

The Effects of Communication Strategy Training on EFL Speaking Anxiety and Speaking Strategy among the Community College Adult Learners in Taiwan

Cheng-Chang Tsai

Department of Applied Foreign Languages, Nan Kai University of Technology, Taiwan (R.O.C.)

[Abstract] The study mainly focused on investigating English as Foreign Language (EFL) speaking anxiety and speaking strategy, comparing genders and language proficiency levels. The participants chosen for the study were 105 participants from a community college in Taiwan. The data collection was carried out in two stages. The first investigation was conducted at the beginning of the semester. The final investigation was conducted at the end of the semester after the participants had received communication strategy training. The participants were asked to fill out the Personal Report of Public Speaking Anxiety (PRPSA) and Foreign Language Speaking Strategy Use (FLSSU) questionnaires to explore the differences between the pre-test and the post-test.

The results of this study show that the scores participants derived from PRPSA and FLSSU were statistically negatively correlated. Regardless of gender group, the conclusion is that the degree of speaking anxiety had been reduced and that students' speaking strategy use had increased after receiving the communication strategy instruction. Also, the communication strategy instruction did have an impact on the five categories, which are management and planning, cognitive, communicative-experiential, interpersonal, and affective speaking strategy uses, and reduced the speaking anxiety for the lower, intermediate, and higher proficiency level students. Based on the findings, pedagogical implications are discussed with the aim of enhancing the teaching and learning of spoken English in foreign-language contexts.

[Keywords] English, speaking, anxiety, strategies, community college, EFL adult learners

Introduction

In the 21st century, people have entered an all-encompassing society, and the world is moving towards globalization. Regardless of the country, people are unable to separate themselves from the trend of globalization. In this age of global and economic growth, the acquisition of knowledge is an important key for the success of a nation, and education no longer is the monopoly that belongs to the elite of another age. It should be shared with all of people, and it is an advantage that all of individuals should have. According to a Ministry of Education (MOE) report, lifelong education is regarded as a major educational policy, and the importance of lifelong education is highlighted. The conception of lifelong education was emphasized by the Taiwanese government, and the government has long strived to create a healthy lifelong learning environment for its citizens. The Ministry of Education (MOE) collaborates with local governments to integrate all community learning institutes and create a sustainable lifelong learning environment. In 2011, the MOE continued to emphasize education for all through promotion of lifelong learning and through community colleges around the island. These institutes allow local citizens to learn and develop new skills, enhance current areas of interest, and share their areas of expertise with others. On the other hand, to meet with Taiwan's learning society, the MOE cooperates with community colleges to provide a variety of courses for citizens, such as computer training, English learning, and the fine arts (The Ministry of Education, 2012).

There is no denying that English ability currently plays an important role in the workplace in Taiwan. More and more people have enrolled in English learning courses in the community colleges in Taiwan, and English is a global language that has been actively emphasized in Taiwan in recent years. Previously, the English exam included only listening, reading, and writing sections, but now an English proficiency exam, like the General English Proficiency Test (GEPT) containing oral sections, implies that EFL oral proficiency is receiving much more emphasis now than previously. Because of this, students start to focus more on EFL speaking ability. When it comes to speaking ability, we should take language anxiety and speaking anxiety into account. Horwitz (2001) stated that a significant and high correlation was found between classroom anxiety and speaking anxiety, thus indicating that the English language classroom context is a source of speaking anxiety. In addition to this, Liu and Jackson (2008) found that language anxiety was positively correlated with unwillingness to communicate.

More recently, Wang (2010) has shown that over 50 % of the students reported experiencing moderate or high levels of speaking anxiety, and mutual influences existed between language achievement and speaking anxiety. As mentioned above, we clearly find that speaking anxiety plays a vital part for foreign language learners. However, the question remains: are there any learning strategies that can be adopted to help students alleviate speaking anxiety and begin speaking English confidently and efficiently? Tarone (2005) stated that speakers use communication strategies to “resolve difficulties they encounter in expressing an intended meaning” (p.488). “There have been relatively few studies investigating the use of speaking strategies of EFL adult learners. Dornyei (1995) found a positive impact of strategy instruction on communicative strategy training and proved that communication strategy might be teachable by instructors. Nakatani (2005) explored awareness-raising training on oral communication strategy use, and the findings revealed that participants in the treatment (strategy instruction) group improved their oral proficiency test scores but that those in the control group did not.

The purpose of the study is to explore whether there is any relationship between speaking anxiety and speaking strategies among adult EFL learners. The researcher will discuss whether various gender and English proficiency levels affect speaking anxiety and the use of speaking strategies after students received instruction in a communication training program. Hopefully, the findings of this study will help overcome foreign language speaking anxiety, put forth suggestions, give pedagogical implications, share general insights, and conclusions learned from this study, and also help English teachers in Taiwan know whether the use of speaking strategies can reduce speaking anxiety in their own teaching situations for their adult EFL learners. More specifically, the study seeks to answer the following three major concerns:

1. Is there any relationship between English as a Foreign Language (EFL) speaking anxiety (PRPSA) and speaking strategies (FLSSU) used by adult EFL learners?
2. What are the effects of communication strategy instruction on adult EFL learners' speaking anxiety (PRPSA) and strategies (FLSSU) used in terms of gender (male and female)?
3. What are the effects of communication strategy instruction on adult EFL learners' speaking anxiety (PRPSA) and speaking strategies (FLSSU) used in terms of various language proficiency levels (high, intermediate, low)?

