Evaluation of Secondary School Students' English Spoken Interaction skills in the light of Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: A Diagnostic and Remedial Study

Eman Galal Ahmed Ahmed Wahdan*
Supervised by

Dr. Amira Elamir Khater ***   **Dr. Aida Abdul Maksoud ****
Dr. Hoda Salah Eldin ****

Abstract

The purpose of the present study aimed at evaluating current situation of spoken interaction performance of Secondary One Stage in the light of level B.2 of spoken interactive illustrative descriptors in the Common European Framework of References for Languages (CEFR). The study was divided into a diagnostic study based on analyzing the EFL National Curriculum speaking standards and student book in the light of CEFR spoken interaction scales. And a remedial study depended on designing suggested framework. The participants of the study were sixty female students (30 experimental group students – 30 control group students). The suggested framework was administrated to the experimental group students in the second term of the academic school year 2019 / 2020 at one of the governmental schools in Cairo. Two instruments were administrated on the two groups pre / post spoken interaction test and analytic rubric for spoken interaction. The results of the pre / post test indicated that the suggested framework was effective in enhancing the experimental group students spoken interaction skills. Recommendations and suggestions for further researches were provided.

Keywords: CEFR, spoken interaction, speaking skills

Department of Curriculum and Instruction Faculty of Women for Arts Science and Education *
Ain Shams University
``emanwahdan2012@gmail.com
Professor of Curriculum and Methods of teaching English as a foreign language (EFL), **
Department of curriculum and instruction, Faculty of Women, Ain Shams University
Associate Professor of Curriculum and Methods of teaching English as a foreign language ***
(EFL), Department of curriculum and instruction, Faculty of Women, Ain Shams University
Lecturer of Curriculum and Methods of teaching English as a foreign language (EFL), ****
Department of curriculum and instruction, Faculty of Women, Ain Shams University**.**

Introduction

English became in arguably the 21st century language which connects people from different regions, cultures, religions and nations. It has increasingly become the medium in every domain of context, as well as, an important asset for anyone seeking employment, since it is considered one of the soft skills believed to greatly sharpen an individual's competitive edge in the challenging employment market. According to its significant role as a lingua franca, more focus is given to speaking skills at secondary stage. Since one of the main aims of the National Curriculum Framework for English as a foreign language which is designed to help Egyptian students to cope up with the challenges of higher education and be enroll in the labor market, is to enable students to:

- interact, communicate and collaborate orally with confidence in pairs, groups or whole class discussion.
- communicate complex ideas in spoken English, in both formal and informal contexts and in range of media.

Speaking is one of the four language skills through which learners can communicate with each other to achieve certain goals or express their opinions, intentions, hopes and viewpoints. Many researchers pointed out different aspects of speaking skills that can be classified into spoken production or monologue through which the speaker focuses on giving oral presentation and spoken interaction or dialogue in which the speaker interact orally with each other.

In the light of speaking importance, success in learning a language is measured by the ability to carry out a conversation in the target language. Goh & Burns (2012) also illustrated that learners often consider speaking the most demanding skill when learning a foreign language. Mahfouz (2016) also confirmed that speaking is a form of communication skills that students need in college entrance and competent workers, therefore, EFL students at the Egyptian secondary schools are more likely to be able to practice such skills as they have studied English for nine years. Despite of this important role of speaking skills in communication, Abolfotouh, (2020) most of students are unable to speak English confidently. This led them to be frustrated as they have spent years in studying

English; however, they still do not have the ability to do conversation appropriately.

In terms of the new assessment reform and status of English as the international language, the requirement for international standardized framework of evaluate and certify the proficiency level of using a foreign language is in need in order to prepare students having the ability to cope up with the challenges of labor market. This is what Common European Framework of References for Languages (CEFR) clarified and which is used as a basis for evaluating the current situation of secondary one students and designing the suggested framework of the remedial study.

Review of Literature and Related Studies

In the light of the publications of the Council of Europe (2001), the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR) refers to a comprehensive method providing international standards that prescribe the descriptions of language learners in order to develop their knowledge and skills for effective communication. It categorizes six levels of language proficiency: A1(Breakthrough) and A2 (Waystage) for Basic Users, B1(Threshold) and B2 (Vantage) for Independent Users, and C1 (Effective Operational Proficiency) and C2 (Mastery) for Proficient Users. Each level describes a set of common reference points and the wording of the descriptors matches different language skills and competence with what language learners can do.

The framework provides a descriptive scheme of categories that language professionals can use in each of the six levels in the four language skills. These categories are called "illustrative descriptors" and were represented in communicative language competence. They can help the teacher explains and categorizes what can be inferred from students' performance in each level.

Nakatani (2012) asserted in his study that CEFR has been used for the instruction and assessment of foreign languages in many countries, as well as it is regarded as the useful guideline to describe achievements of learners of foreign languages. Martyniun & Noijons (2007) also showed a

survey administrated to 30 Council of Europe member states. The majority of the participanted countries concluded that the CEFR was employed and viewed as a useful tool for curriculum planning, development of tests and for textbook writing.

