital recording facilities (e.g., MP3). Interviewees are free to express any opinions relevant to this research or the questions asked by the researcher in English or Mandarin as long as the communication is clear to each other. Process drama or scripted role plays will be explained before the interviews start.

此訪談會在教學實驗之前與之後舉行。5至6人一組與研究者圍坐著進行訪談，一次約歷時15分鐘。每次訪談的過程都會用MP3錄音下來。只要雙方都清楚溝通的資訊，受訪者可以隨心所欲地用英文或中文表達與本研究或訪談問題有關的意見。研究者會在訪談前先解釋過程戲劇或有稿的角色扮演方式為何。

**Notes** 注意事項
The whole process of the interview will be recorded, and the recording will be reviewed and analysed only by the researcher. Your recording and its transcription will be kept in a locked and private cabinet for research purpose only. Confidentiality of your record is assured. It is an anonymous research. Pseudo names or codes will be used for this study or further publication.

整個訪問的過程將會被錄音，此錄音記錄只為研究目的，只有研究者能使用、分析此記錄。你的錄音電子檔及其逐字記錄，將會被妥善保存在私人上鎖的櫃子中，有絕對的保密性。此為一匿名研究，此研究或相關發表將確保使用受訪者的假名字或代號。

**Interview Questions Asked Before the Intervention** 在教學實驗前的訪問問題:
(No.1 to 8 are applied to all) (第一題到第八題適用於所有人):

1. Do you feel anxious or self-conscious when you have to talk in English? 當你必須要用英文講話時，你會感到不安或忸怩不自在嗎?
2. What is your first impression when you hear “oral communication strategies (OCSs)” ? 當你聽到「口語溝通策略」時，對這個詞的第一印象為何?
3. Can you recall anyone using OCSs in their English communication? How do you view people who use strategies to sustain or improve their English oral communication? 你能回想到有任何人在用英語溝通時，會使用到口語溝通策略的狀況嗎? 你對使用策略去維持或改善他們英語溝通狀況的人，看法為何?
4. Do you think you will use oral communication strategies if you could? 你覺得如果你有能力使用口語溝通策略，你會去用這些策略嗎?
5. If you have been applying OCSs in your English communication, how frequently do you employ them? 假如你曾經使用過口語溝通策略，那你使用他們的頻率是怎樣的呢?
6. If you have been applying OCSs in your English communication, what OCSs have you been using? 假如你曾經使用過口語溝通策略，你用的又是哪些策略呢?
7. Do you feel motivated to learn or use OCSs for communicating with others in English? 你覺得在跟別人用英文溝通時，你會有動機去學習或使用口語溝通策略嗎?
8. Do you think using OCSs in English oral communication could be trained? 你覺得使用口語溝通策略來幫助英語口語的溝通是可以被訓練的嗎?
9. (For Experimental Group): What do you think about integrating process drama in English oral communication strategy training? (這題為實驗組專用) 你對於結合英文口語訓練和過程戲劇的看法為何?
10. (For Control Group): What do you think about integrating scripted role play in oral communication strategy training? (這題為對照組專用) 你對於英文口語訓練和有稿的角色扮演的相互結合看法為何?

End of this interview. Thank you very much!

Appendix F: Journal Prompts

Directions 說明

Participator's Diary

1. Do you feel less anxious or self-conscious when you have to talk in English now? 當你現在必須要用英文講話時，你比較不會感到不安或不自在了嗎?
2. What do you think about “oral communication strategies (OCSs)” now? Are they helpful to you? 你現在對英文口語溝通策略的看法為何? 你覺得那些策略對你有幫助嗎?
3. Are you more aware of people using OCSs when you listen to their speech acts now? How do you regard people who use strategies to sustain or improve their English oral communication? 你在聽人家講英文時，會比較注意到他們是否有使用口語溝通策略嗎? 你現在對那樣使用策略去維持或改善他們英語溝通狀況的人，看法為何?
4. Have you been using some OCSs this semester? Where, what situations and how often have you been using them? 你這學期有曾經使用過口語溝通策略嗎? 是在哪裡，什麼狀況下用到的? 你使用的頻率為何?
5. What OCSs have you been using most often? 你最常使用的策略有哪些呢?
6. Do you feel more motivated to learn or use OCSs for communicating with others in English after this semester’s training? 你覺得現在在跟別人用英文溝通時，你會有動機去學習或使用口語溝通策略嗎?
7. Do you think using OCSs in English oral communication could be trained? 你覺得在用英語溝通時，使用口語溝通策略是可以被訓練的嗎?
8. (For Experimental Group): What do you think and feel about integrating process drama in English oral communication strategy training? What do you like or dislike about it? (這題為實驗組專用) 你對於結合英文口語訓練和過程戲劇的看法為何? 對於這種課程，你喜歡或不喜歡的地方有哪些?
9. (For Control Group): What do you think and feel about integrating scripted role play in English oral communication strategy training? What do you like or dislike about it? (這題為對照組專用) 你對於英文口語訓練和有稿的角色扮演的相互結合看法為何? 對於這種課程，你喜歡或不喜歡的地方有哪些?