Literature Reviews

Foreign Language Learning Anxiety

Kelly (2002) states anxiety is a complicated psychological term covering various variables. In its simplest form, anxiety can be defined as “a general feeling of apprehension, including hyper-vigilance, increased sympathetic nervous system activity, and difficulty concentrating” (p.54). According to Horwitz (2001), language anxiety is a kind of anxiety specifically associated with second/foreign language learning contexts. Horwitz, Horwitz, and Cope (1986) stated foreign language anxiety is “a distinct complex of self-

perception, beliefs, feelings, and behaviors related to classroom language learning arising from the uniqueness of the language learning process” (p.128). It happens when learners attempt to successfully adopt a foreign language that they have not yet adequately or fully mastered. Besides this, they also identified three kinds of related anxieties as components of foreign language anxiety: communication apprehension (the fear of communicating with other people), test anxiety (fear of exams and other assignments adopted to evaluate the students’ performance), and fear of negative evaluation (the worry about how others view the learner) (Horwitz, Horwitz, & Cope, 1986).

For many students, foreign language classes can be more anxiety-provoking than other classes (Kitano, 2001). MacIntyre and Gardner (1991) further argued that “if anxious students could focus on positive experiences in the second language, rather than on negative ones, the debilitating effects of language anxiety could be reduced” (p.297). Therefore, foreign language anxiety is a distinct variable in the language learning process and has significant influence on language learning. In addition to this, MacIntyre (1999) synthesizes some findings of language anxiety research and provides the following general conclusions: (1) anxiety stems from negative learning experiences early in the language learning experience; (2) language anxiety negatively correlates with L2 learning achievement and with self-perception of L2 proficiency; and (3) anxious learners get lower grades, spend more time studying, and so on. With respect to literature on anxiety in language learning, Young (1991) identified six kinds of potential sources of language anxiety: 1) personal and interpersonal anxieties; 2) learners’ beliefs about language learning; 3) instructor beliefs about language teaching; 4) instructor-learner interactions; 5) classroom procedures; and 6) language testing” (p.426).

Foreign Language Speaking Anxiety

Apart from foreign language anxiety, some students are anxious of participating in speaking class. As a matter of fact, speaking is the most anxiety-provoking language skill in foreign language learning situations (Cheng et al., 1999). To date, anxiety over speaking has received the most empirical attention in the literature (Gregersen & Horwitz, 2002; Woodrow, 2006). According to Ayres (1996), the fear of making a speech and an oral presentation ranks as the top fear among students and adults from various backgrounds. Also, Young (1992) mentioned that speaking is considered the most stressful of the four skills from the perspective of foreign language teachers and students. More Recently, Wang (2010) revealed that over 50 % of the students reported experiencing moderate or high levels of speaking anxiety. There has been a great deal of research conducted in the field of oral or speech presentation, but only a few studies have focused on the sources of it (Kitano, 2001). A closer examination of sources of foreign language speaking anxiety showed a correlation between a) anxiety and fear of negative evaluation, and b) anxiety and perception of lower ability in relation to peer groups and native speakers (Kitano, 2001).

Wu (2004) stated that there exists a positive correlation between a student’s language anxiety and English-speaking proficiency. In addition, Hsu (2008) also mentioned that male students show more anxiety concerning their insufficient English ability in class, while female ones felt more anxious because they didn’t have enough preparation before speaking in class. Liu (2007) revealed that most students became more anxious while speaking English in class, especially at the front of class. There were several factors causing anxiety, such as lack of vocabulary and low English proficiency. In a more recent study, Fang and Dong (2010) confirmed that the students having higher anxiety also have lower spoken English ability. Moreover, the more influential factors leading to high anxiety include attention to intonation and pronunciation, motivation, and so on. All of these above studies provided valuable insights into the correlation between speaking anxiety and the learner’s achievement and proficiency.

EFL Speaking Strategy

Over the past decades, there have been a number of studies conducted to explore the different aspects of communication strategies. In general, there are three dimensions when it comes to communication strategies: taxonomy of communication strategies, use of communication strategies, and instruction of

communication strategies. Dornyei (1995) mentioned two taxonomies of communication strategies that differ from each other: avoidance and compensation. The first one refers to the tendency of the students not to employ certain linguistic elements because of phonological, syntactic, or lexical constraints. Brown (2000) also stated topic avoidance may be the most frequent method that students have ever used. The second one is compensatory strategies that involve compensation for missing knowledge. Based on Dornyei's (1995) classification, there are twelve kinds of compensatory strategies, including message abandonment, topic avoidance, literal translation, code switching, foreignizing, approximation, word coinage, circumlocution, use of all-purpose words, self-repair, appeals for assistance, and time-gaining strategies. Dornyei (1995) also found a positive influence of strategy instruction on communicative strategy training. Besides this, O'Malley and Chamot (1990) found that the class given explicit training in metacognitive, cognitive, and social effective strategies in speaking tasks improved their performances significantly more than the control group. Recently, Derwing and Rossiter (2002) mentioned that the most commonly used strategies when EFL students are faced with communication breakdown were paraphrase and self-repetition.

