DELIVERY, LANGUAGE USE AND TOPIC DEVELOPMENT IN SPEAKING OF EFL STUDENTS

Ariel E. San Jose[1i],
Jerome R. Vicencio[2]
[1]Lecturer, Faculty of Foundation Studies
Gulf College, Oman
[2]Program Leader, Faculty of Foundation Studies
Gulf College, Oman

Abstract:

Learning speaking beyond the adolescent period can be compared hiking in a treacherous mountain. This mixed method research was conducted to uncover the speaking abilities particularly in the aspects of delivery, language use, topic development and phonetic challenges. Using the Integrated Speaking Rubrics, Extent of Use of First Language, and interviews, the researchers found that all aspects were poor. Moreover, several language challenges were identified. Elaborations were provided in the results, discussions and conclusions.

Keywords: delivery, language use, topic development, speaking skills, EFL students, Gulf College

1. Introduction

English language is massively learned by all races in the world today. With globalization, its influenced has felt not only by all nationalities but even so by the patriotically inclined nations. But while the English skills of people in most countries are improving, Arab countries' English proficiency remained at worst stage. Sawahel (2015) mentioned that in the 2015 report of EF-English Proficiency Index, 12 Arab countries were at the driver seat. Oman was ranked 70th among the 80 countries included in the survey. Oman was described as having very low proficiency.

Shabbir and Bughio (2013) mentioned that pronunciation of English words is a problem among Arabic learners because Arab speakers often use Arabic phonetics to

---

[i] Correspondence: email arielsanjose74@gmail.com

pronounce words. Hence, substitutions of sounds are heard rampantly among Arabic speakers, which according to San Jose and Vicencio (2016) are even manifested in writing. Moreover, Rabab'ah (2002) noticed that language usage is also another challenge among Arabic speakers because Arabic and English contexts are uniquely different.

Arabic learners of English generally can't speak in English well because they rarely have the opportunity to use it. English is not recognized as an official, second, or educational language rather as a foreign language. In a random mapping conducted among Gulf College students, results revealed that generally students only use (four skills) English inside the classroom. It also showed that they had even studying English for more than 8 years and they started learning English since they were 10 –15 years old. It further revealed that students speak in English occasionally. It implied that students lack the venue and motivation to use English for communication.

With this in mind, the researchers conducted this study to determine and explore students' discourse delivery, use of language, and topic development.

2. Research Questions

The primary goal of this mixed method research was to uncover the speaking abilities of the English as Foreign Language (EFL) students who took English for three semesters.
Particularly, this study sought to answer the following questions:
1. What is the level of delivery in speaking of the students?
2. What is the level of language use in speaking of the students?
3. What is the level of topic development in speaking of the students?
4. What are the challenges encountered by students in speaking?

3. Theoretical Lens

This study was anchored on the contentions of two theories. First, was the *Behaviourist Learning Theory.* The major principle of this theory rests on the analyses of human behavior in observable stimulus-response interaction and the association between them (Watson, 1913). It also points out that learning a language is 'habit formation and performance' (Brooks, 1960). Thus, it is true that language is controlled by the consequences of behavior. This theory was applicable in this study because part of the determination of the speaking delivery, language formation, and topic development of the participants was their extent of use of their first language (Arabic) which constituted to their behavior to the learning of second language.

Second, was the *Critical Age Hypothesis* developed by Lenneberg (1967). This concept contended that second language learners who started studying the language when they were below their adolescent age may 'generally achieve higher second language proficiency' compared to those who learn the second language during their adulthood. Although the participants of the study were not pre-judged of their abilities of learning English as their second language, it was evident that their progression of learning a second language was steady or very slow. As mentioned by Krashen (1973) and Krashen, Long and Scarcella (1979) that adult learners may learn a second language but in much lesser development than a young child.

4. Method

Presented in this chapter are the methods and procedures used in this study. The presentation includes the research design, research participants, research instrument used, and procedures in gathering the information.