End of this interview. Thank you very much!

Appendix F: Journal Prompts

Participator’s Diary

Directions 說明
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Please write down whatever you would like to say about your English classes in week 4, 5, 6, 8, 10, 11, 13, 14 and 15. There will be 9 entries in total. The first 4 entries will be collected in week 9 and the rest in week 18. You can write your journals in either English or Chinese. Please choose a code or pseudo name to represent you and use it all the way throughout your journal writing. No word limit but it would be better to only use the papers given by the researcher. Feel free to write on the reverse side of a paper.

請寫下您對於第4, 5, 6, 8, 10, 11, 13, 14和15週的英語課的任何感想和意見。您總共在這個學期會要寫完九份日誌。研究員會在第9 週的時候收取您前四份的日誌，在第18週時，收取剩下的五份。您可以使用英文或中文書寫您的內容。請在您所有的日誌中使用同一個假名字或代號。沒有字數限制，但最好只寫在研究員所給的紙上。紙張反面也可使用。

Notes 注意事項

Your journals will only be viewed by the researcher for research purpose only. They will be kept in a locked and private cabinet. Confidentiality of your record is assured. It is an anonymous research. Pseudo names or codes will be used for the thesis report and further publication. Content of your journals will not influence your rights and academic evaluation in any aspects. Only research will have access to your journals. Your journal will be kept in a locked and private cabinet. Confidentiality of your record is assured. It is an anonymous research. Pseudo names or codes will be used for the thesis report and further publication. Content of your journals will not influence your rights and academic evaluation in any aspects.

Your pseudo name or code 您的假名或代號 ________________________

This is week 第幾週 ______________. Today’s date: 今天日期 ________________

1. What impressed you most in today’s English class? 
   您對今天英文課印象最深的有哪些事?
2. What do you like or dislike about today’s English class? 
   您對今天的英文課，有什麼喜歡或不喜歡的地方?
3. Other thoughts or comments. 
   其他看法或意見

Journal Prompts for the Teacher

老師日誌

This is week 第幾週 ______________. Today’s date: 今天日期 ________________

1. What impressed you most in today’s intervention? 
   您對今天的教學實驗印象最深刻的是?
2. Do you think participants were achieving the learning goals set for this week? 
   您覺得參與研究的學生們有達成這次實驗所設定的學習目標了嗎?
3. What is the atmosphere in today’s class? What affective changes have you observed? 
   今天的課堂氛圍如何? 您有觀察到學生情緒情緒上的什麼變化嗎?
4. What else would you do to improve today’s lesson or intervention? 
   您覺得今天的教學實驗還有哪裡須要改進的?
Appendix G: The 1st intervention plan of process drama

**Aims:**
This intervention plan is the first of the three drama modules of this research. The realistic topic of this module helps learners who are new to learn with drama to engage easily in activities of process drama and to contextualize the use of oral communication strategies for English communication.

**Participants:**
26 freshmen of the Dental Laboratory Department from a five-year college of Medicine and Management in Southern Taiwan consented to join the research. There were 23 females and 3 males participating in this intervention. Most of the participants were from low to medium socio-economic backgrounds. Their language proficiency level was averagely low, for their average score of an official entrance exam on English subject was 18.6 over 60 points of full scores.

**Topic:** Pets and Pet Owners

**Background planning and requirements**

**Key Question:** How do participants give advice to help people?

**Pre-text:** A short plot was performed to the participants with the drama technique, teacher-in-role as a handicapped person needing for help.

**Focus Questions:** How do the participants persuade a stranger to get a new pet to replace his lost one with various rationales?