Method

Participants

The participants chosen for the study were 105 participants from six English speaking classes of a community college in Taiwan. They were 35-52 years of age. There were 31 male and 74 female participants. The English-speaking proficiency placement exam was measured by a test that was patterned on an intermediate level mock GEPT (General English Proficiency Test). The total possible exam score was 100 points. Based on the results of the exams, students were classified into three speaking proficiency levels: low, intermediate, and high. The 35 participants who received scores below 60 points were classified into the low group; the 51 participants who scored between 60-80 points were classified into the intermediate group; and the 19 participants who obtained a score above 80 points were classified into the high group.

Instruments

The instruments used in the study included two questionnaires: one is relevant to foreign language speaking anxiety; the other regards foreign language speaking strategy. The questionnaires were administered in Chinese, the participants' native language. To assess the internal consistency reliability of the items included in the translated questionnaire, a pilot test was administered to 10 subjects randomly selected from the whole population in question. The results showed the internal consistency reliability, achieving an alpha coefficient of .85 in the pilot run. On the whole, reliability with values higher than .80 identified good reliability for research purposes (Hair, Anderson, Tatham, & Black, 1998). After the pilot test, the ambiguities and misunderstanding of items were recognized, and some of the items bearing extreme scores were revised to assure a higher reliability. The Personal Report of Public Speaking Anxiety (PRPSA) (see Appendix A) designed by McCroskey (1970) composed of 34 items measuring foreign language learners' speaking anxiety was used, and an internal consistency of the FLCAS as .87 was recorded. Then, the

Language Speaking Strategy Use (FLSSU), designed by Stern (1992) (see Appendix B), consisting of 14 items measuring foreign language learners' speaking strategies, and an internal consistency of the FLSSU as .83 was recorded. The structure of the questionnaire was divided into five categories, including management and planning (Questions 2 and 8), cognitive (Questions 7, 9, 11,14), communicative-experiential (Questions 5 and 10), interpersonal (Questions 1, 12, 13), and affective (Questions 3, 4, 6). Based on Stern (1992), the management and planning strategies express the language learners' intention to direct their own learning. Cognitive strategies are used as procedures and operations in learning and problem solving, such as practice, memorization, guessing, and so on.

Communicative-experiential strategies are adopted by learners in order to keep the conversation going, such as gesturing and paraphrasing, asking for repetition. Interpersonal strategies are used for language in real-life situations and to become familiar with the target language culture. Affective strategies are those that help the learners manage emotions or attitudes and get rid of the feelings of strangeness and anxiety when communicating in a new language. All the items of these two questionnaires (except the background questionnaire items) were placed on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from “strongly disagree” to “strongly agree.”

Data Collection

The data collection was carried out in two stages. The first investigation was conducted at the beginning of the semester (the first week of the semester). The participants were asked to fill out the Personal Report of Public Speaking Anxiety, and the Foreign Language Speaking Strategy Use questionnaires. Current research suggests two techniques to reduce speaking anxiety. First, systematic desensitization involves relaxation, deep breathing, visualization, and so forth (Friedrich, Goss, Cunconan, & Lane, 1997). This technique can be practiced in group settings or alone. The second technique, strategy training, refers to learning and practicing skills aimed at improving individual speaking behavior (Kelly, 1997). Strategy training usually involves participating in a course in which students learn and practice speaking strategies (e.g., organization of ideas, delivery, coping with the speaking difficulties, and so on). Then, they were taught how to use the above-mentioned speaking strategies in order to reduce public speaking anxiety, as well as to increase speaking strategy use during English oral practice lectures. During the first four weeks of the course, students were given lectures that related to basic fundamental strategies in English oral practice, such as posture, facial expressions, gestures, eye contact, and voice inflections. After that, the master teacher taught some speaking strategies in the class for the duration of the semester.

The speaking strategies were as follows: 1) I try to relax my muscles by breathing deeply every time I feel nervous about speaking English; 2) If I do not know how to say a word or phrase, I try to ask a classmate or my teacher; 3) I use the dictionary to prepare a role playing or communicative activity in class; 4) If I do not know how to say a word, I try to use a synonym or describe what I want to say; 5) If I do not know how to say a word in English, I try to say it in Chinese; 6) If I do not know how to say a word or phrase, I try to use gestures and my hands; 7) I try to ask my speaking partner to repeat a word or phrase if I do not hear it clearly; 8) If I do not hear a word or phrase clearly, I try to relate it to the part of the conversation that I understood; 9) I try to structure some ideas in my mind before speaking; 10) To gain time, I try to use fillers, such as “and,” “well,” etc; 11) I try to ask my speaking partner to repeat or explain with different words that I did not understand.

In the second stage, after the instruction in the use of the speaking strategies discussed above at the end of the semester (the eighteenth week of the semester), the participants were given the same two kinds of questionnaires to fill out again. They were informed that the data would not relate to their course grades and anonymity was ensured to increase the probability of honest responses.

Data Analyses

The results from the questionnaires were derived using SAS (Statistical Analysis System, 9.1 version) for Windows. In order to determine whether there is any relationship between the Personal Report of Public Speaking Anxiety (PRPSA) and the Foreign Language Speaking Strategy Use (FLSSU) among these participants, a Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient was calculated. A Paired-sampled t- test was conducted to examine the differences between PRPSA and FLSSU between genders in the pre-test and post-test. A One-way ANOVA was adapted to explore the differences between PRPSA and FLSSU to various language proficiency levels in the pre-test and post-test.