Since speaking is generally thought to be the most important of the four skills, Tüm (2017) described it in his study as the heart of the CEFR framework for languages learning, teaching and assessment. Since CEFR specialized speaking skills two scales in self-assessment gride which is intended to help learners to profile their main language skills, and decide at which level they might look at a checklist of more detailed descriptors in order to self-assess their level of proficiency, and qualitative aspects of spoken language use scale which focuses on different qualitative aspects of language use. Considering spoken interaction as a type of speaking skills, it is described in CEFR framework as the origin of language with interpersonal, collaborative and transactional functions. It is one of the communicative language competence types which concerned with managing co-operation and interaction such as turn-taking and turn-giving, framing the issue and establishing a line of approach, proposing and evaluating solutions, recapping and summarizing the point reached, and mediating in a conflict. (CEFR, 2001) So, CEFR established this type of activities as important in collaborative learning as they are in real world communication. (CEFR companion Volom, 2018)

In this regard, there are six stages or levels of English proficiency in spoken interaction based on CEFR. They are breakthrough level (A1) where the students can interact in a simple way, waystage user (A2) where the students can communicate in simple and routine tasks, threshold user (B1) where the students can deal with particular situations, independent user (B2) where the students can respond to others fluently and spontanously, competent user (C1) where the students can express themselvess fluently without searching for expressions and good user (C2) where the students can take part in any conversation effortlessly.

Based on the illustrative descriptors of the spoken interaction, the design of remedial study was constructed.These descriptors were submitted to 9 TEFL specialists in order to determine the appropriate level for Secondary One Stage. According to their comments, level B.2 or Vantage was chosen that is described as "limited operational proficiency" and "adequate response to situations normally encountered". It reflects progression slowly but steadily across the intermediate.

The study instruments followed B.2 level in spoken interaction through whichthe speaking standards included in the Ministry of Education (2018) National Curriculum Framework of English as a Foreign Language were modified. Accordingly, the following standards and learning outcomeswere concluded:

1. Contribution in a conversation

- Compare and contrast orally cultural practices in the target countries with their own in pair or group discussion even when speech is fast.

- Express him / herself appropriately in cultural issues with avoiding cross errors of formulation.

- Discuss social practices of the speaker of the target culture without irritating them or requiring them to behave other than they would be.

2. Making informal discussion with friends

- Participate with his /her friend on topic of their interests with giving comments.

- Account for his/her point of view in a discussion with his/her friend clearly on topics of personal/general interests by providing relevant explanations.

- Evaluate a character in a book or film during a discussion with his/her friend by providing comments.

3. Making goal-oriented cooperation

- Outline an issue clearly and speculate about causes or consequences of this issue.

- Discuss the advantages and disadvantages of a topic related to their daily life.

4. **Interviewing and being interviewed**

- Make an oral discussion through expanding ideas in an interview for job application or project presentation.

5. **Using telecommunications to develop accurate and appropriate speech**

- Engage in an extended casual conversation with a friend over technological telecommunications on an interesting topic.

- Make an oral discussion via one of the telecommunications to argue current issue topic.

Context of the problem

Everyday life situations give evidence that we neither write dialogues to communicate something to someone nor do conversations follow symmetrical patterns when exchanging information (Valldeperez,2016). Although the importance of spoken interaction skills, they are ignored and often regarded as being less important in EFL classrooms. As there are few opportunities to practice English in real situations or activities provided by teachers to strengthen students' spoken interaction competences during teaching process (Dincer, 2017).

This is as a result of the effectiveness of exams on teaching practices that raised the rate of test specifications which concentrate on some language skills; grammar, vocabulary, reading and writing skills rather than others. Accordingly, teachers and students allocate their time and efforts for exam and its result (Badr, 2009). In addition, the study of McIlwraith & Fortune (2016) that was about "English language teaching and learning in Egypt: an insight" asserted the ignorance of teaching and evaluating speaking skills, and as a result of that they recommended linking the national examinations to the Common European Framework of Reference framework (CEFR) and developing formative assessments of speaking (also based on the CEFR) for use in the classroom. Accordingly, the importance of (CEFR) has been provided as "a common basis for

the elaboration of language syllabuses, curriculum guidelines, examinations, textbooks, etc. across Europe." (Council of Europe, 2001, p. 1) then it has spread all over the world. However, no actual application of it has been dated in Egypt.

The problem of this research had been based on the following reseources:

1- Researcher's experiences

The researcher works as an assessment specialist in Test Development Department at National Center for Examination and Educational Evaluation (NCEEE) where she prepares the test specification and the new assessment system for secondary one stage. It was found that they lacked assessment rubrics for spoken interaction skill.

2- Analyzing Student Book & Workbook

Six units of Student's Book were analyzed holistically in which each unit implemented 6 lessons. Accordingly, the researcher found that:

- Qualitatively, the activities did not involve rubrics or teacher observation sheet to assess students' oral interactive performance.

- Quantitatively, the workbook did not include spoken interaction activities or rubrics to give students the chance to self-assess themselves.

3- Analyzing the National Curriculum Framework

The National Curriculum Framework for English as a foreign language (EFL) for secondary stage students were analyzed to determine the level which secondary one stage are on internationally.It was noticed that there was disparities between these levels A1, A2, B1 & B2. So it was not clarified the language level that is required to reach for.

