The Effect of Recorded Dialogues in Higher Education Students' Spoken Performance.

(es) Efecto de diálogos grabados en el desempeño oral en inglés de los alumnos de Educación Superior.

(Port) O Efeito de Diálogos Gravados no Desempenho Falado de Alunos do Ensino Superior.

María Rossana Ramírez-Ávila
Universidad Casa Grande
mrramirez_a@hotmail.com; mramirez@casagrande.edu.ec
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4745-2245

Xavier Oswaldo Viteri-Guevara
Universidad Casa Grande
xavier.viteri@casagrande.edu.ec; xavier.viteri23@hotmail.com
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4247-279X

C.net *magister*

Recorded Dialogues

5%
Similitudes

< 1% Texto entre comillas
0% similitudes entre comillas
< 1% Idioma no reconocido

Nombre del documento: Recorded Dialogues.docx	**Depositante:** JLA EDICIONES	**Número de palabras:** 5974
ID del documento: 5b1719164dbabe290d6c42ef6b272b763ff47311	**Fecha de depósito:** 30/5/2023	**Número de caracteres:** 41.405
Tamaño del documento original: 296,66 kB	**Tipo de carga:** interface	
	fecha de fin de análisis: 30/5/2023	

Ubicación de las similitudes en el documento:

Autorización:

Universidad Casa Grande

Guayaquil, 23 de mayo de 2023

Señores
Consejo Editorial
Revista Yuyay
Ciudad

De mis consideraciones:

Por medio del presente, tengo a bien comunicar que el trabajo de titulación del Mgtr. Xavier Oswaldo Viteri Guevara no ha sido sometido a evaluación en ninguna otra revista, pero consta en el repositorio de la Universidad Casa Grande. Consecuentemente, la Coordinación de la Maestría autoriza el envío del documento para consideración del Consejo Editorial de Yuyay.

Abstract (en)

Students' participation in English class is low and evidenced lack of vocabulary when they are exposed to speaking activities. To assist students overcome that situation, this innovation integrated pair work through recorded dialogues in a technical context. Participants studied at a public university located in Guayaquil (Ecuador). They belonged to the school of Net and Telecommunications.

Mixed-design research was conducted. Quantitative instruments: pre and posttests, pre- and post-surveys, and action research were part of it. Data collected answered three research questions, two related to improvement in speaking in terms of vocabulary and fluency, and a third to know students' perspectives towards this innovation. Results showed a large impact (Cohen's d=2.97 – average of the three speaking components) for speaking due to the innovation (p < .001).

Regarding students' perspectives, the means of the post-survey were positive for the components of the innovation (pair work, planning and structuring, and recording of the dialogues). Implications of this study address other higher education authorities and EFL teachers who would like to engage students in the lessons with authentic and student-centered activities like pair-work and content of students' field of interest.

Keywords: pair review; dialogues; fluency; speaking; English as a foreign language; higher education.

Resumen

La participación de los estudiantes en la clase de inglés es baja y evidencia una falta de vocabulario cuando están expuestos a actividades orales. Para ayudar a los alumnos a superar esa situación, se implementó esta innovación. Se integró el trabajo en parejas a través de la grabación de diálogos en contextos técnicos. Los participantes de esta investigación estudian en una universidad pública ubicada en Guayaquil (Ecuador).

La investigación tiene un diseño mixto. Se incluyeron instrumentos cuantitativos: pruebas iniciales y posteriores, encuestas de inicio y al término de la innovación, así como también una investigación acción. Los datos recogidos responden a tres preguntas de investigación, dos relacionadas a la mejora en la fluidez y uso de vocabulario técnico en diálogos, y una tercera para conocer la perspectiva de los alumnos sobre esta investigación. Los resultados muestran un gran impacto para la producción oral (Cohen's d=2,97, promedio de los componentes de las preguntas uno, dos y tres) y son estadísticamente significativos ($p < .001$). Las perspectivas de los alumnos también cambiaron luego de la innovación.

Con relación a las perspectivas de los alumnos, las medias de las encuestas finales fueron positivas para los componentes de la innovación (trabajo en pareja, planificación y estructuración del diálogo y su grabación). Las implicaciones de este estudio están dirigidas a las autoridades y docentes de inglés como lengua extranjera de otras instituciones de nivel superior, quienes deseen motivar a los estudiantes con lecciones que contengan actividades auténticas y centradas en los alumnos como es el trabajo en parejas y contenido de acuerdo con los intereses de los alumnos.

Palabras claves: trabajo en parejas; diálogos; fluidez; destreza oral; inglés como lengua extranjera; educación superior.