**The 5 Ws:**
- What’s happening? A crippled man eagerly asks around in the park whether anyone has seen his dog. He seeks help from a group of people (namely, all the participants on the seats in the classroom) sitting in the park.
- Who’s it happening to? ---A crippled man and a group of very intelligent students who have much experience of keeping pets and are passionate about helping people.
- Where is it happening? --- In the park.
- When is it happening? --- In the late afternoon.
- What’s at stake? ---The crippled man is lonely and often needs company and help of his dog. It was dusk while his dog was missing. It couldn’t be found anywhere. The crippled man was afraid of that some people enticed his dog away for dinner. Some older people in that community still keep the tradition of eating dogs for their better health.
- The students of the community were taught in schools to help handicapped people when they are of need.

**The hook:** Many students have experience of keeping pets. Being able to share and being consulted about their own personal experience would motivate them to get involved in the drama theme and reduce their anxiety of using English for oral communication. English could then become a tool for them to express their ideas instead of for academic examination only.

**The teacher-in-role:** A crippled man

**Resource:** A rod for the crippled man, big pieces of papers and colour pens for each group, name cards for different pets.

**Connected areas:**
1. English—oral communication strategies, grammar, sentence writing, speaking and listening.
2. Analysing, questioning, cooperating with others, information/resource searching
3. Veterinary study/ biology
4. Ethics

**Drama outcomes:**
1. Forming: Participants communicate in and out of the role as experts of pets or as pets.
2. Presenting: Participants divided into two groups playing one kind of pet and pet owners who might have some sorts of physical disability. Pets and pet owners later have to interview each other in order to best match one another.

3. Responding: Participants discuss among themselves from various perspectives about the suitability of what pet handicapped people could and should keep.

**Brief description of the procedures for this intervention:**
This intervention has a realistic topic with which the students could at least play three different roles: kind and intelligent student helpers, pets or pet owners with physical disability. The first 50-minute session of every week is used to instruct five sub-categories of OCSI or English grammar designed in original curriculum and process drama takes place in the subsequent session.

<Week 4: 50 mins>

*Introduction:* Before starting this module, the teacher-researcher has to explain what and how process drama activities will be conducted in the following weeks and what they are expected to learn from these activities. (15 minutes)

*Pre-text & teacher-in-role:* Then the teacher-researcher tells the students in the park that they are going to see a crippled man walking in after she leaves the classroom. The crippled man will ask for their help because the teacher-researcher used to talk to the crippled man about her students’ passion and abundant experience about all sorts of pets. After explaining to them and coming back again from outside of the classroom, the teacher-researcher in role with a rod comes in and asks the students whether they have seen his dog in English. The students need to answer his question in English as well because he couldn’t understand Mandarin, and they also ask him some questions about how his dog looks like, where exactly it got off the leash, what might be its favourite food and where might be its favourite spots to play. (20 minutes)

*Teacher out of roles and discussion:* After asking help from the students, the teacher-researcher gets out of the role of crippled man to help the students review what they were doing with the crippled man. She also asks the students to come out of the drama and discuss about what English oral communication strategies and sentences have been used just then. In the process of role-playing, the teacher-researcher should come out of the role if the students really need to ask about pronunciation and usage of some vocabularies or about grammatical questions, which are not related to the development of the drama. (10 minutes)

*Reflecting and journal writing:* Since it would be extremely difficult to collect all the participants’ journals if they bring them home to complete. They might easily forget about the activities they do in class or to leave the writing logs at home. Therefore, the most efficient way to get all of their feedback is to allocate some minutes for them to finish their journal writing and collect their journal pieces at the end of a class or before they go home for the day. The journal papers are distributed to the participants only, and for the rest of the non-participants, they would have to review their grammar book or finish grammar exercises while the participants were writing up their journals at the last few minutes. (about 5 minutes or during break time)

<Week 5: 50 minutes>

*Teacher-in-role:* The teacher-researcher acts in role as the crippled man again to ask the students whether they have seen his dog and try to get advice from them about getting new pets if he could not get back his lost dog. (5 minutes)

*Group work and brainstorming:* The class is divided into seven groups and asked to write down on a piece of big paper about their suggestions of what new pets would be suitable for a handicapped man to adopt. The teacher-researcher jumps out of role and helps with their questions regarding use of vocabulary, sentence structures or grammar. (20 minutes)

*Teacher-in-role:* The teacher-in-role creates more conflicts and dilemma by throwing some queries to the students after each group tells him what pets he should adopt and with what methods to feed them. It is not easy to satisfy the crippled man, so he wants the students to think thoroughly again about their suggestions and to be able to answer more profound questions of his next time when they meet. (15 minutes)