4.1 Research Design

In obtaining the pertinent information, many language practitioners and researchers are in agreement that more than one method is recommended to make the findings credible and valid. Some of these methods can be situational observations, analysis of spoken through written texts and interviews (Waters, 1996; Benesch, 1996; Barkhuizen, 1998). In this research, quantitative and qualitative methods were considered. The recorded speaking mock exams, following the IELTS format, of students who had taken English subjects for two semesters were inter-rated. In determining the level of delivery, language use and topic development, the researcher used the Integrated Speaking Rubrics (2014). To support the quantitative data, the researchers conducted situational observations including casual interviews with the students. Moreover, a mapping survey questionnaire on Extent of Use of First Language (San Jose, 2011) was used to gather information regarding the utilization of the students' first language in the classroom, at home, at school and with other people. All these were done to make comparisons and triangulations of results.

4.2 Participants

This study had two sets of participants. First, were the 60 General Foundation Program (GFP) students. These students took English subjects for three semesters. Second, was a group of teachers who had taught English for more than two semesters.

4.3 Research Instruments

This study utilized three instruments in obtaining information which were essential in the formulation of results, discussions, and conclusions. First, was the Integrated Speaking Rubrics. This standardized instrument measured the students' speaking delivery, language use and topic development. Second, was the utilization of Extent of Use of First Language to gather information regarding the use of the students' first language in the classroom, at home, and in dealing with other people. Lastly, was the interview guide questionnaire which was used to obtain relevant information from a group of teachers who handled English subject particularly speaking module. The information gathered from this instrument was used in triangulating with the first two information obtained.

Table 1: Scale Use in Rating the Speeches

Range	Description	General Verbal Interpretation
3.28 – 4.0	Very Good	The response fulfills the demands of the task, with at most minor lapses in completeness. It is highly intelligible and exhibits sustained, coherent discourse.
2.52 – 3.27	Good	The response addresses the task appropriately, but may fall short of being fully developed. It is generally intelligible and coherent, with some fluidity of expression, though it exhibits some noticeable lapses in the expression of ideas.
1.76 – 2.51	Poor	The response is connected to the task, though it may be missing some relevant information or contains inaccuracies. It contains some intelligible speech, but at times problems with intelligibility and/or overall coherence may obscure meaning.
1.0 – 1.75	Very Poor	The response is very limited in content or coherence or is only minimally connected to the task. Speech may be largely unintelligible.

4.4 Procedures in Gathering Information

The sources of information of this study were primarily through the Integrated Speaking Rubrics, Extent of Use of First Language Questionnaire, and interview guide questions.

Particularly, the following steps were conducted:

A. Mapping

Before the formulation of research proposal, a mapping was conducted among the selected students of the Faculty of Foundation Studies. They were asked to answer the Extent of Use of First Language. Additionally, pop-up or casual interviews among the English teachers were done. Through these, we had a grasp of the problem in speaking of the students. Hence, we formulated a proposal for the study.

B. Choosing of Speaking Materials

After the proposal was formulated, we had a brainstorm on the credible source of speaking materials. We decided to record the speaking mock exams because it was conducted on the 8th week of the semester. The speaking mock exam was considered as a practice test in

preparation for the finals which happened on the 14th week. We also purposely and conveniently decided to get 60 recorded samples.

C. Inter-rater Marking

After the recorded mock speaking exams were obtain, we subjected the recorded exam to be rated by two English teachers. In rating the speaking mock exams, we used the Integrated Speaking Rubrics. The rubrics measured the delivery, which refers to the clarity, fluency, pronunciation, enunciation, and intonations of English words. It also looked into the language use, which refers to the control of basic and complex grammatical structures, coherence, and choice of words. Lastly, the rubrics also measured the topic development, which looked into the clarity of responses, progression of ideas, and conveying of relevant information appropriate to the topic.