Summary

A participação dos alunos nas aulas de inglês é baixa e evidenciada falta de vocabulário quando são expostos a atividades de fala. Para ajudar os alunos a superar essa situação, essa inovação integrou o trabalho em dupla por meio de diálogos gravados em um contexto técnico. Os participantes estudaram em uma universidade pública localizada em Guayaquil (Equador). Pertenciam à escola de Rede e Telecomunicações.

Foi realizada uma pesquisa de design misto. Instrumentos quantitativos: pré e pós-testes, pré e pós-pesquisas e pesquisa-ação fizeram parte dela. Os dados coletados responderam a três perguntas de pesquisa, duas relacionadas à melhoria da fala em termos de vocabulário e fluência, e uma terceira para conhecer as perspectivas dos alunos em relação a essa inovação. Os resultados mostraram um grande impacto (d de Cohen = 2,97 – média dos três componentes da fala) para a fala devido à inovação (p < ,001).

Em relação às perspectivas dos alunos, os meios do pós-pesquisa foram positivos para os componentes da inovação (trabalho em dupla, planejamento e estruturação e gravação dos diálogos). As implicações deste estudo abordam outras autoridades do ensino superior e professores de EFL que gostariam de envolver os alunos nas aulas com atividades autênticas e centradas no aluno, como trabalho em dupla e conteúdo do campo de interesse dos alunos.

Palavras-chave: revisão de pares; diálogos; fluência; Falando; inglês como uma língua estrangeira; ensino superior.

Introduction and Literature Review

Participants of this study held an A1 level, according to a proficiency test taken online (https://www.kaplaninternational.com/free-english-test-online). This mock test was chosen to determine the proficiency of students. They were students of the Communication Systems and Network school. Before they finish the third level, they need certifications from technological areas like CNN1 Cisco and IBM. Most certifications require spoken communication in English given the personalized teaching of electronic circuits that come from North America. Therefore, reaching standard levels of oral fluency for communication is essential for these language learners. In addition, Ecuadorian policies require university students to meet a B1 level prior to their graduation (Consejo de Educación Superior, 2013).

Roeders (1997) mentioned that to improve education, active learning techniques should be applied. Active learning techniques encourage creativity and participation of students. They are sometimes included in lesson plans to make students autonomous and critical human beings. This study proposes active learning through the use of dialogues created by EFL students. The content was related to students' computing class.

Studies report that students have many reasons for not developing speaking skills (Al-Eiadeh et al., 2016; Derakhshan et al., 2016). Some of those are: confusion, embarrassment, deficiencies of English learning in prior educational levels, difficulties in pronunciation, limited vocabulary, fossilization, lack of confidence, anxiety due to inaccurate utterances, and misunderstanding questions, among others. These conditions worsen when teachers want to develop speaking skills in a non-English speaking country because students are not expose to the language or do not need to use it (Rashtchi & Khoshnevisan, 2008).

In this regard, Derakhshan et al. (2016) pointed out the usefulness of practice, structure, and planning to develop speaking skills. Moreover, Harmer (2007) suggested combining language features in communication. In this context, students need input to create their dialogues. Krashen (2009) mentioned that input is the new information students incorporate to what they already know. He sustained that the focus should be in the meaning. The Council of Europe (2018) considered conversation as a macro-functional basis of the Common European Framework of Reference. It is within the interaction component that transactional language use is visible for information exchanges to obtain goods and services. Therefore, oral practice is better in dialogues to promote communication. If the practice is authentic or simulates real situations, students become engaged. In learning a new language, Rashtchi and Khoshnevisan (2008) added students should also understand how native speakers manage the language in context.

The Ecuadorian Ministry of Education has set student standards taken from the Common European Framework as reference (Ministerio de Educación, 2012). Thus, this study included the ones from the spoken production which served two objectives: for students to start conversations, and for the pair to understand an interlocutor. The standard describes that students in A1 "can understand everyday expressions aimed at the satisfaction of simple needs" (Council of Europe, 2018, p. 84).

This study was based on the principles of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT). In a list of components of CLT, Jacobs and Farrell (2003) proposed teachers to consider: (a) the role of the learner is a key component in the process; (b) teaching is based on process rather than product; (c) school context is connected to the world; (d) individual differences of learners and the of social nature of learning is considered; and, (e) the emphasis is on meaning.

Considering the previous components, pair work through real-life and field-related dialogues matches well the CLT approach. In this research, students were active at writing their dialogues, and then recording in pairs. They applied content related to their field of studies to connect school practices with the world. Then, students shared their recordings in a What's App group created for the purpose of this study.

Alamer and Al Khateeb (2021) reported the advantages and challenges of applying What's App in learning. They highlighted the increase in students' motivation when their teachers use this application. The design of their study was quasi-experimental and their participants were enrolled in two Saudi major universities.