4- Conducting an interview

Both the English Language Counselor and the general inspector whose positions let them to visit many classes were interviewed in the light of:

- How can spoken interaction be assessed in the workbook?

- How far does test specification involve spoken interaction?

Their opinions included the following points:

- there is no relationship between what is taught for spoken interaction skills and workbook.

- there is no correlation between test specification and what is taught for spoken interaction skill. So, the teacher ignores teaching these skills during the lesson.

- most students care about the parts that are included in the final exam.

5- Pilot study test

The researcher tested ten students in their spoken interaction skills. In the interview, each student was asked to "talk about a character or a person that she likes". Their speeches were recorded and assessed according to a designed rubric as it is shown in table (1).

Table 1

Rubric for Speaking skills

Speaking sub-skills	Good	Fair	Poor
Pronounciation	Student can produce most of the words correctly.	Student can produce some of the words correctly.	Student can not produce most of the words correctly.
Vocabulary	Student can use accurate and correct words.	Student can use some accurate words.	Student can not use accurate words.

Turn-taking	Student can intervene appropriately in discussion with others.	Student can intervene poorly in discussion with others.	Students can not intervene appropriately in discussion with others.
Grammatical Accuracy	Student's speech shows a relatively high degree of grammatical control of using well-formed phrases and sentences.	Student's speech shows limited grammatical control of using well-formed phrases and sentences.	Student's speech does not have a degree of grammatical structure.

Students' recorded speeches were analyzed in the light of the designed rubric and the percentage for each sub-skill was calculated as it is shown in table (2).

Table 2

Percentage of analyzing students' records

Level	Pronounciation	Vocabulary	Turn-Taking	Grammatical Accuracy
Good	-	-	-	-
Fair	30%	30%	1%	30%
Poor	70%	70%	90%	70%

According to the results of the previous table, It was noticed that the percentage of "Poor" levelraisedto 70% of students. This indicated that most of

students did not have the ability to interactappropriatly in English. It was concluded that this weakness was according to some reasons:

- students' fear of making mistakes during their speech.

- students' inability to arrange their ideas during speaking.

- their poverty of vocabulary that help them to express their ideas orally.

- students' self-distrust in their abilities to speak into others.

- lacking of speaking skills questions in final exam that can motivate students to practicethis skill

Statement of the problem

According to the previous studies, analysis of Student Book and Workbook, opinions of English Language Counselor and general inspector of English language and results of the pilot study, the problem of the present study represented in the weakness of first secondary students in spoken interaction. This is as a result of the negligence in teaching this skill which led to a lack in assessing and evaluating it.

To address this problem, the present study aims to answer the following question:

"What is the effectiveness of a diagnostic and remedial study in evaluating secondary school students spoken interaction skills in the light of Common European Framework of Reference for Languages?"

To answer the above question, the following sub-questions are provided:

- What is the level that Secondary One Students are required to achieve in the light of Common European Framework of Reference for Languages? (A1, A2, B1, B2, C1, C2)

- What are the appropriate spoken interaction skills for Secondary One Students?

- What are the basics of a diagnostic study for evaluating Secondary School Students Spoken Interaction Skills in the light of Common European Framework of Reference for Languages?

- What are the basics of a remedial study according to the results of evaluating Secondary School Students Spoken Interaction Skills in the light of Common European Framework of Reference for Languages?

Purpose of the study

The purpose of the present study was to evaluate the current situation of the Egyptian secondary one students' spoken interaction skills through a diagnostic study in the light of the CEFR levels and suggest a framework for this stage according to the selected CEFR level in the remedial study.

Hypotheses of the study

1. There is statistically significant difference between the mean scores of the experimental and control group in the overall spoken interaction test in favour of the experimental group.

2. There is statistically significant difference between the mean scores of the experimental group in the pre and post overall spoken interaction test in favour of post-test.

3. There are statistically significant differences between the mean scores of the experimental group in the pre / post spoken interaction sub-skills test in favour of post-test.

Definitions of terms

Common European Framework of Reference for Languages

CEFR was presented by Council of Europe (2001: p.1) as "a common basis for the elaboration of language syllabuses, curriculum guidelines, examinations, textbooks, etc. across Europe. It describes in a comprehensive way what language learners have to learn to do in order to use a language for communication and what knowledge and skills they have to develop so as to be able to act effectively".

Little (2006) described the CEFR as a basis for international co-operation in the development of language education policy, the construction of language curricula, the implementation of language learning and teaching, and the assessment of language learning outcomes (cited in Arikan 2012). Also, North (2007) defined it as a reference tool, not an instrument to be applied. (cited in Maldina 2015)

According to the present research, CEFR was defined operationally as "a reference tool based on level B.2 through which secondary one students had the ability to interact orally with a degree of fluency and spontaneity through their contribution in a conversation, making informal discussion with friends, making goal-oriented cooperation, interviewing and being interviewed and using telecommunications to develop accurate and appropriate speech ".

Spoken Interaction

CEFR considered spoken interaction "the origin of language, with interpersonal, collaborative and transactional functions". (CEFR: 2001, P:81)

Brita (1994) defined spoken interaction as"a joint of social activity which is governed by speakers take turns andspeakers cooperate.