D. Formulation of Interview Guide Questions

We prepared an interview guide questionnaire based on the areas of assessment found in the Integrated Speaking Rubrics. This was done to attain alignment and triangulation of results. Triangulation according to Casey and Murphy (2009) is an essential process using multiple sources of information to draw sound judgment. Carter, Bryant-Lukosius, DiCenso, Blythe, and Neville, (2014) averred that in qualitative research, triangulation measures the validity of information while Johnson, O'Hara, Hirst, Weyman, Turner, Mason and Siriwardena (2017) mentioned that triangulation is met when information are obtained from sources of similar context.

E. Conduct of Interview among Teachers

To have a strong claim on the results of this study, we decided to have interviews with English teachers who taught speaking to the General Foundation students for at least two semesters. Before the formal recorded interview, we supply the teachers with interview guide questions for them to be familiar with the questions.

F. Data analysis of information

After the recorded mock speaking was inter-rated, its results were given to a statistician to determine the level of delivery, language use and topic development; on the other hand, the information gathered from the interview among the teachers were given to the data analyst. The results of the two information were presented in the results of the study.

5. Trustworthiness of the Study

Truthlikeness was one of the issues in qualitative research. Thus, researchers need to address four important aspects in doing qualitative research. Shenton (2004) and Creswell (2007) offered four significant steps, credibility, transferability, dependability and confirmability.

Polit and Beck (2012) defined credibility as the truthfulness of the information presented by the investigators. It is enhanced by a thorough descriptions and verifications of information. For Sandelowski (1986) credibility is attained if the topic under investigation is shared by other individuals. Hence, Cope (2014) mentioned that researchers need to be involved. In this research, the researchers used the inter-rater method to make the results non-biased. Moreover, gathered information from the interview were presented to the teachers for self-verification. Further, both quantitative and qualitative information were subjected to statistical and data analysis. Lastly, the mapping conducted before the conduct of research proved that the speaking skills of the participants were similar to other students.

Dependability is the constancy of information in similar situations (Polit and Beck, 2012; Tobin & Begley, 2004); and repeatability of the concept (Trochim, 2006; Koch, 2006). In this research, dependability was observed because this current research is a repetition of a study conducted by San Jose in 2011 on dialectal variations and its effect to the speaking proficiency. Similar procedures and theory were followed; however, with different participants.

Confirmability, according to Polit and Beck (2012) and Tobin and Begley (2004) is a clear manifestation of genuine responses of the participants to the questions raised and not the researchers' opinions. Thus, all results and discussions should reflect the information gathered. In this research, confirmability was established through the audit trail and coding applied in the information gathered particularly in the interview with the teachers. Moreover, verbatim of the interviews were included in the presentation of results. Lastly, all data could be verified upon the request of the readers.

Transferability is the applicability of the findings of research (Houghton, Casey, Shaw, and Murphy, 2013; Polit and Beck, 2012); sufficiency of information, capable of being "fit" or transferable (Sandelowski, 1986); clear description of the context (Cobbo and Forbes, 2002; Creswell, 2007; Elo and Kyngas, 2008; Lincoln and Guba, 1985). In this study, we made a thorough presentation of the objectives of the study, the methods, the theory, the steps in gathering information, the results, the analysis, the discussions and the implications. All these parts were handled with utmost clarity. Moreover, the presentation of results and discussions were all essential information necessary to answer the research questions. On the other hand, Cope (2014) mentioned that transferability is dependent on the goal while Patterson and Ambrosini (2015) averred that transferability is achieved by making faithful to the context. In this study, the aim was clear and all information was solely focused on the delivery, language use, and topic development in speaking of the participants.

5.1 Limitations of the Study

This study only considered 60 recorded speaking samples. The students involved were from the Faculty of Foundation Studies. Specialization students (post GFP students) were not included because they didn't have English modules. Moreover, four English teachers were involved in the interview. Further, this study used the quantitative and qualitative methods. Quantitative information was taken from the markings of the inter-rater and the qualitative information was obtained from the interviews. Due to these limitations, a bigger number of participants may be used so that generalization can be given. San Jose (2012) pointed out due to limited samples 'results may not be applied to general populations because they were only representation of the samples.'