In addition, Oprandy (1999, cited in Jacobs & Farrel, 2003) pointed out the critical role of teachers in the design of pair work activities. When they plan pair work, they should include meaningful tasks. Richards (2006) defined meaningful tasks as those that students will be stored in students' long-time memory. Moreover, teachers must tolerate messiness because of the organization of the tasks while identifying students' needs to meet them accordingly.

In the same venue, Harris and Noyau (1990, cited in Jacobs & Farrel, 2003) sustained that pair work enhances learner's autonomy. They explained that the collaboration among peers raises independence from the teacher, as it happened in other approaches. They also highlight the role of meaningful tasks to retain more information. In this regard, it is important to consider student's preferences of topics.

This research proposes pair work to improve speaking through the creation of dialogues shared in an application. Some considerations about speaking are that it does not only aim at understanding the linguistic features, but it also involves interpreting and knowing the meaning of the message. To this end, important components are vocabulary and grammar (Derakhshan et al., 2015). Lucas (2001) listed other decisions that appear during this process like: being knowledgeable of the topic, organizing thoughts into spoken ideas, structuring the message, and responding to the listeners' feedback. For Backlund (1990 as cited in Al-Eiadeh et al., 2016), the same issues are classified into social, self, and content knowledge. The author added that communication may be impaired if students show deficiencies in one of them.

Speaking involves fluency and accuracy. The first refers to the ability to speak spontaneously and without many pauses. The latter to construct grammatically correct ideas, phrases, or chunks (Derakhshan et al., 2015). For other authors like Bygate, speaking also involves interaction and production. Bygate (1997) defined production as the ability to speak without time limitations; and interaction is produced when pairs negotiate the conversation. Burns and Joyce (1997 as cited in Al-Eiadeh et al, 2016) shared similar points of view. They considered speaking involves interaction to construct meaning. This interaction means not only receiving and processing information but also producing it.

Hence, students require extended, authentic, and meaningful practice (Celce-Murcia, 2001; Jacobs & Farrel, 2003). Celce-Murcia (2001) added that speaking tasks need structure and planning. This author suggested using short dialogues, and a structure of question-answers to start with. Due to students' proficiency level, they required that the structure and planning phases were preceded by vocabulary introduction.

Participants in this study belonged to the school of Network and Telecommunications. Thus, technical vocabulary from their field of study were introduced in readings. According to Mahraj (2018) and Wanpen et al. (2013), learning technical vocabulary is an important factor to students of technical areas of study. Students like to be familiar with the type of English used in their career (Mahraj, 2018). They also need to communicate effectively and convey meaning of that communication in their fields (Wanpen et al., 2013). Mahraj (2018) classified vocabulary into two main categories. The first one refers to the ones found in academic texts. The second one refers to the lexicon that is associated with specific areas of study. To the previous classification, Wanpen et al. (2013) added that sometimes the meaning of words varies, or they can be unique if they are used in specific areas. For Mahraj (2018), vocabulary enhances students' performance in the four skills of the language. The study of this author promoted grammar rules to raise students' knowledge of technical vocabulary.

To improve speaking, there are many research studies in the context of EFL that have investigated teacher's and students' perspectives of role plays (Krebt, 2017; Tran, 2016); the use of improvisation techniques for transactional and interpersonal conversation (Hadeli, 2017); self-recording videos (Rojas & Arteaga, 2019); and audiotaped dialogue journal (Rashtchi & Khoshnevisan, 2008). In the last study, students interacted with the teacher talking about a variety of topics. The purpose of the teacher, as in a regular dialogue, was to be an active interlocutor who responded to students' written work. Ho (2003 as cited in Rashtchi & Khoshnevisan, 2008) reported that dialogue journals are excellent resource of input to ease appropriate output. Recent studies report the use of revoicing or dubbing to improve production skills (Ávila-Cabrera, 2022; Bolaños & Navarrete, 2022; Talaván, 2021).

This study proposed that students work in pairs to create a dialogue after topics that were introduced. Pairs could rehearse before recording and uploading the audio file to the What's App group. When recording the dialogues, students may demonstrate difficulties like one of the pair trying to dominate the conversation, speaking very low and not clearly, ignoring the pair, or making constant interruptions (Backlund, 1990 as cited in Al-Eiadeh et al., 2016).

Methodology

Design

To determine improvement, a mixed design was implemented. It included qualitative and quantitative instruments. The design applied was a mixed methods design. Following Laverty's process (2018), this study includes quantitative instruments at the beginning, a qualitative intervention, and quantitative instruments at the end. It finishes with the interpretation of the results. In this study, the quantitative instruments were surveys at the beginning and at the end as well as pre and posttests. The qualitative intervention was action research. This design was adopted to answer the following research questions:

1. To what extent does pair work through dialogues improve spoken fluency?
2. To what extent will dialogues improve technical vocabulary?
3. What are students' perspectives towards this intervention?