*Reviewing:* The teacher-researcher comes out of the role and helps review the English sentences and strategies they have been using in class. (5 minutes)
Reflecting and journal writing: The participants have to finish their journal writing, and the non-participants do grammar exercises, review or ask about grammar questions. (about 5 minutes or during break time)

<Week 6: 50 minutes>

Pre-text: The teacher-researcher urges the groups to defend for their own recommendation of pets as if their pet suggestions are the most suitable for the crippled man. She tells them that the man will need to see answers to questions written on the big papers given by her last week, in order to make his final decision. (5 minutes)

Group role-play: Within every group, half of the group members play pet owners and the other half plays pets of their recommendation. The questions provided by the teacher on the blackboard should be answered on the big papers given and read between pets and pet owners. (20 minutes) These questions on the blackboard are to help the students to use grammatical structures learned and to help them think critically with their roles. They are as follows.

1). What pet are you? (For pet owners to ask pets)
2). Why do you want to have this pet? (For pets to ask pet owners)
3). How many meals a day does your pet have? (For pets to ask pet owners)
4). What food do you usually eat? (For pet owners to ask pets)
5). Do you like your pet/ your owner? Why? (For pets and pet owners to ask one another.)

Hot-seating: Then two or three volunteer groups take turns to do hot-seating. A pet owner needs to sit next to his or her pet(s) on hot seats. People on hot seats have to answer any questions the class asks. The questions the teacher provided on the blackboard could be used in this activity. The class could also ask any questions they want to as long as they use English. (20 minutes)

Reflecting and journal writing: The participants have to finish their journal writing, and the non-participants do grammar exercises, review their learning or ask the teacher about grammar questions. (about 5 minutes or during break time)

The end of this module plan

Notes:
The main structure of this intervention is based on the exemplars of O’Toole and Dunn’s (2002) book Pretending to Learn: Helping children learn through drama and with a reference to Kao and O’Neill’s (1998) process drama activities conducted in Taiwan.
Appendix H: The 2nd module plan of process drama

**Aims:**
This intervention plan is the second of the three drama modules of this research. The realistic topic of this module helps learners who are new to learn with drama to engage easily in activities of process drama and to contextualize the use of oral communication strategies for English communication.

**Participants:**
Same as the ones of the first plan in Appendix G.

**Topic:** Hosting foreign guests

**Background planning and requirements**

**Key Question:** How can participants negotiate for a better deal with limited resources?

**Pre-text:** -- Showing some photos taken by the former student ambassadors A school secretary comes to tell all the participants (as student ambassadors in the drama) that they might not be able to accompany foreign guests to travel around Taiwan this time.

**Focus Question:**
How can students design and implement an economically viable and environmentally friendly trip around Taiwan for foreign guests while the travelling budget is cut down?

**The 5 Ws:**

*What’s happening?* Canadian exchange students wish to travel around Taiwan during their visit, but they only have a very limited allowance for the trip they plan to take. They ask help from the student ambassadors of this class to make their dream trip come true and express their wish to travel together with the student ambassadors.

*Who’s it happening to?* --- The student ambassadors; travel agents

*Where is it happening?* --- In a classroom

*When is it happening?* --- One month before the proposed trip begins

*What’s at stake?*
The trip is not included in the itinerary of the official exchange program, so the college does not have the responsibility to sponsor this additional trip. Student ambassadors are asked by their foreign guests to negotiate for the college’s sponsorship as well as a better deal with travel agencies.

**The hook:** Most adolescents love adventure and travelling. Being able to host and introduce foreign guests about the students’ own country would give English learners the sense of achievement. This drama context is much related to their real life experience (e.g., negotiating for a better deal or better services with others), so the participants are expected to engage in this drama theme instantly.

**The teacher-in-role:** Two intermediate roles: (1). A travel agent (2) A school treasury secretary

**Resources:** A huge map of Taiwan; Big sheets of papers for groups to plan and show details of their respective trips; A file folder for the treasury secretary to show her hard-working image

**Connected areas:**
English: grammar and on-line surfing for English travelling information; critical literacy; computing skills; budget planning, geography and environmental protection issues; transportation network and native culture appreciation.