6. Results and Discussions

This section presents the findings of the study. Tables were included in the presentation of the quantitative information while verbatim statements obtained from the interviews were presented. Further, for the purpose of audit trail, codes were assigned to the verbatim text.

Table 2: Level of Delivery in Speaking Respondents

Aspect	Mean	Description	Specific Verbal Interpretation
Delivery	1.98	Poor	Speech is clear at times, though it exhibits problems with pronunciation, intonation, or pacing and some may require significant listener effort. Speech may not be sustained at a consistent level throughout. Problems with intelligibility may obscure meaning in places but not throughout.

Shown in Table 2 was the level of delivery in speaking. It indicated that students had a very poor performance in this aspect. This result was confirmed by the information obtained from the teachers. The teachers generally observed that students had complication on how to sound English words. Thus, it hindered them to speak with fluency and fluidity. Typically, students stuttered, stammered and repeated most of the words. It was an implication of their struggles in making the words sound correct.

> *"In terms of delivery, some of them were not fluent. Some, when you talk to them stammer and stutter"* T1P1L5

> *"…one of the problems they actually face especially pronunciation, fluidity. Not all of them can speak with spontaneity"* T2P1L11-12

"I find it hard to comprehend the meaning of their speech because they have inhibitions and they have pronunciation problems and the way they pronounce words" T4P1L42-43

The problem of sounding the English words correctly which hinders the fluency of the students can be attributed to the second language learners' first language. Generally, this is common to all second language learners.

For example, Filipinos have difficulty with /f/ and /p/ and cluster consonants; Thais have pronunciation problem with consonants and vowels, words ending with a consonant; consonant clusters; words with /ei/ sounded as /e/; /r/ sounded as /l/; /v/ usually pronounced as /f/; and /z/ sounded /s/ or voiceless; intonation of questions; and stress problems (Wei and Zhou, 2002); Japanese find it hard to identify and produce English /r/ and /l/ (Goto, 1971); Spanish find /i/-/ɪ/ contrast, a contrast which is not present in their mother tongue, difficult to perceive and produce (Flege and MacKay, 2004). However, these results are contrary to Corder (1967), Dulay and Burt (1974), and Krashen and Pon (1975) that differences in languages do not always cause difficulties and many errors produced are not always due to inter-lingual interference. This study supports Flege's Speech Learning Model which points out that learner's second language performance depends on the *'relationship between the mother tongue and the target language'* - in this study, Arabic and English. It further explains that the greater the distance of the perceived L2 sound and the closest L1 sound, the more likely it is that the phonetic differences. Eckman, Elreyes and Iverson (2003) points out in Perceptual Interference that second language learners use their mother tongue's phonetic cues to perceive and produce second language phonemes; hence, it causes phonetic interference between the two. On the other hand, Benrabah (1997) observes that Arabic learners make incorrect stress placement when they speak in English. Al-Saidat (2010) finds that Arabic learners unmindfully *'add an anaptyctic vowel in the onset as well as in the coda of certain English syllables'* this is so because of the nature of the Arabic language. Also, Khan (2011) observes that the confusion of Arabic learners between /f/ and /v/ sound, the confusion in the uses of /s/ and /c/, the inability to distinguish between /sh/ and /ch/, the emphasis on doubling /m/ sounds, and writing what they pronounce make then struggle in speaking English correctly.

In summary, students' inability to make a good pronunciation of English words is influenced by their use of their mother language. Their lack of recognition of the English sounds cause inhibitions.

Table 3: Level of Language Use in Speaking of Respondents

Aspect	Mean	Description	Specific Verbal Interpretation
Language Use	1.86	Poor	The response is limited in the range and control of vocabulary and grammar demonstrated (some complex structures may be used, but typically contain errors). This results in limited or vague expression of relevant ideas and imprecise or inaccurate connections. Automaticity of expression may only be evident at the phrasal level.

Presented in Table 3 is the level of language use in speaking. This result showed that students had poor English vocabulary and syntax. According to the teachers, students only used the simplest words in their utterances, an indication that students had limited knowledge of English syntax.