According to the current study spoken interaction "is a unit of language governed by secondary one students' interaction in the light of level B.2 of CEFR to contribute in a conversation, make informal discussion with friends, make goal-oriented cooperation, interview / be interviewed and use telecommunications to develop accurate and appropriate speech.

Methods and Procedures

i. Design

This study was divided into a diagnostic study in which secondary one students' spoken interaction skills were evaluated in the light of Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR) on twointact classes that were randomly selected.And a remedial study through which a suggested framework was designed according to level B.2 of CEFR and administrated on the experimental.

ii.   Participants

Participants of the study were sixty students first year secondary students (30 students in the experimental group and 30 students in the control group) enrolled in El Shahed Mohamed Imtiaz Kamel School in Abbassia, Cairo in the second term of the academic year 2019/2020. The age of those students ranged from 15 to 16 years old. They received four sessions for English language per week. Each lesson lasted for 40 minutes. So, they constituted a homogeneous group in terms of their learning history and English proficiency. They attend school in one shift which ran from 8:00 a.m. to 1:35 p.m.

iii.   Instruments of the study

1.   Pre/post Spoken Interaction Test

Objectives

According to the modifications that had been done to the speaking standards in the EFL National Curriculum Document that were based on B.2 level in the Common European Framework of References for Languages (CEFR), a pre-post spoken interaction test (SIT) was constructed by the researcher. It was used as:

- Pre-S.I test before implementing the suggested framework to make sure those students of the experimental and control groups were at the same speaking level.

- Post S.I test to investigate the effectiveness of the modified EFL national standards in developing first year secondary students' spoken interaction skills.

Construction

The spoken interaction test was constructed according to the following procedures:

- Reviewing previous studies concerned with how to develop speaking test in EFL: Khalil (2015), Mahfouz (2016), www.britishcouncil.org , the fourth version of interchange serious, upstream intermediate level B.2 and www.intercambioidiomasonline.com

- Designing different tasks that require students to speak interactively.

- Ranking questions in the test, so it ranged from easy to difficult.

- Submitting the test to a panel of jury members to establish its validity.

- Piloting the test, on a random sample of students that belonged neither to the experimental nor to the control groups to determine test time, difficulty and suitability.

- Establish test reliability.

Description

The first stage is **"The Warm-Up Stage"**. This step was before the next tests to implement settling the examinee into the exam, create friendly atmosphere and elicit expressions of greetings (hello, how are you and so on). This was through some compliments paid by the examiner as well as through few easy questions focusing on small talks. Short turns were more common at this stage, usually more spontaneous phrases rather than neat sentences.

The pre/post spoken interaction test focused mainly on the exchange between two examinees in a form of pair work. It included three tasks to evaluate the following standards: Making informal discussion with friends, Making goal-oriented cooperation and Interviewing and being interviewed. However, there were other standards which were not evaluated summatively, but they were assessed formatively. This is because:

- the "**Contribution in a conversation**" standard concerned with the social function of language with different culture and the topics need previous preparation.

- the "**Using telecommunications to develop accurate and appropriate speech** " standard concerned with communication over distance by using technological means such as mobiles, tablets, computers and internet-based applications for audio and video communication and would need more time to be administrated.

Regarding the previous reasons the researcher assessed the ignored standards in the spoken production and spoken interaction test contentiously through teacher observation sheet, peer assessment checklist and T. Chart suggestions for self-oral improvement.

Validity

To measure the test content, the first version was submitted to nine of TEFL professors, lecturers, ministry of EFL and English language teachers to evaluate the tests in terms of:

- number of tasks

- appropriateness of tasks to the measuredstandards

The test proved to be mostly a valid one, as it measured what it was intended to measure in most cases.

Piloting the test

The test was piloted to determine timing of the test items. So, fourteen first year secondary students were selected randomly from El Shahed Mohamed ImtiazKamel School who belonged neither to the experimental nor to the control groups.

The estimated time for the spoken interaction test was 14 minutes. Six minutes for social network and a hotel problem, two minutes for the interview and one minute for warm-up andgiving the tips.

Reliability of test

The reliability was calculated for the test by using Cronbach's Alpha which was (0.77). These resultsrevealed high reliability coefficient. Accordingly, the test could be considered as a reliable tool.

Scoring the test

Scoring of the spoken interaction test was administrated on 10 samples in the light of the designed analytic rubric by three different raters; the researcher of the present research was one of them. The p-value in the ANOVA output was used

to determine whether the differences between some of the means were statistically significant. Usually, a significance level (denoted as α or alpha) is ≤ 0.05. The results showed that the overall agreement between the three raters was 1.000. This means that the P-value is greater than the significant level. Hence, there is no statistically significant difference between the three raters, and as result the inter-rater reliability was established.

2. The Spoken Interaction Analytic Rubric

Description

Designing the rubric was concerned with assessing students' spoken interaction with their peersand the examiner. It consisted of five sub-skills with score points ranging from 4 to 1. Level 4 included the standardized level of CEFR B.2 level. Moreover, the construction of level 3, 2 and 1 were consistent with the previous one and focused on evaluating the lower gradual performance of spoken interaction sub-skills.

Validity

The Analytic Rubric was submitted to 3 TEFL professors and lecturers. They were asked to:

- determine the suitability of the spoken interaction sub-skills to B.2level and secondary one students.