Participants

Forty students from two different groups participated in this study. They were Engineering and Networks majors. Their English proficiency was A1, according to a test taken online (https://www.kaplaninternational.com/free-english-test-online). Their ages ranged from 18 - 40 years (M = 20.12, SD = 3.78). They were in the third semester of the school of Mathematics and Physics at a public university in Guayaquil. Some of the participants came from nearby cities. These two groups were assigned to the teacher-researcher. They had similar limitations in speaking, that was the reason to implement the study in both classes. When there were speaking activities, the researcher observed that students did not actively participate. Their responses were single word or phrases. They completed all activities in this research. There were not students excluded.

Instruments, pre and posttest

A pre and post-test provided statistical information to know if the application of dialogues improved students' speaking. They answered research questions one (To what extent does pair work through dialogues improve spoken fluency?), and two (To what extent will dialogues improve technical vocabulary). The pretest was the first recording students did in pairs. Students had to create a dialogue in pairs, record, and share it with the teacher in the What's App group. The same procedure was observed for the posttest.

The intervention lasted six weeks. In-between the pre and posttest, there were five practices with different topics related to students' area of study.

Recordings were graded using a rubric that included components: fluency (speaking spontaneously and without many pauses), and vocabulary (technical vocabulary). The highest grade for each component was 5 and the lowest 1. The maximum grade students could get was 15. It was expected that students start with an average of the lowest band and move to the second band. To avoid bias in the results, the posttests were graded by a colleague.

Survey

Participants completed two surveys. The pre-survey was developed to get demographic information to describe the participants. This survey was made up of four questions. They were multiple choice items. In some cases, it asked students to provide reasons for their responses.

This survey also included items with a Likert scale that goes from Totally Disagree (5) to Totally Agree (1). The items were taken from the literature review regarding speaking difficulties. There was also a section about classroom activities in general, in speaking specifically, and pair work to know background information of students about their previous learning experiences.

The post survey included a Likert scale. The items related to students' feelings when speaking, speaking activities they practiced, dialogues, and pair work. Similar items were compared to determine if students changed their perspectives as a result of the innovation.

Both surveys were built in groups of ideas according to each main variable, following Christensen and Knezek (2017) procedure. The section of the Likert scale provided data to answer research question number three about students' perspectives towards the technical dialogues to improve their spoken fluency. The surveys were piloted with a different group to improve the instrument. It underwent a process of validation by three experts in the field of English as a Foreign Language. Their comments were considered to improve the consistency of the survey. Conbrach alpha was .76 in the pre-survey and .82 in the post-survey which is interpret as a good internal reliability (Oviedo & Campo-Arias, 2005).

Data Analysis

This study includes a mixed-design. Once the normality of the data was found, parametric tests were used. Quantitative data from the pre and post-test was entered in a spreadsheet. Then, the data was exported to the SPSS. Descriptive statistics were run like minimum, maximum, mean, and standard deviation. The means were compared and contrasted to know if there was an improvement through a pair t-test. The mean and the standard deviation were entered in an online calculator to get the effect size and determine if the use of dialogues had an impact in students' speaking fluency and use of technical vocabulary.

Survey responses were coded and registered in a spreadsheet. Later, it was reported in a table with the means and standard deviation to analyze if the perspectives of students prior and after the innovation changed. To test the reliability of the surveys, the Conbrach alpha's coefficient is included.

Action Research

Once the teacher identified the problem of students in speaking, a lesson plan was developed to introduce the practice of dialogues. The implementation lasted six weeks. Classes were held on Tuesday,

Wednesday, and Friday for two hours each day. The content was taken from the regular coursebook and from adapted material related to Net and Telecommunication which is students' field of study. As suggested by Celce-Murcia (2001), students planned and structured their dialogues before practicing them. The planning was in pairs. They had to write and read a dialogue that reflected their understanding of the passages. This practice was done after introducing the topics and completing the activities of the book.

To raise students' confidence and lower their anxiety levels, they practiced their lines before they recorded their conversations. The teacher monitored the process and provided feedback if needed. Students could use other aids like pronunciation applications from google to help them improve their utterances. Those aids were provided by the teacher or students could search the ones of their preferences. Students typed in the search engine (google) the sentence, question, phrase, or word and listened to them as many times as they felt necessary.