**Drama outcomes:**
A. Forming: Students negotiate, in and out of the role as student ambassadors, a range of situations and narratives.
B. Presenting: Students rehearse and present dramatic actions and speech acts for the purpose of making the trip happen.
C. Responding: Students discuss and interpret the learning and critical issues developed throughout drama experiences.

**Brief description of the procedures for this intervention:**
This topic is a realistic issue in which the students could play at least three different roles: the travel agents, the student ambassadors and the Canadian exchange guests.

<Week 10: 50 mins>

**Pre-text:** Before commencing this session, the teacher-researcher show students some photos of previous hosting programs taken by former student ambassadors (daily life and travelling photos).
It gives the participants a rough idea of how and what the former exchange students and the student ambassadors did during the exchange period of time in Taiwan. The teacher-in-role as a secretary of the college principal announces that the class will have to host a group of Canadian exchange students and also briefly describes the exchange program to them. (15 mins)

Teacher out-of-role: The teacher-out-of-role models the participants how five OCSs they learned in the last session could help them communicate with the exchange students. The teacher-researcher provides some scenarios for possible communicative obstacles and discusses how to work the communicative problem or cultural conflicts out with the assistance of OCSs learned. The teacher discusses with the class what might happen and what sentence structures they might be using for clarifying and communicating information with the foreign guests. (25 mins)

Reflecting and journal writing: The teacher reviews briefly with the students about what drama elements they have experienced and tells them what process drama techniques they will be experiencing at next session. The participants need to finish their journal writing, and the non-participants do grammar exercises, review their learning or ask the teacher about grammar questions. (about 10 minutes or during break time)

<Week11: 50 mins>

Pre-text: Playing a game with blindfold which will help students use their senses to identify their partners. This game aims to help students set their minds free to interact with different racial and cultural roles later. It also helps reduce students’ sense of strangeness toward unfamiliar classmates. This will help them better participate in their drama. (10 mins)

Teacher-in-role: The teacher-researcher plays a treasury secretary of the college and pretends to check a travelling proposal and the budget of the trip made by the foreign exchange students on her file folder. She recommends the foreign exchange students to modify their travelling plan into an educational one, which detailed planning for transportation and travelling spots is included as well. They need to set up learning aims and outcomes for each sightseeing spot they go around Taiwan. Reports or journals about the trip will need to be submitted to both colleges in Taiwan and Canada after the trip. If they agree to satisfy these conditions, the college in Taiwan will sponsor them with a small amount of stipend. The hosting students (namely the participants) will also be permitted two days of leaves to travel with the foreign guests but will not be subsidised by the college. (10 mins)

Group role-play: After the treasury secretary’s explanation, each group needs to play two roles. Three or four members play hosting students and the other three or four as foreign guests in a group. The teacher-researcher will list some key questions for all to focus on and discuss. On a big sheet of paper, each group will have to produce a preliminary travelling plan which should include their main transportation plans, ticket prices for youth or students, the budget they will spend everyday and what culture, food or art crafts they will be able to learn, enjoy or make at each travelling spot. (15 mins)

Still image/tableau: Each group in role has to report their discussion briefly with the information written on the sheet to the whole class in English. Then, each group has to think about a photo their group might take in their planned trip. Each group presents the photo image with their body postures. The photo image could be any memorable moment which might happen in their trip. Each member has to think about one sentence to describe that moment. The moment could be happy, sad, tragic, dangerous, exciting or helpless. Each group takes turns to present and describe their still image. (15 mins)

Reflecting and journal writing: The participants have to finish their journal writing, and the non-participants do grammar exercises, review or ask about grammar questions. (during break time)

<Week 13: 50 mins>

Pre-text: Teacher-in-role: The teacher-researcher plays a travel agent, who talks on the phone with her boss in front of the whole class. She tries to repeat as much messages from her boss as possible. The main information should be that it’s impossible for their agency to meet the requests made by the class because of the class’ limited budget and demands for the travelling itinerary. (5 mins)

Debriefing: The teacher-researcher steps out of her role and tells the class that the travel agent will come to the classroom soon and has told her about the necessity of changing their plans. The class will need to talk about modification of their travelling plans and deals with the travel agent. They need to plan questions and be ready to negotiate with the travel agent. (10 mins)
Hot-seating & group role-play: The teacher gets in role as the travel agent again. The teacher-researcher will sit on a chair in front of the whole class. The whole class will take their roles as the hosting student ambassadors and the foreign guests respectively and negotiate for a proper trip. The teacher-researcher will need to emphasize her role as an employee of the travel agency who can’t really make any final decisions. End the drama with the travel agent promising to talk to her boss about their requests and questions, in order to avoid further emotional agony or unpleasantness as well as to create drama tense among the roles of the travel agent, the student ambassadors and the foreign guests. (20 mins)

