How do Oral Rehearsals and Peer-feedback Affect Monologic and Dyadic English Speaking Tasks?

Mutsuko Nagasaki, Kristin Armitage, Sunao Orimoto

English Education Center, Institute for Education and Student Support, Ehime University

1. Introduction

1.1. Background of the Study

It is widely acknowledged that using a target language is essential for developing second language (L2) ability, and in fact, the effective roles of output and interaction in L2 learning have been supported by many empirical studies (e.g., Keck, Iberri-Shea, Tracy-Venture, & Wa-Mbaleka, 2006; Mackey & Goo, 2007). Output has a crucial role in second language learning as the process of producing and modifying output draws learners' attention to the form, as well as the meaning of a message (Swain, 1995). Communicative tasks and activities that provide learners with opportunities to produce output and interact with others are now being extensively used in the L2 classroom (Littlewood, 2011). However, outside the classroom, there are very limited opportunities for Japanese English as a Foreign Language (EFL) students to use English in their daily lives.

To solve this problem and create abundant opportunities to produce output and interact with others in English, the authors have employed oral rehearsals as an out-of-class activity and the effects of doing them repeatedly have shown that they improve EFL students' speaking and communication ability (Nagasaki & Orimoto, 2016; Nagasaki, Orimoto, & Armitage, 2019; Nagasaki, Armitage, & Orimoto, 2020).

In addition to output, noticing plays an important part in L2 learning (Schmidt, 2001), as it is only when learners notice their linguistic problems, they may then be able to analyze them and attempt to modify their output themselves (Swain & Lapkin, 1995). Noticing the gap between what learners can say and what they want to say takes place in the interaction between the learner and the surrounding input (Izumi, 2013). This input may be in the form of self-review or peer-feedback. Self-review activities can be "an ongoing dynamic tool for reflecting on past and possible future performance and learning behavior" (de Saint Léger, 2009, p. 160). Peer-feedback can also provide valuable input. In fact, some research that explored the role of peer-feedback in L2 oral presentations found that peer-assessment enhanced L2 learners' motivation to learn (Nejad & Mahfoodh, 2019), helped increase their confidence, improved their oral proficiency (Lee, 2017) and helped them learn about making and judging effective presentations (White, 2009). However, some studies on peer-feedback have pointed out that learners will not be able to give appropriate feedback to each other, they will adopt the mistakes of their partners, or they will be viewed as arrogant (Barker, 2004; Hyland, 2004; Philp, Adams, & Iwashita, 2014).

The study outlined in this paper employed repeated individual and interactive rehearsals outside the classroom to analyze what effects different types of rehearsals have on different types of oral performances. In addition, what L2 learners noticed through self-review and peer-feedback that they engaged in immediately after speaking was examined to analyze the outcomes of self-review and peer-feedback.

1.2 Previous Research

Two types of oral rehearsals, individual rehearsals—practice speaking alone, and interactive (pair) rehearsals—practice speaking in pairs, were used in the authors' previous studies to examine their effectiveness in L2 learning. In 2016 (Nagasaki & Orimoto) and 2019 (Nagasaki, Orimoto, & Armitage,) the authors examined the effects of individual rehearsal on a monologic English-speaking task on first-year Japanese university students (n=39 in 2016; n=63 in 2019). The results showed that individual rehearsal was a significant predictor of learners' improvement in a speech test in the 2016 study, while it was effective in two different types of tests— a speech test and a narrative test—in the 2019 study,

indicating that the more L2 learners engage in individual oral rehearsals, the more they are likely to improve their monologic speaking ability.

In the authors' subsequent study (Nagasaki, Armitage, & Orimoto, 2020) they examined whether, combining individual rehearsals with interactive rehearsals, led to the development of 60 first-year Japanese university students' communication ability. The results showed, that both individual and interactive rehearsals are significant predictors of improving students' scores in a paired conversation test, and different types of rehearsals developed different linguistic aspects. Specifically, interactive rehearsals were likely to improve their scores of starting and ending a conversation (e.g., greetings and small talk) and attitude (e.g., making eye contact) in the conversation test, whereas individual rehearsals were likely to improve their scores in expressing ideas and vocabulary.

These results provide crucial implications for teaching and learning, namely; that L2 learners can benefit from both types of rehearsals. However, since the learners in this study engaged in both types of rehearsals in the same period of the time, whether doing only interactive rehearsals or only individual rehearsals promotes L2 communication ability is unknown.

The present study aims to investigate the issues raised in the authors' previous research: that is, whether doing only individual rehearsal can promote monologic speaking (speech) ability as well as L2 communication ability and whether doing only interactive pair rehearsal can promote these two types of ability. The study also aims to determine what learning opportunities and language aspects L2 learners attend to when doing self-review and receiving peer-feedback.

2. The Study

2.1. Research Questions

To examine the effects of the two types of oral rehearsals more precisely and noticing through self-review and peer-feedback, the following research questions were established:

RQ1: Do oral rehearsals promote L2 communication ability? Specifically: a. Does doing only pair rehearsals promote L2 communication ability?, b. Does doing only individual rehearsals promote L2 communication ability?, c. Does doing both types of rehearsals promote communication ability even more?