After each practice, students used a rubric (Appendix 1) to self-assess their work. This was introduced by the teacher. It was used with an example of a recording. Students assessed their work to improve it in the next delivery. This process was repeated five times. By the end of the implementation, the first and last recordings were considered as pre and posttest.

Results

Results of a preliminary survey, related to students' background, indicated that students practiced English outside classes for about two hours. Twenty-two students said they spoke English to relatives or friends. The ones that did not practice mentioned as the main reason the lack of money to do so. Sixteen students reported to use technology to learn English.

Interestingly, students that did not use technology explained that it was dangerous (13), they also said they lack resources (10), and there was one student that indicated he did not have the necessity to practice English outside classes. Most students (30) agreed that teachers should use technology in the classroom. They considered technology makes learning interesting and entertaining.

To use parametric or non-parametric measures, Kolmogorov-Smirnov normality test indicated that the data was not normally distributed ($p > .001$). Thus, parametric tests were applied. The first research question addressed to what extent dialogues improved fluency. Table 1 shows that there was an improvement in this component of the rubric. It means students spoke spontaneously and without many pauses their dialogues. After rehearsing, they did not use their lines to read as they did at the beginning. The result of $p < .001$ indicates that the findings are statistically significant. According to the scale provided by Plonsky and Oswald (2014), a result of Cohen's $d = 3.13$ is interpreted as having a large magnitude of impact.

Table 1
Results of the pre and posttest for fluency

	Min	Max	Mean	SD	*p* value	Cohen's *d*
Pre	1	3	1.75	.716	.000	3.13
Post	3	5	3.95	.686		

Note: Viteri Guevara, X. O. (2019) for Master's thesis, Universidad Casa Grande. Departamento de Posgrado.

The second research question referred to the incidence of dialogues in terms of technical vocabulary. Table 2 evidence an improvement as result of the innovation, p < .001 indicates that the results were statistically significant. There is a large impact for learning, too (Cohen's d = 3.17).

Table 2
Results of the pre and posttest for technical vocabulary

	Min	Max	Mean	SD	*p* value	Cohen's *d*
Pre	1	3	2.15	.671	.000	3.17
Post	3	5	4.10	.553		

Note: Viteri Guevara, X. O. (2019) for Master's thesis, Universidad Casa Grande. Departamento de Posgrado.

These results indicate that there was improvement in all components of the rubric to a large extent. They are all statistically significant. From all components that the rubric evaluated for speaking, the one that improved the most was vocabulary.

For the last question, students provided their perspectives towards the components of this intervention. The following table summarizes the most relevant perspectives from pre and post results of the survey for the variables of this study.

There was a change in students' perspectives from their feelings when they speak which were negative (totally agree=5) at the beginning to positive at the end (totally disagree=1). On the other hand, there was a low mean for the items that involved the aspects of planning and recording the dialogue in the pre-test. That result improved in the post-survey which indicates that students structured what they were going to record.

Table 3
Results of the pre and post survey.

When you speak in English, you …	Pre M(SD)	Post M(SD)
Feel confused for not knowing what to say.	3.15(.98)	1.87(.64)
Feel afraid of making mistakes pronunciation, grammar.	3.61(.96)	1.75(.59)
Translate everything you want to say.	3.46(.69)	1.77(.77)
Can't continue the conversation because of lack of vocabulary.	3.29(1.02)	1.75(.77)
Speak with not many pauses.	3.54(.96)	1.8(.85)
Planning and Recording the Dialogue	Pre	Post
Created dialogues to practice with peers.	2.49(.54)	3.48(.64)
Write a dialogue from ideas from the book.	2.49(.51)	3.9(.84)
Write a dialogue about a conversation related to your field.	2.44(.52)	3.9(.78)
Practice a dialogue about general ideas.	2.78(.63)	4(.93)
Practice a dialogue related to Net and Telecommunication.	2.73(.71)	3.78(.77)

Note: Viteri Guevara, X. O. (2019) for Master's thesis, Universidad Casa Grande. Departamento de Posgrado.

In the next table, the items on the left were included in the pre-survey and the ones on the right were added in the post-survey. Students checked the answers of neutral and disagree (3-2) at the beginning, and the tendency moved to agree and totally agree at the end.

Table 4

Results of the pre and post survey about pair work.

Pair work			
Pair work is useful to practice speaking.	2.68 (.55)	We worked equally.	3.97 (.53)
Pair work for speaking is difficult because the student who knows more dominates the conversation.	3.02 (.85)	We agreed in the flow of the conversation.	3.75 (.78)
It is not advisable because some pairs speak slowly.	2.73 (.68)	It was easy to work in pairs to give more ideas.	3.92 (.86)
It is not advisable because some pairs do not pronounce correctly.	2.80 (.73)	There was interaction when planning the dialogue.	3.88 (.82)
The pair makes constant interruptions.	2.90 (.86)	There was interaction when practicing.	4.55 (.64)
		There was interaction during the recording.	4.22 (.58)

Note: Viteri Guevara, X. O. (2019) for Master's thesis, Universidad Casa Grande. Departamento de Posgrado.