Debriefing & thought-tracking: Everyone steps out of the roles, reflects on and reports what they have learned from the drama activities or the whole negotiation process in English. (10 mins)

Reflecting and journal writing: All the students have to reflect on their journals about what OCSs they have been using and how they think about their performance in today’s process drama activities. (5 mins and some break time)

<Week 14: 50 mins>

Teacher narration: The teacher-researcher tells the whole class that the travel agent phoned her last night and told her that the agency still could not accept their proposals because there are too many sightseeing spots asked but too little of budget offered. They will have to go on planning the trip by themselves and getting an approval from the school administration for more financial support. This particular travel agency could not help them anymore. (5 mins)

Teacher narration and group discussion: Each group in role will have to collect and compile more information for the plans they scheduled on big sheets in week 11. The teacher-researcher would ask them “how other travel agencies would design this trip” and “what you would change about this travelling plan if your group is another travel agency”. The teacher-researcher reminds them that all the travel agencies will need to present and compete with one another about their own itineraries or trip proposals later. As a travel agency, they should particularly pay attention to the benefits of their own agencies as well as the customers’ requests about the trips and their limited budget. (30 mins)

Hot-seating: Each travel agency will need to stand in front of the class for their presentation, and subsequently be questioned by other agencies about their presentations. After completing all the presentations, everyone out of role votes for their favourite travel agency and plans. Each group has two votes and they can only give their own group a vote if they wish to do so. The other vote has to go to other groups. The teacher-researcher tells the class that the final winner will be announced at the end of the class session in order to create drama tense and more engagement. (15 mins)

Reflecting and journal writing: The participants have to finish their journal writing, and the non-participants do grammar exercises, review or ask about grammar questions. (Break time)

End of this module plan

Notes: The main structure of this intervention is based on the exemplars of O’Toole and Dunn’s (2002) book Pretending to Learn: Helping children learn through drama and with a reference to Kao and O’Neill’s (1998) process drama activities conducted in Taiwan.
Appendix I: The 3rd intervention plan of process drama

Aims:
This intervention plan is the third of the three drama modules of this research. The imaginary topic of this module helps learners who are new to learn with drama to engage easily in process drama activities and contextualize the use of oral communication strategies. This module also aims to help learners to think critically and openly. The participants’ imagination and creativity is particularly valued in this intervention. They are also expected to enjoy their creativity with this topic and their use of English with confidence more in this module than in the previous two, due to the familiarity of techniques of process drama at this stage.

Participants: Please see the description about participants in Appendix G.

Topic: The three little pigs and the big bad wolf

Background planning and requirements

Key Question: How do disadvantaged people protect their own rights?

Pre-text: The original story “The three little pigs and the big bad wolf” is well known by everyone in class. Pictures about the three pigs’ houses and the last scene of boiling the wolf are sketched by the teacher on the blackboard to intensify those roles’ characteristics and stories.

Focus Questions: How can the three pigs, the wolf and the owl get what they want by negotiation or conciliation?

The 5 Ws:
*What’s happening?*
The wolf needs to find the best food in the world for his new born baby. A year after falling into the three pigs’ boiling pot, he suddenly recalls how delicious and nutritious pork could be. He attempts to attack the three pigs again for his baby’s sake. The owl hears the news and hopes to find conciliation and peace between pigs and the wolf for the forest. The pigs would also like to start a conversation with the wolf in order to avoid attacking.

*Who’s it happening to? --- Three pig brothers, the big wolf and the owl.*

*Where is it happening? --- In the forest.*

*When is it happening? --- A year after the wolf got hurt with the three pigs’ hot water and right after the wolf’s baby was born.*

*What’s at stake? --- The wolf might disagree with whatever the pigs suggest and ignore the owl’s advice. The pigs need to persuade the wolf out of his brutal ideas of killing pigs with strong and convincing arguments and reasons.*

The hook: It could be fun for the participants to play the fairy tale characters that they have been rather familiar with since they were little. The three pigs are competing to see who can really save the whole family from the wolf’s attack.

The teacher-in-role: The owl (an intermediate role) and the wolf (a villain role).