Results

1. *Is there any relationship between English as a Foreign Language (EFL) speaking anxiety (PRPSA) and speaking strategies (FLSSU) used by adult EFL learners?*

To find out whether there is a relationship between PRPSA and FLSSU among all participants, a Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient was calculated. The scores participants got from PRPSA and FLSSU were statistically correlated, and the correlation coefficient was found to be $-.81$. The highly negative correlation between two variables indicated that when students' speaking anxiety level increased, their use of speaking strategy use decreased. The results revealed that there was a significant negative relationship between the speaking anxiety and management and planning, cognitive, communicative-experiential, affective and interpersonal speaking strategies with a correlation coefficient (r) of $-.57$ ($p < .0001$), $-.61$ ($p < .0001$), $-.55$ ($p < .0001$), $-.57$ ($p < .0001$), and, $-.62$ ($p < .0001$) respectively (See Table 1). Their percentage of variance being $r^2 = .32$, $r^2 = .37$, $r^2 = .30$, $r^2 = .32$, and $r^2 = .38$, respectively.

This indicated that the correlation coefficient of speaking anxiety and management and planning, cognitive, communicative-experiential, affective, and interpersonal speaking strategies can explain 32%, 37%, 30%, 32%, and 38% of the variations, respectively. This implied that most of the participants preferred to use interpersonal speaking strategies most (38%), more than management and planning, cognitive communicative-experiential, and affective strategies after receiving the communication strategy instruction.

Table 1
Foreign Language Speaking Anxiety and Speaking Strategy Pearson Correlation

Item	Speaking Anxiety	Speaking Strategy	Management & Planning	Cognitive	Communicative-experiential	Affective	Interpersonal
Speaking Anxiety	1	$-.811^*$	$-.578^*$	$-.619^*$	$-.554^*$	$-.571^*$	$-.625^*$
Speaking Strategy		1	0.664^*	0.816^*	0.65^*	0.728^*	0.744^*
Management & Planning			1	0.448^*	0.296^*	0.38^*	0.397^*
Cognitive				1	0.43^*	0.415^*	0.507^*
Communicative-experiential					1	0.406^*	0.316^*
Affective						1	0.438^*
Interpersonal							1
* < .0001							

2. *What are the effects of communication strategy instruction on the adult EFL learners' speaking anxiety (PRPSA) and strategies (FLSSU) used in terms of gender (male and female)?*

The following results showed the mean scores on PRPSA and FLSSU in the pre-test and post-test of male and female participants. A paired-sampled t-test was conducted to examine the effects on speaking anxiety and speaking strategy on the mean score between the pre-test and post-test on each group, and the effects of each domain was statistically significant at the .0001 probability level. According to the analyses of paired-sampled t-test, there was a difference between male and female groups because $t(104) = 6.12$, $p < .0001$. Overall, the male group had a lower mean score in the post-test ($M = 1.79$, $SD = 0.30$) than in the pre-test ($M = 3.26$, $SD = 0.90$) in terms of the male students' degree of speaking anxiety. On the other hand, the male group had a higher mean score in the post-test ($M = 3.90$, $SD = 0.37$) than in the pre-test ($M = 2.91$, $SD = 0.91$) in terms of the males' use of speaking strategies. To be specific, the male group had a higher

mean score in the post-test than that in the pre-test in terms of the males' use of speaking strategies, including management and planning, cognitive, communicative-experiential, interpersonal, and affective strategies (see Table 2). It is obvious that strategy training had a great and positive influence on the male learners' speaking anxiety and strategy.

Table 2

A Comparison between Pre-test and Post-test in terms of Speaking Anxiety and Speaking Strategy in Male Group

Item	Pre-test		Post-test		Diff of Mean	T value	P-value
	Mean	Standard	Mean	Standard			
Speaking Anxiety	3.1	0.9	1.85	0.3	-1.25	-7.83	<.0001
Speaking Strategy	2.91	0.91	3.9	0.37	0.99	7.17	<.0001
Management & Planning	2.89	1.04	3.9	0.71	1.01	5.15	<.0001
Cognitive	2.97	1.04	3.86	0.59	0.89	4.88	<.0001
Communicative-experiential	2.85	1.07	3.9	0.77	1.05	4.95	<.0001
Interpersonal	2.87	0.93	3.95	0.6	1.08	6.7	<.0001
Affective	2.94	0.92	3.91	0.54	0.97	6.12	<.0001
All	3.04	0.4	2.45	0.2	-0.59	-7.1	<.0001

sample size n=31

The female group had a lower mean score in the post-test ($M=1.85$, $SD=0.14$) than in the pre-test ($M=3.10$, $SD=0.83$) in terms of the females' degree of speaking anxiety. On the other hand, the female group had a higher mean score in the post-test ($M=3.79$, $SD=0.33$) than in the pre-test ($M=2.72$, $SD=0.79$) in terms of the females' use of speaking strategies. To be specific, the female group had a higher mean score in the post-test than in the pre-test in terms of the females' use of speaking strategies, including management and planning, cognitive, communicative-experiential, interpersonal, and affective strategies (see Table 3). It proves that strategy training also had a great and positive impact on the female learners' speaking anxiety and strategy.