- review the content of levels: 3, 2 and 1 in each sub-skill to recognize the sequence of description.

3. The suggested framework

Objectives

The overall aim of the suggested framework is to develop EFL secondary one students' spoken interaction skills. It is based on the speakingstandards included in the Ministry of Education (2018) National Curriculum Framework of English as a Foreign Language that were modified according to level B.2 of the spoken interaction illustrative descriptors in CEFR.

Description

The suggested framework consisted of three units which implemented different topics to suit Secondary One Students. Each unit was divided into three lessons. Some lessons included supplementary listening materials which were selected according to the level B.2 in the CEFR and the content of tasks. Each lesson focused on two learning outcomes. The materials and tasks of the suggested framework were designed in the light of the action-oriented approach which calls students as social agentsand the adapted standards of the National Curriculum Framework for English as a Foreign Language.

However, it was considered the following criteria, during designing the tasks in each lesson which are:

1. relevant to students' background knowledge and culture.

2. authentic representing real life spoken discourse.

3. raising students' awareness of different aspects of speaking skills (i.e. spoken production or interaction).

Procedures

1- Reviewing literature and related studies of using Common European Framework of Reference for Languages in teaching and assessing speaking skills.

2- Reviewing literature and related studies of evaluating spoken interaction skills.

3- Determining the appropriate spoken interaction sub- skills for secondary one students.

4- Designing student self-assessment questionnaire to be administrated on the experimental group students and help students in determining their ability to assess their spoken interaction performance.

5- Designing teacher's observation sheet to assess students' interactive performance during teaching.

6- Designing peer assessment checklist for students.

7- Designing manual for the instructor.

8- Designing manual for student.

Teaching strategy

The proposed framework is based on the action-oriented approach that is adopted by Common European Framework of References for Languages. This approach is a complementary one to the communicative approach. If considered that language learning is divided into two as knowledge and skills, action-oriented approach is the name of these two processes from the constructive learning where the learner is autonomous and directs his/her own process in which knowledge is constructed that Piaget, Vygotsky and Bruner emphasized till to the process that the skills are acquired commonly and internationally.

The notion of this approach depends on viewing learners as "social agents", i.e. members of society who have tasks to complete in a given set of circumstances, a specific environment and within a particular field of action (CEFR, 2001, P:9).

To indicate this approach, the researcher divided the lesson into three sections as the following:

Pre-speaking task

The aim of this task was preparing students to be involved in the next tasks of the lesson. It could be described as a warming up task which was used to break the ice at the beginning of the lesson. Its objective depended on one of the learning outcomes that students were going to achieve at the end of the lesson. The tasks that were designed for this section included individual, pair and group work.

During speaking task

It included two tasks each of which represents one of the two learning outcomes that students had to achieve at the end of the lesson. The form of the tasks differentiated between individual, pair and group work, according to the content of the task.

The instructor played the role of facilitator and monitorto:

- help students to understand the content of the task.

- explain peer assessment checklists that students used to assess their colleagues' performance in the two task forms.

- circulate the class and write notes while students preparing the task.

- register the observations during their doing the task either individually or in pairs / group in the observation sheet.

- record students' performances and upload them on the created WhatsApp group.

Post speaking task

The purpose of this task related to students' self-assessment of their oral performance. This step was conducted through:

- writing notes at the end of the lesson about what they did in the previous tasks and how they could improve this in the next session through writing suggestions.

- making an oral reflection including their opinion in the tasks of the lesson they did and send it to the WhatsApp group of the class before the next session.

Instructional aids

The instructional aides that wereimplemented in the suggested framework to facilitate the learning and assessment process were:

- a recorder to record student's performance during the task.

- worksheets of the tasks that were designed by the researcher

- Teacher's observation sheet to assess his/her students' oral performance during their presentation.

- Peer assessment checklist that students use to assess their colleague during their spoken production / interaction presentation.

- Student speaking assessment questionnaire that wasgiven to the students' pre and post their attending the suggested framework to assess their speaking skills.

- T.chart suggestions for self-oral improvement that let each student assess her performance at the end of each session.

- Post students' satisfaction questionnaire that wasdesigned to conduct students' opinion in the tasks that they completed in the suggestedframework.

- creating a group on WhatsApp application for the class to upload students' records after each session and make students record a reflection for 3 minutes about their opinions in the tasks of the unit and how they helped them to improve their speaking skills.

- downloading offline dictionaries on each student's mobile to help them in knowing the meaning of new vocabulary they want. Such as, Meriam Webster (English English) and U.Dictionary (Arabic English).

Data Analysis

In terms of the study hypotheses, statistical analysis was administrated on spoken interaction test data depended on using T.Test. Accordingly, the following results were reported as the following:

1- In order to verify the first hypothesis, the researcher used independent samples T-test to measure the significant differences between experimental and control group in the overall spoken interaction test as in the following table:

Table 3

T- test results of the post-overall spoken interactiontest for the control and experimental groups

Test	Group	N	Mean	S.D	D.F	T-value	Sig.	Effect size
Overall spoken interaction test	**Experimental group**	30	18.00	2.017	58	24.101	.000	0.909213031
	Control group	30	6.23	1.755				

The estimate T. value is (24.101) and it is statistically significance at level (.000). This proved that there were statistically significant differences between the independent samples, the experimental and control groups, on the post overall spoken interaction test in favour of the experimental group.