Resources:
A red beret (hat) for playing the owl; a headband with a decoration of devil’s horns (a Halloween accessory) or a pair of sun glasses for playing the wolf; name cards for different pig groups.

Connected areas:
English—oral communication strategies, grammar and debating skills.
Negotiation strategies and skills.

Drama outcomes:
A. Forming: Students playing pig brothers communicate with the owl and then the wolf for seeking a truce. The owl is a mediator of the forest.
B. Presenting: Students in pigs’ roles ask the owl questions and try to get more information about why and when the wolf would attack them. A negotiation between pigs and the wolf would take place.
C. Responding: Three pig groups representing Brother1, 2 and 3 try to see who could better negotiate with the wolf in order to rescue the whole pig family in a peaceful way. They all need to collect useful information from the mediator, the owl.

Brief description of the procedure for this intervention:
This intervention has an imaginary topic, with which the students could depict different pig brothers’ roles (Pig Brother 1, 2, or 3) with distinct personalities, characteristics, intelligence and life attitudes, shown through the process of dealing threats and obstacles in the classroom drama. The participants in groups would brainstorm for solutions and ideas to save their characters and their families. They would have to negotiate with their opponent by applying communication skills and strategies in English.

<Week 15: 50 mins>

Pre-text: The teacher draws three different pictures of houses and other two pictures are a big boiling pot and a wolf’s head with a painful look. The teacher asks whether the students could relate these pictures to a fairy tale they know, and help them analyse distinct characteristics of the three little pigs according to the three styles of houses drawn. The teacher writes adjectives that the students use to describe pigs on the black board and helps them to recall what happened to the wolf at the original story. The teacher then starts another story about the wolf after he ran away from the pig’s house. (20 mins)

Teacher-in-role & Hot-seating: The teacher-researcher tells the students that she knows someone (the owl), who is familiar with everyone and knows everything in the forest. She tells the students that the owl will come to talk to them in a minute. He will be wearing a red beret hat. She then goes out of the classroom and puts on the red beret hat to represent the wise owl. The owl comes into the classroom with a worried look and directly announces a bad news in front of the pigs played by the students. The owl would facilitate and encourage the pigs to enquire more from him about the wolf’s current plans and intention. (20 mins)

Reflecting and journal writing: The teacher-researcher leads the students to reflect upon what they just did for the drama acts and asks them to think back what OCSs they have been using to communicate with the owl or with other roles. They would need to record these reflections in their weekly journals. (10 mins)

<Week 16: 50 mins>

Pre-text: The teacher expresses that there would be a face-to-face conversation between pigs and the wolf today, but the students as pigs should listen to what messages the owl gets from the wolf first. (5 mins)

Teacher-and group-in-role: The teacher goes out the door and puts on the red beret hat. In the owl’s role, the teacher expresses the message that the wolf still would not give up attacking the pigs even after he has tried his best to persuade the wolf. The owl asks the pigs to help maintain peace for the forest by using their wisdom and strategies. He tells the pigs that the wolf would be coming to talk to them in person in a minute, and he’d better not be here because the wolf does not trust him anymore. He should not be the mediator of this case anymore. Then the owl goes out of the door, takes off the hat and puts on a big pair of sunglasses to pretend the wolf. (5 mins)

Hot-seating: The wolf talks to the pigs about his original plan of attacking them right away, but because the owl tells him that it might be interesting to create a conversation between pigs and the wolf. The pig brothers in groups start to raise different questions and try to persuade him to give up attacking the pig families from several perspectives and by having deals with the wolf. In this tense scenario, the three pig groups have to negotiate with the wolf or persuade him with better solutions. (30 mins)

Reflecting and journal writing: The teacher-researcher summarizes all the opinions generated from different groups and selects the best persuasion or solution made by one of the pig brothers. The teacher also needs to help the participants to reflect upon what OCSs they have been using during the drama acts with the wolf. They then need to record these reflections in their weekly journals. (10 mins)

End of this module plan

Notes: The main structure of this intervention is based on the exemplars of O’Toole and Dunn’s (2002) book Pretending to Learn: Helping children learn through drama and with a reference to Kao and O’Neill’s (1998) process drama activities conducted in Taiwan.
Appendix J: Conversations of Module 1 for the Control Group

**Topic:** Pets and Pet Owners

(1)
A: Hey, what are you?
B: I am a pig.
A: What’s your name?
B: David.
A: What do you usually eat?
B: I like to eat leftovers.
A: O.K. I will have you as my pet.