Table 3

A Comparison between Pre-test and Post-test in terms of Speaking Anxiety and Speaking Strategy in Female Group

Item	Pre-test		Post-test		Diff of Mean	T value	P-value
	Mean	Standard	Mean	Standard			
Speaking Anxiety	3.26	0.83	1.79	0.14	-1.47	-15.1	<.0001
Speaking Strategy	2.72	0.79	3.79	0.33	1.07	13.6	<.0001
Management & Planning	2.7	1.02	3.83	0.61	1.13	9.24	<.0001
Cognitive	2.7	0.84	3.76	0.56	1.06	11	<.0001
Communicative-experiential	2.74	1.05	3.81	0.64	1.07	8.38	<.0001
Interpersonal	2.72	0.93	3.81	0.52	1.09	10.1	<.0001
Affective	2.75	0.9	3.77	0.55	1.02	9.29	<.0001
All	3.1	0.39	2.38	0.14	-0.72	-14	<.0001

sample size n=74

Interestingly, female learners had higher degrees of speaking anxiety than their male counterparts in the pre-test and post-test. The findings of this study were consistent with Huang's findings (2005); Huang (2005) found that female students suffered from higher speaking anxiety than males (see Tables 2 and 3). On the contrary, male learners used more frequent speaking strategies than females in the pre-test and post-test. The results of this study varied from Li's finding (2010), in which Li stated that females applied strategies more often than males when speaking English.

In conclusion, whether a male or female group, it is concluded that the students' degree of speaking anxiety had been reduced and their speaking strategy degree usage increased after receiving speaking strategy instruction. In other words, the speaking strategy instruction has an effective influence on male and female groups.

3. What are the effects of communication strategy instruction on the adult EFL learners' speaking anxiety (PRPSA) and speaking strategies (FLSSU) used in terms of various language levels (high, intermediate, low)?

A one-way analysis of variable (ANOVA) was generated to compare the mean scores between the impacts of PRPSA and FLSSU on various proficiency levels. Results showed a statistically significant difference on PRPSA in the lower, intermediate and higher proficiency levels with $F(2, 102) = 641.57$, $p < .0001$ (see Table 4), and the results also identified a statistically significant difference on FLSSU in the lower, intermediate, and higher proficiency levels with $F(2, 102) = 137.58$, $p < .0001$ (see Table 5). On average, the lower proficiency group ($M = -2.31$, $SD = .24$) had a lower mean score than the intermediate proficiency ($M = -1.33$, $SD = .21$) and higher proficiency ($M = 0.07$, $SD = .28$) groups in terms of their degrees of speaking anxiety. On the other hand, the lower proficiency group ($M = 1.70$, $SD = .30$) had a higher mean score than the intermediate proficiency ($M = 1.00$, $SD = .40$) and the higher proficiency ($M = -.04$, $SD = .39$) groups in terms of their use of speaking strategies. Interestingly, the lower proficiency group had a higher mean score compared to the intermediate and higher proficiency groups in the management and planning

strategy, cognitive, communicative-experiential, interpersonal, and affective domains after receiving communication strategy training (see Table 6-11). As mentioned above, the lower-level learners appeared to use more speaking strategies than were used by the intermediate and high-level students. To be specific, the communication strategy training had a more obvious impact on the lower-proficiency group than the intermediate and higher proficiency groups with respect to the speaking anxiety and strategy.

Table 4

Various Language Proficiency Levels and Speaking Anxiety One-Way ANOVA Test Analysis

Source	SS	df	MS	F	P-value
Between Groups	70.20354974	2	35.10177487	641.57	<.0001
Within Groups	5.58064865	102	0.05471224		
Total	75.78419839	104			

Table 5

Various Language Proficiency Levels and Speaking Strategy One-Way ANOVA Test Analysis

Source	SS	df	MS	F	P-value
Between Groups	37.38729988	2	18.69364994	137.58	<.0001
Within Groups	13.85886144	102	0.13587119		
Total	51.24616132	104			

Table 6

Various Language Proficiency Levels and Speaking Anxiety and Speaking Strategy One-Way ANOVA Test Analysis in terms of Pre-test and Post-test

Item	Low		Average		High		F	P-value	Compare
	Mean	Standard	Mean	Standard	Mean	Standard			
Speaking Anxiety	-2.31	0.24	-1.33	0.21	0.07	0.28	641.57	<.0001	L-S,L-H,S-H
Speaking Strategy	1.7	0.3	1	0.4	-0.04	0.39	137.58	<.0001	L-S,L-H,S-H
Management & Planning	1.76	0.88	1.08	0.93	-0.08	0.56	28.06	<.0001	L-S,L-H,S-H
Cognitive	1.65	0.63	0.99	0.64	-0.07	0.84	39.61	<.0001	L-S,L-H,S-H
Communicative-experien	1.86	0.77	0.88	0.94	0.08	1.12	24.64	<.0001	L-S,L-H,S-H
Interpersonal	1.73	0.58	1.05	0.77	-0.02	0.66	39.47	<.0001	L-S,L-H,S-H
Affective	1.59	0.49	1	0.85	-0.07	0.74	31.99	<.0001	L-S,L-H,S-H
All	-1.14	0.2	-0.65	0.2	0.04	0.22	206.22	<.0001	L-S,L-H,S-H