2- In order to verify the secondhypothesis, t-test was used to compare the means scores of the pre and post overall spoken interaction test for the experimental group. The results were conducted as shown in the following table:

Table 4

T- test results comparing the pre- test vs. post- test mean scores for the experimental group in overall spoken interaction test

Test	Group	N	Mean	S.D	D.F	T-value	Sig.	Effect size
Pre overall spoken interaction test	**Experimental group**	3 0	6.87	1.67 6	٢٩	22.47 6	.000	0.94571022 6
Post overall spoken interaction test			18.0 0	2.01 7				

The estimated T.test value is (22.476) and it is statistically significance at level (.000). These results proved that there were statistically significant differences between the mean scores of the pre / post overall spoken interaction test of the experimental group in favour of posttest. In other words, this hypothesis is confirmed.

3- In order to verify the third hypothesisand get clear view of the experimental group's performance in the pre / post SI sub-skills, T.test was used to determine the frequencies of their pre / post responses in the sub-skills of spoken interaction test.

Table 5

T- test results of the of the control and experimental groups' mean scores in the Pre / Post S.I sub-skills

Group	Sub-skills	N	Mean	S.D	D.F	T-value	Sig.	Effect size
Experimental group	Appropriateuseof language (Pre)	30	1.63	.490	٢٩	1.760	.000	0.196505658
	Appropriateuseoflanguage (Post)		3.63	.490				
	ManagementSkills (Pre)		1.43	.504		1.888	.000	0.109460891
	ManagementSkills (Post)		3.60	.498				
	FillersandHesitationDevices (Pre)		1.23	.430		2.130	.000	0.13528084
	FillersandHesitationDevices (Post)		3.63	.490				
	Askingforclarification (Pre)		1.17	.379		2.107	.000	0.13276083
	Askingforclarification (Post)		3.50	.509				
	Non-VerbalCommunication		1.40	.498		1.962	.000	0.117184

449

(Pre)		
Non-VerbalCommunication (Post)	3.63	.490

There were statistically significant differences at (0.00) level between the mean scores of experimental group on the pre and post S.I sub-skills. Since the estimated t- values were (1.760) for appropriate use of language, (1.888) for management skills, (2.130) for fillers and hesitation devices, (2.107) for asking for clarification and (1.962) for non-verbal communication.

Discussion of Results

According to the results of the study, it can be concluded that the suggested framework that was based on modifying EFL National Speaking Standards in the light of B.2 level speaking illustrative descriptors in CEFR framework, proved its large effect on enhancing the experimental group students' spoken interaction skills. This can emphasize the important role of CEFR framework, as international standards, in language education reform and that is adopted in many countries. This can go in line with Hosseinfar's study (2017) through which he asserted how lesson planning, teaching and assessment practices in 39 schools changed after the MOE in UAE implemented CEFR as a basis for curriculum framework. The CEFR can-do statements eventually paved the way for more communication, as well as, triggered students' involvement in self-assessment.

In addition, the experimental group students achieved tangible improvement in their pre / post spoken interaction test after implementing the suggested framework as compared to their performance previously. These clear differences were as a result of many reasons such as, shyness, allocated time for teaching speaking and irrelevance of topics. Moreover, this finding was outlined by many researchers such as Abdl-Latif (2012) and McIlwraith, H & Fortune, A (2016).

The researcher of the present study illustrated varied reasons for students' improvement that was revealed in the statistical and descriptive data analysis. For the appropriate use of language, the progress occurred according to the varied

interactive tasks that enabled students to do formal and informal roles. The allocated time for organization was another reason that helped student to manage their ideas and opinions with their partners. Moreover, the progress that happened for the management skills (Opening, Interruption, Closing and Turn-Taking) were raised because of the different opening and ending roles that students had in each interactive task. This can go in line with the findings of Tork (2006) study through which she asserted that the discussion between students and teacher helped them recognize how to start their speech, provide adequate supporting details, provide a comment of their own and move smoothly from one idea to another through the use of adequate discourse markers and references.

In addition, the results revealed high effect in **fillers and hesitation devices**. This was because of the regular practicing of language that reduced their fear of making mistakes with their partners. Accordingly, students' self-confidence from practicing speaking enabled them to ask their partners to give more clarification for the abstract ideas. This was revealed in the results of asking for clarification as being an interactive sub-skill. This is aligned with Mahfouz's study, (2016) in which she asserted that practicing natural features of everyday language could improve students' oral interaction. As well as, the level of shyness decreased and they had the ability to interact with their colleagues through direct eye contact. This was, also, reflected in the results of **non-verbal interactive** sub-skill.

On the other hand, peer assessment checklist proved experimental group students' development in performing the interactive tasks. Since this checklist set the spirit of competition among them where each pair was classified as a team. This can go in line with the studies of Mahfouz, (2016) and Tork, (2006) who asserted that using such checklist could enthuse students to do their best during their conversation in the target language, which can be through the cooperation during switching, continuing conversation, exchanging details and giving opinions.