"hmm.. most of them could only tell simple sentences. So, and then some of them are not actually answering in a coherent way" T2P1L15-16

".. there is wrong with their grammar… grammar, that's the problem… It takes them minutes or seconds to answer because they do not know the words that they are using" T3P2L32/34-35

"…due to weak grammatical structures they adopted, it is hard to understand the message" T4P3L45

This result concreted some findings of the previous studies. Mahmoud (2005) finds that Arabic learners significantly commit errors when they speak collocations in English, especially with lexical combinations. He also notices that Arabic students strongly depend on inter-lingual transfer from Arabic to English. On the other hand, Tahaineh (2010) observes that Arabic learners encountered significant difficulties in the use of appropriate prepositions. He infers that the major source of the interference was the mother tongue (Arabic). Al Hosni (2014) claims that Arabic students are unable to speak in English because they lack the necessary vocabulary items and grammar structures.

Interestingly, Khan (2011) asserts three Arabic learners' difficulty in English structure is due to their confusion. First, he notices that students adapted a "double subject" responses; for instance, "*My brother he is a bank manager*." Second, he observes that students find hard to understand the differences of present, past and the perfect tenses. Third, he notices that students do not use articles.

In summary, the Arabic students' less developed grammatical competence (Canale and Swain, 1980) and linguistic competence (Hymes, 1979) such as cognition of syntax, grammar, lexical items and phonology and association of English with their mother tongue (Arabic) made them struggle in exhibiting good speaking performance in English.

Table 4: Level of Topic Development in Speaking of Respondents

Aspect	Mean	Description	Specific Verbal Interpretation
Topic Develop-ment	2.07	Poor	The response conveys some relevant information but is clearly incomplete or inaccurate. It is incomplete if it omits key ideas, makes vague reference to key ideas, or demonstrates limited development of important information. An inaccurate response demonstrates misunderstanding of key ideas from the stimulus. Typically, ideas expressed may not be well connected or cohesive so that familiarity with the stimulus is necessary to follow what is being discussed.

Shown in Table 4 was the level of topic development in speaking. This result showed that students had limited ability in expounding a given topic in English. The teachers mentioned that generally alienated with the topic; hence, they weren't able to answer in length about the topic.

"…the teacher has to simplify the questions, then, that's the only time they can also at least tell a relevant answer to the question…" T2P1L19

"I think they can't understand the question well" T3P2L40

"Well, they don't have much idea. In fact, they don't read a lot in English and they have got less experience especially when it comes to topic" T4P3L47-48

We observe that students have in their mind the ideas; however, they are hindered to express them because of their lack of English vocabulary, confusion on collocation, anxiety, and inability to pronounce long and hard words. This indicates that grammatical competence is needed to have a language performance.

This result opens the controversial argument in communicative competence. Hymes (1972) contends that communicative competence doesn't only represent the grammatical competence but also sociolinguistic competence and discourse competence. He mentions that 'there are rules of use without which the rules of grammar would be useless'. This favors Chomsky and Halle (1965) who say that '*no one can function in real life situation with only grammatical competence.'* However, their contentions were challenged by Terrel and Krashen (1983) who see communicative competence as the use of language in social communications without grammatical analysis. They related communicative competence to the communication and doesn't give a focus for the grammatical competence. This means that communicative competence is manifested in the communication and it is all the abilities that we need to use for communication.

In summary, the inability of the students to develop and express their ideas was hindered by their lack of grammatical competence. It therefore follows that someone needs to have knowledge of a language in order for him to make a performance of the language.

6.1 Challenges of Arabic Learners

Based on the recorded speeches of the participants, we found the following relevant challenges among the participants.

6.1.1 Syllabication of Words

It was observed that Arabic students pronounce single syllable cluster consonant words into two such as *clothes* into *clo-thes, screen into sc-reen, know into k-now.*

6.1.2 Confusion of You and I pronouns is troublesome for Arabic learners specifically the You and I. Most of the time, they make interchange of the two. Sometimes they do not use pronoun in their sentences.