Table 7

Various Language Proficiency Levels and Management & Planning Strategy One-Way ANOVA Test Analysis

Source	SS	df	MS	F	P-value
Between Groups	41.5440513	2	20.7720257	28.06	<.0001
Within Groups	75.5035677	102	0.7402311		
Total	117.047619	104			

Table 8

Various Language Proficiency Levels and Cognitive Strategy One-Way ANOVA Test Analysis

Source	SS	df	MS	F	P-value
Between Groups	36.3516	2	18.1758	39.61	<.0001
Within Groups	46.8067	102	0.45888		
Total	83.1583	104			

Table 9

Various Language Proficiency Levels and Communicative-Experiential Strategy One-Way ANOVA Test Analysis

Source	SS	df	MS	F	P-value
Between Groups	42.1362082	2	21.0681041	24.64	<.0001
Within Groups	87.2114109	102	0.8550138		
Total	129.347619	104			

Table 10

Various Language Proficiency Levels and Affective Strategy One-Way ANOVA Test Analysis

Source	SS	df	MS	F	P-value
Between Groups	33.96235032	2	16.98117516	31.99	<.0001
Within Groups	54.14770259	102	0.53085983		
Total	88.11005291	104			

Table 11

Various Language Proficiency Levels and Interpersonal Strategy One-Way ANOVA Test Analysis

Source	SS	df	MS	F	P-value
Between Groups	37.88614674	2	18.94307337	39.47	<.0001
Within Groups	48.9540649	102	0.47994181		
Total	86.84021164	104			

Conclusions and Discussions

The scores participants got from PRPSA and FLSSU were statistically correlated, and the correlation coefficient was found to be negative in this study. The negative correlation between two variables indicated that when students' speaking anxiety level increased, their use of speaking strategy decreased. The findings of this study partly corresponded with Li's finding (2010). No one can deny that speaking anxiety plays an important role in speaking comprehension. A harmonious and relaxed atmosphere should be created in EFL speaking classroom settings. A harmonious and relaxed atmosphere benefit students by reducing their speaking anxiety and increasing their strategy uses. It is also useful for English teachers to design various classroom activities, such as ice-breakers and conversation partners, to help students to get rid of their speaking pressures. On the other hand, English teachers should develop suitable and effective strategies to help learners reduce or eliminate their speaking anxiety in English classes based on various speaking proficiency levels.

Whether a male or female group, it is concluded that students' degrees of speaking anxiety had been reduced and their speaking strategy degree usage increased after receiving the communication strategy instruction. It is obvious that the communication strategy instruction has an effective influence on male and female groups and that the students also benefit from this strategy instruction.

As mentioned previously, it is clear that the communication strategy instruction did have an impact on all five categories (strategy management and planning, cognitive, communicative-experiential, interpersonal, and affective) of strategy uses for the lower, intermediate, and higher proficiency level students. The findings of this study are also similar to Dornyei's (1995) findings. Dornyei mentioned a positive impact of strategy instruction on communicative strategy training. EFL oral communication strategies are adopted to deal with oral communication problems; therefore, EFL teachers are strongly

recommended to design class activities in ways that help students overcome oral communication problems and challenges. Since strategic competence plays a significant part in successful and efficient communication, EFL teachers and curriculum designers are expected to improve students' strategic competence in order to enable them to communicate effectively.

The Research Limitations

First, one limitation of the present study was the small number of participants (105 undergraduate students), and the results cannot be generalized to all learning settings. Second, the questionnaires used for collecting data on speaking anxiety and speaking strategy were a quantitative instrument that can be subject to the impact of response bias. Some deeper results of these findings might be generated if a qualitative instrument, such as a think-aloud protocol, is used. Finally, it is difficult to measure affective variables in a limited time frame, so it would also be useful to conduct a longitudinal study to explore speaking anxiety and strategy over time.