The following results reflect students' perspectives towards the implementation of dialogues to improve their fluency. These items were included in the post-survey. The mean of each item refers to neutral (3), agree (4), and totally agree (5).

Table 5

Results of the pre and post survey

Writing the dialogue helped me recall vocabulary.	3.72(.85)
When we recorded the dialogues, we did not have many pauses.	4.30(.57)
Dialogues are useful to practice speaking.	4.12(.69)
Dialogues are difficult because the student who knows more dominates the conversation.	3.80(.82)

Note: Viteri Guevara, X. O. (2019) for Master's thesis, Universidad Casa Grande. Departamento de Posgrado.

The positive results evidence the impact of recording dialogues to improve speaking in general, and specifically in fluency. This practice also contributed to expand students' knowledge of technical vocabulary. Their points of view demonstrated that they agreed with this implementation.

Discussion

In regards to speaking, some authors consider linguistic features like vocabulary and grammar (Derakhshan et al., 2015), others mention decisions about topic, organization or ideas, structure of the message, and responding to the listeners' feedback (Lucas, 2001). For Backlund (1990 as cited in Al-Eiadeh

et al., 2016), the same topics are classified into social, personal and content knowledge. In the first recording, deficiencies were detected in the creation of dialogues. Students were very slow and unclear. At the end, they managed to create more spontaneous dialogues, they were more confident when speaking and had a fluid expression when working in pairs. This may be the effect of including the social (pair work), personal (students' individual contributions to the task), and content knowledge (technical vocabulary) as stated by Blacklund (1990 cited in Al-Eiadeh et al., 2016).

Lucas (2001) contributed with some decisions that students make when they speak; for example: being knowledgeable of the topic, organizing thoughts into spoken ideas, structuring the message, and responding to the listeners' feedback. In this study, students did not respond to feedback; but, they were knowledgeable of the topic, they organized their thoughts in writing, and practiced several times to record the voice message that was uploaded to the What's App group.

Passages chosen were related to their field of study, Backlund (1990 as cited in Al-Eiadeh et al., 2016) referred to this as content knowledge. Thus, this component may have motivated students to participate in the activity and learn technical vocabulary that they have not seen in previous English classes. Teaching technical vocabulary not only aims to understand linguistic characteristics, but also implies interpreting and knowing the meaning of the message (Derakhshan et al., 2015). In the first recording, the vocabulary was very limited, there was no way to build relevant dialogues that were understood by the couple. In the analysis of post-recordings, it was determined that students produced coherent sentences and phrases connected with the words and topics that were introduced.

About technical vocabulary, Mahraj (2018) and Wanpen et al. (2013) agreed that it is an important factor in the career of students. Students find it useful to be familiar with technical words, since they could relate this content with their classes in Spanish. It was noticed that students did not translate the passages but they structured the dialogues according to the main ideas of the content. Wanpen et al. (2013) sustained that the meaning of the words can be unique is they are used in specific areas. The technical words for students of engineering and networks are similar in English and Spanish. Therefore, that connection may have contributed to the improvement in speaking of this study and the reduction or not use of translation.

As suggested by Celce-Murcia (2001) as well as Jacobs and Farrel (2003), students had several extended and meaningful practice. Celce-Murcia (2001) recommended structuring and planning the speaking activities. This structure and planning was done by students. They created the lines that were recorded in pairs. The teacher monitored their work. It was noticed that all students participated. They were engaged and involved until they finished the activity. However, they needed time to plan, rehearse, and record their dialogues.

Students' perspectives towards speaking report they had problems when they spoke (confusion, afraid of making mistakes, long pauses, lack of vocabulary). After the study, those opinions were reduced. Students' responses to the survey indicated that they had not been exposed to the process of writing dialogues and recording them. They did not believe in pair work. They considered it useless, and difficult due to circumstances like: pairs speaking slowly, mispronunciation, and interruptions. That perspective also changed to positive reactions towards pair work. In terms of the innovation, students gave the highest scores to recording dialogues and to improve fluency.

These positive perspectives towards the variable of the innovation may have been due to the principles of CLT applied: focusing on the role of learner, teaching the process, emphasizing on meaning, and connecting school to the real world. With pair work, these students relied less on the teacher. This means they were becoming autonomous learners (Jacobs & Farrell, 2003).