> *Sometimes go to...*
> *Sometimes visit some people*

6.1.3 Pronunciation

For Arabic students, pronunciation of English is the most challenging aspect.

/j/ - /g/

manager /manɪdʒə/ - /manɪdgə/
college /ˈkɒlɪdʒ/ - /ˈkɒliːg/

/ch/ - /sh/

children /ˈtʃɪldrən/ - /ʃɛldrən/

/ɪŋ/ - /ɪŋk/

everything /ˈɛvrɪθɪŋ/ - /ˈɛvrɪθɪŋk/
anything /ˈɛnɪθɪŋ/ - /ˈɛnɪθɪŋk/
swimming /ˈswɪmɪŋ/ - /ˈswɪmɪŋa/
going /ˈɡəʊɪŋ/ - /ˈɡəʊɪŋa/

/p/ - /b/

shopping /ˈʃɒpɪŋ/ - /ˈʃɒbɪŋ/
people /ˈpiːp(ə)l/ - /ˈbiːb(ə)l/
problem /ˈprɒbləm/ - ˈbrɒbləm/
open /ˈəʊp(ə)n/ - /ˈəʊb(ə)n/

/ɪŋ/ - /ɪŋa/

watching /wɒtʃɪŋ/ - /wɒtʃɪŋa/
relaxing /rɪˈlaksɪŋ/ - /rɪˈlaksɪŋa/
using /juːzɪŋ/ - /juːzɪŋa/

ring /rɪŋ/ - /rɪŋa/
wrong /rɒŋ/ - /rɒŋa/

6.1.4 Tense

Arabic students have no sense of the tense.

Last week, I will go with my family.
Last week, I finishing...
I watching cartoon....

6.1.5 Verb to be

Arabic students commonly do not or forgot to use verb to in their utterances.

I reading...
What I doing?

6.1.6 SV Agreement

Arabic students have difficulty identifying the subject; thus, they commit SV disagreement. Nevertheless, they most of the time use the simple form of the verb.

The people can know...	*Every two week...*
It's have...	*I have four brother and 6 sister...*
It's can...	
It's make...	

6.1.7 Excessive Use

For Arabic students to have a conversation, they overuse words like can and go.

I can know...	*go the shopping*
can I visit	*go my family*
can I listen	
can you see another country	

7. Conclusion

The poor level in delivery, language use and topic development of students should not cause alarm as many would do. The results give a clear condition of the students' speaking in these three aspects; thus, making it significant baseline information to take action to improve the speaking skills of the students.

Theoretically, there might be a big problem; the behaviorist mentions that 'learning a language is a habit formation and it is controlled by the learners' behavior while Critical Age Hypothesis argues that '*learners beyond adolescent learn a second language in a slower pace than a young child'*. However, these theories don't clearly state about the approach on learning a second language. Thus, adapting an approach in learning a second language where learners are involved may be an appropriate solution.

In learning a language, first or second, do teachers ask the students on what they like and don't like? Do teachers ask students what suggestions they have to improve the teaching

of a language? Thus, setting a convergence of two sides maybe a good idea and a better solution to address the challenges in learning a second language.

References

1. Al Hosni, S. (2014). Speaking difficulties encountered by young EFL learners. International Journal on Studies in English Language and Literature (IJSELL), 2(6), 22-30.

2. Al-Saidat, E. M. (2010). Phonological analysis of English phonotactics: A case study of Arab learners of English. *The Buckingham Journal of Language and Linguistics*, 3, 121-134.

3. Barkhuizen, G. P. (1998). Discovering learners' perceptions of ESL classroom teaching/learning activities in a South African context. TESOL quarterly, 32(1), 85-108.

4. Benrabah, M. (1997). Word-stress–a source of unintelligibility in English. *IRAL-International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 35(3), 157-166.