References

- Ayres, J. (1996). Speech preparation processes and speech anxiety. *Communication Education, 45*, 228-235.
- Brown, H. D. (2000). *Principles of language learning and teaching*. (4th ed.). NY: Longman.
- Cheng, Y., Horwitz, E. K., & Schallert, D. L. (1999). Language Anxiety: Differentiating writing and speaking components. *Language Learning, 49*, 417-446.
- Derwing, T. M., & Rossiter, M.J. (2002). EFL learners' perceptions of their pronunciation needs and strategies. *System, 30*, 155-166.
- Dornyei, Z. (1995). On the teachability of communication strategies, *TESOL Quarterly, 29*, 55-85.
- Education in Taiwan 2011-2012*. (2012). Taiwan: Ministry of Education.
- Fang, P. G., & Dong, Y. (2010). A study on college students' anxiety to spoken English. *Canadian Social Science, 6*(2), 95-101.
- Friedrich, G., Goss, B., Cunconan, T., & Lane, D. (1997). Systematic Desensitization. In J. A. Daly, J. C. McCroskey, J. Ayers, T Hopf, & D. M. Ayres (Eds.), *avoiding Communication: Shyness, Reticence, and Communication apprehension* (2nd ed., pp.305-329). Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.
- Gregersen, T., & Horwitz, E. K. (2002). Language learning and perfectionism: Anxious and non-anxious language learners' reactions to their oral performance. *The Modern Language Journal, 86*, 562-570.
- Hair, J. F., Anderson, R. E., Tatham, R.L., & Black, W. C. (1998). *Multivariate data analysis*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Horwitz, E. K., Horwitz, M. B., & Cope, J. A. (1986). Foreign language classroom anxiety. *Modern Language Journal, 79* (1), 125-132.
- Horwitz, E. K. (2001). Language anxiety and achievement. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 21*, 112-126.
- Huang, H.W. (2005). *The relationship between learning motivation and speaking anxiety among EFL non-English major freshmen in Taiwan*. Unpublished these for master of department of Applied Foreign Language Languages, Chaoyang University of Technology, Taiwan.
- Hus, S. (2008). Foreign language anxiety among technical college students in English class. Unpublished Master thesis. Nanya Institute of Technology, Taoyuan, Taiwan.
- Kelly, W. E. (2002). Anxiety and the prediction of task duration: A preliminary analysis. *The Journal of Psychology, 136*(1), 53-58.
- Kelly, L. (1997). Skills Training as a Treatment for Communication Problems. In J. A. Daly, J. C.

- McCroskey, J. Ayers, T Hopf, & D. M. Ayres (Eds.), *avoiding Communication : Shyness, Reticence, and Communication apprehension* (2nd ed., pp.331-365). Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.
- Kitano, K. (2001). Anxiety in the college Japanese language classroom. *The Modern Language Journal*, 85(49), 549-566.
- Li, R.L. (2010). The relationship between speaking anxiety and speaking strategies among university students in Taiwan. Master's Thesis. National Ping Tung University of Education. Department of English.
- Liu, M. (2007). Anxiety in oral English classrooms: A case study in China. *Indonesian Journal of English Language Teaching*, 3(1), 119-137.
- Liu, M. & Jackson, J. (2008). An exploration of Chinese EFL learners' unwillingness to communicate and foreign language anxiety. *The Modern Language Journal*, 92(1), 71-86.
- MacIntyre, P. D. (1999). Language anxiety: A review of the research for language teachers. In Young, D. J. (Ed.), *Affect in foreign language and second language learning: a practical guide to creating a low-anxiety classroom atmosphere* (pp. 24-45). New York: McGraw Hill.
- MacIntyre, P. D., & Gardner, R. C. (1991). Investigating language class anxiety using the focus essay technique. *The Modern Language Journal*, 75, 296-304.
- McCroskey, J.C. (1970). Measures of communication-bound anxiety. *Speech Monography*, 37, 269-288.
- Nakatani, Y. (2005). The effects of awareness-raising training on oral communication strategy use. *Modern Language Journal*, 89(1), 76-91.
- O'Malley, J.M. & Chamot, A.U. (1990). *Learning Strategies in Second Language acquisition*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Stern, H.H. (1992). *Issues and Options in Language Teaching*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Tarone, E. (2005). Speaking in a second language. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 485-502). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Wang, T. (2010). Speaking anxiety: More of a function of personality than language achievement. *Chinese Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 33(5), 95-109.
- Woodrow, L. (2006). Anxiety and speaking English as a second language. *RELC Journal*, 37(3), 308-328.
- Wu, J. Y. (2004). The correlation between language anxiety and English speaking proficiency for the 3rd-grades and the 6th-graders in an elementary school. Unpublished Masteral thesis, National Cheng Kung University, Tainan, Taiwan.
- Young, D. J. (1991). Creating a low-anxiety classroom environment: What does language anxiety research suggest? *Modern Language Journal*, 75, 426-439.
- Young, D. J. (1992). Language anxiety from the foreign language specialist's perspective: Interviews with Krashen, Omaggio Hadley, Terrell and Rardin. *Foreign Language Annuals*, 25(2), 157-172.

Appendix A

Personal Report of Public Speaking Anxiety (PRPSA) survey by McCroskey (1970)

1. While preparing for giving a speech, I feel tense and nervous.
2. I feel tense when I see the words "speech" and "public speech" on a course outline when studying.
3. My thought become confused and jumbled when I am giving a speech.

4. Right after giving a speech I feel that I have had a pleasant experience.
5. I get anxious when I think about a speech coming up.
6. I have no fear of giving a speech.
7. Although I am nervous just starting a speech, I soon settle down after starting and feel calm and comfortable.
8. I look forward to giving a speech.
9. When the instructor announces a speaking assignment in class, I can feel myself getting tense.
10. My hands tremble when I am giving a speech.
11. I feel relaxed while giving a speech.
12. I enjoy preparing a speech.
13. I am in constant fear of forgetting what I prepared to say.
14. I get nervous if someone asks me something about my topic that I don't know.
15. I face the prospect of giving a speech with confidence.
16. I feel that I am in complete possession of myself while giving a speech.
17. My mind is clear when giving a speech.
18. I do not dread giving a speech.
19. I prepare just before starting a speech.
20. My heart beats very fast just as I start a speech.
21. I experience considerable anxiety while sitting in the room just before my speech starts.
22. Certain parts of my body feel very tense and rigid while giving a speech.
23. Realizing that only a little time remains in a speech makes me very tense and anxious.
24. While giving a speech, I know I can control my feelings of tension and stress.
25. I breathe faster just before starting a speech.
26. I feel comfortable and relaxed in the hour or so just before giving a speech.
27. I do poorer on speeches because I am anxious.
28. I feel anxious when the teacher announces the date of a speaking assignment.
29. When I make a mistake while giving a speech, I find it hard to concentrate on the parts that follow.
30. During an important speech I experience a feeling of helplessness building up inside me.
31. I have trouble falling asleep the night before a speech.
32. My heart beats very fast while I present a speech.
33. I feel anxious while waiting to give my speech.
34. While giving a speech, I get so nervous facts I really know.