Conclusions

Once a limitation in speaking was observed in English classes, pair work and recording of dialogues were implemented to overcome that situation. Another component was that technical English related to students' field of study was included in the lessons. Students had to plan and organize their thoughts in writing before they recorded the dialogues.

The first recordings were short, they were simple, and they had communication errors. Sharing passages that connected content of students' interest to create dialogues had a great impact on speaking skills and its components: fluency, accuracy, vocabulary, and interaction. All students had the opportunity to participate, it was a student-centered activity.

At the end of the intervention, it was observed that students did not need the teacher to structure their conversations. Thus, this student-centered activity raised their autonomy and self-confidence in their speaking production. Another finding was that students did not only listen to their recordings but those of others. They could have been comparing and contrasting their work.

To conclude, the implementation of this innovation not only upgraded students' speaking but it also changed their perspectives towards pair work and speaking itself. They considered the components of this innovation helped them improve in accuracy, pronunciation, and fluency. This research extended the positive quantitative results to a kind of autonomy, confidence, and extended listening. However, the findings should be interpreted with caution due to the number of students (40).

Limitations and Recommendations

In the research process, one of the main limitations was to analyze and select the materials to prepare the lesson plan. There is a lack of resources in the educational institution. However, it was possible to adapt activities, so they do not require the use of other technology like: projectors, computers, or the internet. It is suggested to determine the level of the students to select the material according to their proficiency. A proficiency or placement test is thus required.

There was not a control group. The teacher-researcher implemented the innovation in the two groups that he was assigned because they both had speaking difficulties. For future research, a control group can be considered to raise validity in the research.

In order to better explain or support quantitative results, interviews should be carried out. This will lead to richer conclusions. Parts of the survey can be turned into questions to get information that reinforces the quantitative data.

There were some organization limitations like crowded classes, and poor attendance of students. They usually arrived late because they travel to the university from their hometowns which are located nearby. Sometimes they reported to have economic problems to pay the transportation.

Lastly, students were expected to use the computers in the laboratory to record their dialogues and to search for information to improve the draft they had made in classes. However, there was a protocol to ask for the room because it was available for all faculty. Besides, the time allowed for each group was limited amount.

Instead and to continue with the intervention, students used their mobile phones to record the dialogues. It was specially challenging to monitor and practice speaking in the computer lab in the institution where this action research took place for different reasons, namely: Not everyone could upload their work to the platforms because the microphones did not work appropriately, limited connectivity, the time was not enough, and there were not computers for each student.

References

Al-Eiadeh, A., Al.Sobh, M., Al-Zoubi, S., Al-Khasawneh, F. (2016). Improving English language speaking skills of Ajloun National university students. *International Journal of English and Education, 5*(3), 181-195.

Alamer, A., & Al Khateeb, A. (2021). Effects of using the What's App application on language learners motivation: A controlled investigation using structural equation modeling. *Computer Assisted Language Learning, 2021,* 1-27. https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2021.1903042

Ávila-Cabrera, J. (2022). Improving oral production skills in the Business English class through creative dubbing. *Journal of English for Specific Purposes at Tertiary Level, 10*(1), 99-122. https://doi.org/10.18485/esptoday.2022.10.1.5

Barnawi, Osman. (2011). Examining Formative Evaluation of an English for Specific *Purposes Program.* (Master's Thesis). https://search.proquest.com/docview/867369327/7BFD87DD91074940PQ/1?accountid=174323

Bolaños, A., & Navarrete, M. (2022). An action-oriented approach to didactic dubbing in foreign language education: Students as producers. *XLinguae, 15*(2), 103-120. https://doi.org/10.18355/XL.2022.15.02.08

British Council. (2015). *English in Argentina.* https://englishagenda.britishcouncil.org/sites/default/files/attachments/english_in_argentina.pdf

Bygate, M. (1997). *Speaking.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Celce-Murcia, M. (2001). *Teaching English as a Second Language or Foreign Language* (2nd. Ed.). New York: Newbury House.

Cabrera Davalos, S. P. (2021). *Peer Feedback to Improve Speaking Facilitated with Mobile Devices* (Master's thesis, Universidad Casa Grande. Departamento de Posgrado).