5. Benesch, S. (1996). Needs analysis and curriculum development in EAP: An example of a critical approach. *Tesol Quarterly*, 30(4), 723-738.

6. Brooks, N. (1960). Language and language learning. New York. Harcourt; Brace and World.

7. Canale, M., & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied linguistics*

8. Carter, N., Bryant-Lukosius, D., DiCenso, A., Blythe, J., & Neville, A. J. (2014, September). The use of triangulation in qualitative research. In Oncology nursing forum (Vol. 41, No. 5).

9. Casey, D., & Murphy, K. (2009). Issues in using methodological triangulation in research. *Nurse Researcher*, 16(4), 40–55. doi:10.7748/nr2009.07.16.4.40.c7160

10. Chomsky, N., & Halle, M. (1965). Some controversial questions in phonological theory. *Journal of linguistics*, 1(2), 97-138.

11. Cobb, A. K., & Forbes, S. (2002). Qualitative research: what does it have to offer to the gerontologist?. *The Journals of Gerontology Series A: Biological Sciences and Medical Sciences*, 57(4), M197-M202.

12. Cope, D. G. (2014, January). Methods and meanings: credibility and trustworthiness of qualitative research. In Oncology nursing forum (Vol. 41, No. 1).

13. Corder, S. P. (1967). The significance of learner's errors. *IRAL-International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 5(1-4), 161-170.

14. Creswell, J.W. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing from five traditions*. (2nd Ed.). Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications, Inc.

15. Dulay, H. C., & Burt, M. K. (1974). Errors and strategies in child second language acquisition. *TESOL quarterly*, 129-136.

16. Eckman, F. R., Elreyes, A., & Iverson, G. K. (2003). Some principles of second language phonology. *Second Language Research*, *19*(3), 169-208.

17. Elo, S., & Kyngäs, H. (2008). The qualitative content analysis process. *Journal of advanced nursing*, *62*(1), 107-115.

18. Flege, J. E., & MacKay, I. R. (2004). Perceiving vowels in a second language. *Studies in second language acquisition*, *26*(1), 1-34.

19. Goto, H. (1971). Auditory perception by normal Japanese adults of the sounds "L" and "R". *Neuropsychologia*, *9*(3), 317-323.

20. Houghton, C., Casey, D., Shaw, D., & Murphy, K. (2013). Rigour in qualitative case-study research. *Nurse Researcher*, 20(4), 12–17.

21. Hymes, D. (1979). On communicative competence. *The communicative approach to language teaching*

22. Integrated Speaking Rubrics (2014). Educational testing service. Available Online at "https://www.ets.org/s/toefl/pdf/toefl_speaking_rubrics.pdf"

23. Johnson, M., O'Hara, R., Hirst, E., Weyman, A., Turner, J., Mason, S., ... & Siriwardena, A. N. (2017). Multiple triangulation and collaborative research using qualitative methods to explore decision making in pre-hospital emergency care. *BMC medical research methodology*, 17(1), 11.

24. Khan, I. A. (2011). Learning difficulties in English: Diagnosis and pedagogy in Saudi Arabia. *Educational Research*, 2(7), 1248-1257.

25. Koch, T. (2006). Establishing rigour in qualitative research: The decision trail. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 53, 91–100.

26. Koch, T., & Harrington, A. (1998). Reconceptualising rigour: The case for reflexivity. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 28, 882–890.

27. Krashen, S. D. (1973). Lateralization, language learning, and the critical period: Some new evidence. *Language learning*, *23*(1), 63-74.

28. Krashen, S., & Pon, P. (1975). An error analysis of an advanced ESL learner: The importance of the Monitor. *Working Papers on Bilingualism*, *7*, 125-129.

29. Krashen, S. D., Long, M. A., & Scarcella, R. C. (1979). Age, rate and eventual attainment in second language acquisition. *TESOL quarterly*, 573-582.