Teacher observation Sheet was used as a descriptive tool to reflect students' improvement in doing the tasks. Accordingly, many comments were taken. For example, they could not use direct eye-contact to read their notes that they prepared, and they could not intervene appropriately in the discussion. Then the

percentage raised in lesson 3 where they began to interact appropriately and talk in details for example about their favourite films character, the important moments in their life, special situations related to them in order to support the discussed topic,…..etc. Furthermore, searching for the topics for the next session was one of the factors that helped students' interaction development. As well as, the competition in pair's performance raised the percentage of doing appropriately.

Student self-assessment questionnaire was administrated pre and post implementing the suggested to reveal the differences in students' responses for oral performance. Since the responses showed students' self-confidence, ability to self-assess themselves and determine the weak points of the spoken performance and highlighting the strong aspects. This viewpoint can go in line with Mahfouz (2016) whose study asserted that self-assessment questionnaire helped students to arrange their ideas in improving their speaking skills.

To make sure of the effectiveness of the suggested framework on the experimental group students, post student satisfaction questionnaire was designed and analyzed descriptively. Students' responses revealed the sufficiency of the suggested framework. This was due to the method of teaching that was represented in the **action-oriented approach** that was adopted by the CEFR framework. Through this approach, students' performances in the interactive tasks were as social agents and performed varied real-life situations in the three units. They were engaged in cycles of actual communication and trained to deal with tasks in specific situations. In the light of the researcher's point of view adopting this approach enhanced students' confidence to speak spontaneously and fluently with each other as shown in their spoken interaction post-test performance. This finding goes in line with the study of Piccard (2014) and Kaliska (2016) who asserted the notion of action-oriented approach that is the learner acts in order to learn and does not learn in order to act.

On the other hand, social media presented in using WhatsApp application facilitated students' speaking skills to be developed. According to the group that the researcher created, it became possible to share students' records of the tasks they performed. This achieved interaction between students and the researcher.

This finding can go in line with what was asserted in the study of Hassan, (2020) who clarified that using technology helped in improving the accessibility of learning, motivating students to learn and interact, being responsible and autonomous students. As well as, this also helped them to assess themselves and write down notes about their performance in the T.Chart for Self-Oral Improvement to determine what they did and what they should do to improve their performance in the next session.

Recommendations and Suggestions

In the light of the present study results, the following recommendations are made:

• In the light of, the importance of CEFR as an international standards, the present study could be used as a model for guiding decision makers and researchers in modifying the EFL National Curriculum Standards according to the standariezed B.2 spoken interaction level for secondary one stage.

• Spoken interaction instruction and assessment should be given more time and efforts in the Egyptian EFL classes.

• Action-oriented approach should be adopted in spoken interaction instruction activities that should be related to students' real life to motivate them to interact orally with each other.

• Teachers are recommended to use rubrics during their teaching and assessment students' spoken interaction skills to give students supportive feedback to involve them in the tasks, as well as encourage their strengths and weaknesses points.

• Using technology in this stage became a must.

Furthermore,the following suggestions for further research and study may motivate other researchers to devote more time and resources for the following further suggested studies such as:

- The effectiveness of applying a similar program over a longer period of time.

- The effectiveness of applying a similar program on: listening, reading, and writing skills.

References

Abolfotouh, M. (2020). Using animated films to develop the speaking skills of student teachers of English in the light of the Communicative Approach, *Unpublished Mastery Thesis*, Faculty of Education, Women's University

Abdel Latif, M. (2012).Teaching a standard-based communicative English textbook series to secondary school students in Egypt: Investigating teachers' practices and beliefs. English Teaching: Practice and Critique September, 2012, Volume 11, Number 3 *http://education.waikato.ac.nz/research/files/etpc/files/2012v11n3art5. pdf pp. 78-97*

Arikan, A. (2012). A Study of Anatolian High Schools' 9th Grade English Language Curriculum in Relation to the CEFR, *M.A Thesis*, Akdeniz University's Institute of Social Sciences.

Badr, A. (2009).The Effect of Using Some Active Learning Techniques on Developing Primary Pupils' Speaking Skill. *Unpublished M.A Thesis*, Faculty of Education, Ain Shams University.

Brita, A. (1994). An introduction to spoken interaction, Longman, Harlow, ISBN 0 58207130 5.

Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. (2001)

Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Companion Volume with New Descriptors. (2018)

Dincer, M. (2017). EFL Learners' Beliefs about Speaking English and Being a Good Speaker: A Metaphor Analysis. *Universal Journal of Educational Research 5(1):* 104-112, *2017 http://www.hrpub.org DOI: 10.13189/ujer.2017.050113 http://www.hrpub.org*

Goh, Ch. & Burns, A. (2012). Teaching Speaking: A Holistic Approach. New York: *Cambridge University Press*.

Hassan, H. (2020). A suggested program for developing English speaking skills and Attitudes of preparatory pupils in the light of Collaborative Learning in a Blended learning Environment, *unpublished M. A. Thesis*, Faculty of Education, Women's College.