Christensen, R., & Knezek, G. (2017). Validating a mobile learning readiness survey: Assessing teachers' dispositions towar adoption. *Journal of Digital Learning in Teacher Education, 33*(4), 148-159. https://doi.org/10.1080/21532974.2017.1347536

Consejo de Educación Superior. (2013). *Reglamento de Régimen Académico.* http://www.ces.gob.ec/lotaip/2017/Diciembre/Anexos%20Procu/An-lit-a2-Reglamento%20de%20R%C3%A9gimen%20Acad%C3%A9mico.pdf

Council of Europe. (2018). *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press

Derakhshan, A., Khalili, A., & Beheshti, F. (2016). Developing EFL learner's speaking ability, accuracy and fluency. *English Language and Literature Studies, 6*(2), 177-186. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/303498787_Developing_EFL_Learner's_Speaking_Ability_Accuracy_and_Fluency

Derakhshan, A., Tahery, F., & Mirarab, N. (2015). Helping adult and young learner to communicate in speaking classes with confidence. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Science, 6*(2), 520-525. https://doi.org/10.5901/mjss.2015.v6n2p520

Hadeli, E. (2017). The effect of improvisation technique towards EFL students' speaking ability. Al-Ta Lim, 24(2), 118. https://doi.org/10.15548/jt.v24i2.290

Harmer, J. (2007). *The practice of English language teaching.* Harlow: Longman.

Jacobs, G., & Farrell, T. (2003). Understanding and Implementing the CLT (Communicative Language Teaching) Paradigm. *RELC Journal, 35*(5), 5-30. doi: https://doi.org/10.1177/003368820303400102

Krashen, S. (2009). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition.* http://www.sdkrashen.com/content/books/principles_and_practice.pdf

Krebt, D. M. (2017). The effectiveness of role play techniques in teaching speaking for EFL college students. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 8*(5), 863870. https://doi.org/10.17507/jltr.0805.04

Laverty, C. (2018). *Educational research: A practical guide. Centre for Teaching and Learning.* https://www.queensu.ca/ctl/sites/webpublish.queensu.ca.ctlwww/files/files/Educational_Research_Guide%20May%202018.pdf

Lucas, S. (2001). *The Art of Public Speaking.* (7th Ed.). Singapore: McGraw-Hill.

Mahraj, M. (2018). Teaching technical vocabulary through word formation rules. *ESPInternational Arab Journal of English for Specific Purposes, 1*(1), 37-44. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/327449200_Teaching_Technical_Vocabulary_through_Word_Formation_Rules

Oviedo, H., & Campo-Arias, A. (2005). Aproximación al uso del coeficiente alfa de Cronbach [An approach to the use of Cronbach's Alpha]. *Revista Colombiana de Psiquiatría, 34*(4), 572-580. https://www.redalyc.org/pdf/806/80634409.pdf

Plonsky, L, & Oswald, F. (2014). How big is "big"? Interpreting effect sizes in L2 research. *Language Learning, a Journal of Research in Language Studies, 64*(4), 878-912. https://doi.org/10.1111/lang.12079

Rashtchi, M., & Khoshnevisan, B. (2008). Audiotaped dialogue journal: A technique to improve speaking skill of Iranian EFL learners. *The Journal of Applied Linguistics, 1*(3),164-176. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/306959487_Audiotaped_Dialogue_Journal_A_Technique_to_Improve_Speaking_Skill_of_Iranian_EFL_Learners

Richards, J. (2006). *Communicative language teaching.* Cambridge University Press.

Roeders, P. (1997). *Learning together.* Lima: WALKIRIA Cultural Society.

Rojas, M., & Arteaga, S. (2019). Perceptions about self-recording videos to develop EFL speaking skills in two Ecuadorian universities. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 10*(1), 60-67. https://doi.org/10.17507/jltr.1001.07

Talaván, N. (2021). Las voces superpuestas: Fundamentos y aplicaciiones didácticas [Overlapping voices: Foundations and applications]. In C. Botella & B. Agulló (Eds.), *Mujeres en la traducción audiovisual. Perspectivas desde el mundo académico y professional* (pp. 69-90). Sindéresis.

Tran, H. (2016). *EFL students' and teachers' perspectives on the use of role-play in teaching English in the Vietnamese context*. (Doctoral dissertation). https://search.proquest.com/docview/1868414593/DD805B54196B4251PQ/2?acc ountid=174323

Vélez-Palacios, A. A., & Ramírez-Ávila, M. R. (2023). Peer feedback and its impact in the writing process of International Baccalaureate students in a public institution. *YUYAY: Estrategias, Metodologías & Didácticas Educativas*, *1*(2), 26-39.https://doi.org/10.59343/yuyay.v1i2.14

Viteri Guevara, X. O. (2019). *Dialogues to Promote Speaking in Students of the School of Network and Telecommunications* (Master's thesis, Universidad Casa Grande. Departamento de Posgrado).

Wanpen, S., Sonkoontod, K., & Nonkukhetkhong, K. (2013). Technical vocabulary proficiencies and vocabulary learning strategies of engineering students. *Procedia*

- Social and Behavioral Sciences, 88, 312-320. https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/82380139.pdf