30. Lenneberg, E. H. (1967). The biological foundations of language. *Hospital Practice*, *2*(12), 59-67.

31. Lincoln, Y.S., & Guba, E.G. (1985). Naturalistic inquiry. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

32. Mahmoud, A. (2005). Collocation errors made by Arab learners of English. *Asian EFL journal*, *5*(2), 117-126.

33. Mantzoukas, S. (2005). The inclusion of bias in reflective and reflexive research: A necessary prerequisite for securing validity. *Journal of Research in Nursing*, 10, 279–295. doi:10.1177/174498710501000305

34. Mays, N., & Pope, C. (1995). Rigour and qualitative research. *BMJ*, 311, 109.

35. Patterson, W. and Ambrosini, V. (2015), "Configuring absorptive capacity as a key process for research-intensive firms", Technovation, Vol. 36 No. 37, pp. 77-89.

36. Pederson, A.E., Hack, T.F., McClemont, S.E., & Taylor-Brown, J. (2013). An exploration of the patient navigator role: Perspectives of younger women with breast cancer. Oncology Nursing Forum, 41, 77–88. doi:10.1188/14.ONF.77-88

37. Polit, D.F., & Beck, C.T. (2012). Nursing research: Generating and assessing evidence for nursing practice. Philadelphia, PA: Lippincott Williams and Wilkins.

38. Rabab'ah, G. (2013). Strategies of repair in EFL learners' oral discourse. *English Language Teaching*, *6*(6), 123.

39. Ryan-Nicholls, K.D., & Will, C.I. (2009). Rigour in qualitative research: Mechanisms for control. *Nurse Researcher*, 16(3), 70–85.

40. Sandelowski, M. (1986). The problem of rigor in qualitative research. *Advances in Nursing Science*, 8(3), 27–37.

41. San Jose, A. E. (2011). Dialectal variations in english: Its effect on speaking proficiency. *UIC Research Journal*. Vol. 17 No. 1.

42. San Jose, A. E. (2012). Linguistic Experiences of Adult Dyslexic Learners. *UIC Research Journal*, *18*(1), 1-1.

43. San Jose, A. E., Vicencio, J. V. (2016). Organization, style, and mechanics in writing of efl students. *International Journal of Education Research for Higher Education* (CHED Accredited Journal) Volume 22 No. 1

44. Sawahel, W. (2015). Arab countries last in global test of english proficiency. Available at https://www.al-fanarmedia.org/ Retrieved October 29, 2017.

45. Shabbir, B. & Bughio, M. (2013). Factors Affecting the Language Learning Process among Saudi Students. *International Research Journal of Arts & Humanities*, 37, 75-81.

46. Shenton, A. K. (2004). Strategies for ensuring trustworthiness in qualitative research projects. *Education for information*, *22*(2), 63-75.

47. Shepard, R. N., & Cooper. L. A. (1982). Mental images and their transformations. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

48. Tahaineh, Y. (2010) "Arab EFL University Students' Errors in the Use of Prepositions". MJAL2:1JANUARY2010. ISSN 0974-8741. Retrieved on 15 December 2017 from: http://www.mjal.org/ HYPERLINK EFL University Students' Errors in the Use of Prepositions

49. Tobin, G.A., & Begley, C.M. (2004). Methodological rigour within a qualitative framework. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 48, 388–396.

50. Trochim, W. M. K. (2006). Research method knowledge base.[Online] Available: http://www.socialresearchmethods.net/kb/qualval.php [October 2, 2017].

51. Vishnevsky, T., & Beanlands, H. (2004). Qualitative research. *Nephrology Nursing*, 31, 234–238.

52. Waters, A. (1996). A review of research into needs in English for academic purposes of relevance to the North American higher education context. Educational Testing Service.

53. Watson, J. B. (1913). Psychology as the behaviorist views it. *Psychological review*, *20*(2), 158.

54. Wei, Y., & Zhou, Y. (2002). Insights into English Pronunciation Problems of Thai Students.

55. Whittemore, R., Chase, S.K., & Mandle, C.L. (2001). Validity in qualitative research. *Qualitative Health Research*, 11, 522–537. doi:10.1177/104973201129119299