Hosseinifar, S. (2017). CEFR in UAE Public Schools: Pedagogical Impacts. *M.A Thesis*, Faculty of the American University of Sharjah College of Arts and Sciences

Kaliska, M. (2016). An Action-Oriented Approach to Language Corpora in Foreign Language Teaching. Lingwistyka Stosowana/ Applied Linguistics/ Angewandte Linguistik: *www.ls.uw.edu.pl*

Khalil,A. (2015).The Effectiveness of a Training Program Based on Instruction Technology on Developing the Listening and Speaking Skills for Faculty of Education English Majors. *Unpublished PhD Thesis*, Faculty of Education, Ain Shams University. P.68

Khalifa, H, Khabbazbashi N, Abdelsalam S & Said, M.E. (2015) International assessment and local contexts: A case study of an English language initiative in higher education institutes in Egypt, *Papers in Language Testing and Assessment* Vol. 4, issue 1

Little, D. (2006). The Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Content, purpose, origin, reception and impact, *Language Teaching*, 39, 167-190

Mahfouz, D. (2016). The effect of a program based on standards in developing EFL secondary stage students' speaking and writing skills. *Unpublished PhD Thesis*, Faculty of Education. Ain Shams University

Maldina, E. (2015). The Impact of the Common European Framework of Reference on Foreign Language Instruction: The case of Sociolinguistic and Pragmatic Competence. *M.A Thesis* of Arts, Graduate Department of Curriculum, Teaching and Learning Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, University of Toronto.

Martyniuk, W. & Noijons, J. (2007). Executive summary of results of a survey on the use of the CEFR at national level in the Council of Europe member states. Retrieved from *www.coe.int/t/dg4/linguistic/Source/Survey_CEFR_2007_EN.doc*

McIlwraith, H. & Fortune, A. (2016).English language teaching and learning in Egyptian insight.

Nakatani, Y. (2012). Exploring the Implementation of the CEFR in Asian Contexts: Focus on Communication Strategies. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences* 46.771 – 775

North, B. (2007). The CEFR illustrative descriptor scales. *The Modern Language Journal*, 91(4), 656-659

Piccardo, E. (2014). From Communicative to Action-Oriented: A research Pathway, *The Centre for Educational Research on Languages and Literacy*, the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (OISE), University of Toronto

Tüm, G. & Emre-Parmaksız, G. (2017). Comparison of speaking activities in Turkish and English language teaching course books regarding self-assessment grid of CEFR. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 13(2), 367-378

Valldeperez, M. (2016). Oral Discourse in Foreign Language Education. Speaking Activities in EFL Textbooks and the CEFR. *PhD Thesis*.

تقويم مهارات التحدث التفاعلي باللغة الإنجليزية لدى طلاب المرحلة الثانوية في ضوء الإطار المرجعي الأوروبي المشترك للغات: دراسة تشخيصية علاجية

إعداد

إيمان جلال أحمد أحمد وهدان

قسم المناهج وطرق التدريس

كلية البنات للآداب والعلوم والتربية- جامعة عين شمس

emanwahdan2012@gmail.com

إشراف

ا.م.د/ أميرة الأمير خاطر	أ.د/ عايدة عبد المقصود زاهر
أستاذ مساعد مناهج وطرق تدريس اللغة الإنجليزية, قسم المناهج وطرق التدريس كلية البنات جامعة عين شمس	أستاذ مناهج وطرق تدريس اللغة الإنجليزية, قسم المناهج وطرق التدريس كلية البنات جامعة عين شمس

د/ هدى صلاح الدين حسين حلمي

مدرس مناهج وطرق تدريس اللغة الإنجليزية, قسم المناهج وطرق التدريس,

كلية البنات جامعة عين شمس

المستخلص

تهدف الدراسه الحالية الى تقييم الوضع الحالي لأداء طلاب الصف الأول الثانوي في التحدث التفاعلي وذلك في ضوء المستوى B.2 للوصف التوضيحي من التحدث التفاعلي في للإطار المرجعي الأوروبي المشترك للغات. وهذه الدراسة مقسمة الى دراسة تشخيصية اعتمدت على تحليل الكتاب المدرسي للغة الانجليزية ومعايير التحدث في الوثيقة الوطنية لمهارات اللغة الانجليزية في ضوء المقاييس الوصفية للتحدث التفاعلي. كما تضمنت الدراسه دراسه علاجية اعتمدت على تصميم اطار مقترح لتنمية مهارات التحدث التفاعلي. شملت عينه الدراسة ٦٠ طالبة من مدرسة حكومية (٣٠ للمجموعة التجريبية – ٣٠ للمجموعة الضابطة). تم تطبيق الاطار العلاجي المقترح على طلاب المجموعة التجريبية وذلك في الفصل الدراسي الثاني للعام الدراسي ٢٠١٩/٢٠٢٠. كما تم إعداد أداتين وهما اختبار قبلي وبعدي ومقياس تحليلي للتحدث التفاعلي ومن ثم تم تطبيقهماعلى المجموعتين. وبناءا على ذلك أشار التحليل الإحصائيلنتائج الإختبار القبلي والبعدي أن الإطار العلاجي المقترح ذو فاعلية في تحسين مهارات التحدث التفاعلي لطلاب المجموعة التجريبية. كما تضمن البحث توصيات ومقترحات لأبحاث أخرى.

الكلمات المفتاحية: الاطار الاوروبي, التحدث التفاعلي , التحدث