(2)
A: Hello, how are you?
B: I am fine. Thank you.
A: You are a cute dog.
B: Thank you. Can you be my owner?
A: Yes. What many meals a day do you have?
B: I eat three meals a day. I love dog food.
A: I can have you. Let’s go.
B: (Barking happily)
Appendix K: Conversations of Module 2 for the Control Group

**Topic: Hosting Foreign Guests**

(1)
A: Hello!
B: Nice to meet you! /Glad to know you.
A: Excuse me, what’s your name, please?
B: Pardon me?
A: Can you tell me your name?
B: Oh, my name is Jill.

(2)
A: Excuse me, can you speak Chinese/ Mandarin?
B: Yes, a little bit.
A: I can show you around the campus. Do you know where the cafeteria is?
B: Yes, I do. Can you recommend me some good stands?
A: Yeah, you can get all kinds of snacks at Family Mart. You can get pearl milk tea at the drink stands. They are all very good.
B: Oh, thanks a lot for your advice.

(3)
B: What are those?
A: They chopsticks.
B: That’s interesting. What are they used for?
A: Taiwanese people use chopsticks to have their meals. Do you want to try?
B: Let me try. Hmmm…. Eating with chopsticks is really interesting.
A: Have you been to the night market nearby?
B: No, not yet. Can you take me there?
A: Of course. Shopping and eating at the night market is a key feature of Taiwan’s culture.
Appendix L: Conversation of Module 3 for the Control Group

**Topic:** The Three Little Pigs and the Big Bad Wolf

**Characters:** Pig Brother 1 (PB1), Pig Brother 2 (PB2), Pig Brother 3 (PB3), the Owl and the Wolf.

The Owl: Today is a good day. We are all very happy to have this negotiation meeting. On this side, we have Mr. Wolf, and on the other side, we have the three pig brothers. We all love peace, so I hope there will be no killing in our forest.

PB1: Of course, we hate killing and bleeding in this peaceful forest.

PB2: That’s right. We hate violence. Making money is the most important thing. Like me, I build up log cabins for people to rent for their vacation in our forest. Isn’t it nice? I have made a lot of money for our forest! I don’t think anyone can see me being eaten, right?

The Owl: That’s right. We don’t want anyone to die.

The Wolf: I haven’t been killing other animals for a long time. But you know, recently I have got my own family, and I just have a baby boy. He needs some good food.

PB1: Is that why you want to attack us? Do you remember how you were tortured by us last time?

PB2: Oh, come on. You know pigs are fat and stupid. If you eat us, your son will become fat and stupid as well!

The Wolf: Is that true?

The Owl: Hmmm… I think maybe it’s true…

PB3: Mr. Wolf, I’ve got a proposal. Maybe we can avoid a lot of damage and killing.

The Owl: Oh, really? What’s that?

PB3: I know there are a lot of goats up on the mountain. You could get nutritious milk from those goats for your son. Then you don’t have to bother killing us because we are in fact quite smart. You know better how we got you into the boiling pot last time.

The Wolf: Hmm… I didn’t know I could get milk nearby. My son should like milk more than pork because he is still a little baby.

The Owl: Oh, that’s wonderful! Then Mr. Wolf, I think your son is crying now. You should go home earlier. We have the deal now that you will not come to attack pigs, don’t we? Fantastic! I will accompany you out.

PB1, 2 & 3: Thank you and good-bye, Mr. Owl. But Mr. Wolf, we hope not to see you again. Best wishes to your family!
## Appendix M: An Example Check List for Observing OCS during Oral Tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Amy</th>
<th>Kelly</th>
<th>Cloe</th>
<th>Christine</th>
<th>Mini</th>
<th>JunJun</th>
<th>Lora</th>
<th>Clare</th>
<th>Ivy</th>
<th>Joseph</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre &amp; post</td>
<td>Pre &amp; post</td>
<td>Pre &amp; post</td>
<td>Pre &amp; post</td>
<td>Pre &amp; post</td>
<td>Pre &amp; post</td>
<td>Pre &amp; post</td>
<td>Pre &amp; post</td>
<td>Pre &amp; post</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF1-Q7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF1-Q8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF1-Q9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF1-Q11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF1-Q17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF1-Q22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF1-Q27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF1-Q29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF2-Q1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF2-Q2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF2-Q3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF2-Q4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF2-Q10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF2-Q16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### No. of Strategies Increased or Decreased