Appendix A

Personal Report of Public Speaking Anxiety (PRPSA) survey by McCroskey (1970) (The Chinese Version)

1. 在準備演講的過程中我覺得很緊張。
2. 在課程中看到『演講』與『公開演講』的字眼時，我感到很緊張。

- 3.當我在演講時，我的思緒很混亂。
- 4.在演講後，我覺得這是一個美好的經驗。
- 5.當我想到要演講時，感到很焦慮。
- 6.我不怕公開演講。
- 7.雖然剛開始演講時，我很緊張，但一會兒之後便覺得平靜自在。
- 8.我很期待演講。
- 9.當老師宣布課堂上要我們發表演講時，我覺得很緊張。
- 10.當我演講時，手會顫抖。
- 11.當我演講時，覺得很放鬆。
- 12.我享受準備演講的過程。
- 13.我很害怕會忘記演講內容。
- 14.我很害怕公開演講我不懂的主題。
- 15.我有自信面對演講。
- 16.當演講時，我覺得我可以掌控整個過程。
- 17.我演講時，思緒很清楚。
- 18.我不會怕演講。
- 19.要演講不久前，我才會做準備。
- 20.當我演講時，會心跳加速。
- 21.我要演講前，坐在房間內感覺很焦慮。
- 22.當演講時，我的身體某些部位會覺得很緊繃。
- 23.當知道距離演講只剩一些時間，會令我覺得很緊張焦慮。
- 24.當演講時，我可以控制我的緊張與壓力。
- 25.演講開始之前，我會呼吸較急促。
- 26.當演講前幾個小時，我覺得自在放鬆。
- 27.因為焦慮的情緒，讓我的演講表現更差。
- 28.當老師要求我們演講時，我感到很焦慮。
- 29.當我發覺我在演講過程中犯了錯誤，接下來我就很難專注了。
- 30.在一場重要的演講中，我發現了我的無助感。
- 31.演講前一晚，我睡不好。

- 32.當我演講時，心臟跳得很快。
- 33.在等待上台演講的過程中，我覺得很焦慮。
- 34.在演講的當下，我可以感覺到自己很緊張。

Appendix B
Speaking Strategy Questionnaire (by Stern 1992)

1. Do you try to speak in English in everyday interaction?
2. Do you try to speak in English whenever you get the opportunity?
3. Do you try to take risk even when you don't have enough confidence to speak right English?
4. Do you try to avoid interference of mother tongue while speaking in English?
5. When you try to say something but you lack the necessary vocabulary, do you use synonym or describe the idea or object in other words?
6. When you speak in English, do you worry about your mistakes too much?
7. When you learn a new English vocabulary do you try to use it in speaking?
8. Do you plan out in advance what are you going to say in English?
9. While you watch/listen to some program or music on television/radio in English do you try to pick up some nice sounding phrases or words to use it later in your English conversation?
10. Do you use fillers (e.g. well, right, anyway, now let me see, as a matter of fact) to have time in conversation when you face difficulty in thinking of appropriate reply?
11. Do you try to correct your pronunciation to improve your speaking skill?
12. Do you frequently use expressions that call for cultural knowledge, such as requesting, apologizing, or complaining in English?
13. Do you try to correct your errors in speaking and welcome others' feedback?
14. Do you practice newly learnt grammatical structures in speaking to check your confidence level with the structures?

Appendix B
Speaking Strategy Questionnaire (by Stern 1992) (The Chinese Version)

1. 在日常生活中，你會試著用英語互動嗎？
2. 有適當時機時，你會試著說英語嗎？
3. 在不確定自己有足口的能力使用正確的英語時，你會願意嘗試看嗎？
4. 說英文時，你會特別注意不讓母語來干擾你嗎？
5. 當你不知道某個英文字彙時，你會試著用其他字彙來代替嗎？
6. 當你說英文時，你會非常擔心犯錯嗎？
7. 當你學到一個新字彙時，會試著使用嗎？

- 8.在你要說英文前，會先在心中構思一下嗎？
- 9.當你在外國影集/廣播上看到或聽到好的句法或字彙，往後你會試著在對話中使用嗎？
- 10.在你在表達時遇到困難會使用如『好的』、『我看看』、『事實上』等來使對話順利的進行嗎？
- 11.你會藉著糾正英文發音來改善說的技巧嗎？
- 12.在英文你會常用『請求』、『抱歉』、『抱怨』措辭，來表達文化的知識嗎？
- 13.你會試著改正錯誤並樂於接受他人意見嗎？
- 14.你會試著用新學到的文法結構來檢驗你對句構的自信度嗎？