RQ2: Do oral rehearsals promote L2 speech ability? Specifically: a. Does doing only pair rehearsals promotes L2 speech ability?, b. Does doing only individual rehearsals promote L2 speech ability?, c. Does doing both types of rehearsals promote L2 speech ability even more?

RQ3: What do L2 learners notice through self-review and peer-feedback?

2.2. Participants

Twenty-four, second- to fourth-year students from two elective English classes in a national Japanese university participated in this study. They were taking "Discussion Skills" and/or "Oral Performance" classes. The participants are regarded as having intermediate levels of English proficiency because they were enrolled in a special English course that has pre-requisites of high grades for their required English classes and over 250 points on the GTEC academic test.

The participants were formed into three groups and respectively designated as "the Pair (interactive) Rehearsal" group (PR, n=13), "the Individual Rehearsal" group (IR, n=6), and "the Pair and Individual Rehearsal" group (PIR, n=5). The students who enrolled in the "Discussion Skills" class were regarded as the PR group and taught by one researcher of this study (R1); the students who enrolled in the "Oral Performance" class were considered as the IR group and taught by another researcher (R3); the students who registered for both classes were regarded as the PIR group. As RQ 1c and RQ 2c indicate, it was hypothesized that PIR students would improve their scores the most since they engaged in double the amount of rehearsals compared to PR and IR students.

Both classes were held fifteen times, once a week for 90 minutes over four months in the same semester.

2.3 Class activity
2.3.1 Conversation

PR and PIR students taking the Discussion Skills course were asked to have five different five- to six-minute conversations in pairs during the course without looking at any script or notes (Table 1). Two lessons before their in-class performance, pairs were randomly set up for every conversation. A group of two to three pairs was formed for every conversation, and pairs took turns performing their conversation in front of the other pair(s).

Table 1

Data Collection Schedule

| | In Class | | Out of Class | |
Week	Pair Rehearsal (PR)	Individual Rehearsal (IR)	Pair Rehearsal (PR)	Individual Rehearsal (IR)
2	Conversation & Speech Pretests			
4			PR for Conversation	IR for Speech 1
5	Conversation 1 (Topic 1: Daily Life/Hobbies)	Speech 1	PR for Conversation	IR for Speech 2
7	Conversation 2 (Topic 2: Memorable Event)	Speech 2	PR for Conversation	IR for Speech 3
9	Conversation 3 (Topic 3: Academic Interest)	Speech 3	PR for Conversation	IR for Speech 4
11	Conversation 4 (Topic 4: Career Design)	Speech 4	PR for Conversation	IR for Speech 5
13	Conversation 5 (Topic 5: Social Issues)	Speech 5		
15	Conversation & Speech Questionnaire			

The students were also instructed to evaluate the performance of each student in the other pair(s) while observing them, according to the Conversation Rubric (Appendix A) that was used to evaluate their performances in the conversation pretest and posttest. Peer-evaluation followed the same process for all performances. Students were told to give the evaluation scores and comments to each speaker of the performing pair. Each speaker wrote down their own scores and comments from everyone in the other pairs in their Language Note File (LNF) which had been provided. Then, based on the scores and comments, the speakers were required to reflect on their performances and write down anything they noticed in their LNFs. These notes were used to examine what the students noticed through peer-feedback.

2.3.2 Speech

The IR students and PIR students taking the Oral Performance course were asked to give five different two- to three-minute speeches during the course without looking at any script or notes. The topics were the same as those for paired conversations (Table 1) . A group of three to four students were formed for every speech, and the students took turns performing their speeches in front of the other students.

Students were also instructed to evaluate the speech performance of each student in their group while observing it, according to the Speech Rubric (Appendix B) that was used to evaluate their performances in the speech pretest and posttest. They also wrote down their own scores and comments from everyone in the group in their LNFs, then reflected on their performances based on them, and finally wrote down anything they noticed in their LNFs. These notes were used to examine what the students noticed through peer-feedback.

2.4 Out of class activity
2.4.1 Pair Rehearsal

Both PR and PIR participants in the Discussion Skills course were required to engage in at least four interactive rehearsals in pairs per conversation; therefore, they were supposed to engage in at least 20, five- to six-minute pair rehearsals during the course as their class assignment. They were encouraged to talk on the phone or have a face-to-face conversation on campus. Before interactive rehearsals, the students were allowed to take about five to ten minutes to discuss what they were going to talk about in pairs and make an outline or notes, if desired. However, they were told not to write any sentences or a detailed script for their conversation.

In addition, they were required to video-record one of the rehearsed conversations, watch it on their own, and write anything they noticed for improvement in their LNFs. These notes were used to examine what the students noticed through self-review.

2.4.2 Individual Rehearsal

The IR and PIR participants in the Oral Performance course were required to orally rehearse a speech at least eight times at home; thus, they were supposed to engage in at least 40, two- to three-minute individual rehearsals during the course as their class assignment. Before rehearsals at home, they were allowed to take about five minutes to consider what they were going to talk about on the given topic and make an outline or notes, if desired. However, they were told not to write any sentences or a detailed script for their speeches. They were required to video-record one of the eight rehearsals, watch it, and write down what they noticed and any findings in their LNFs. These notes were used to examine what the students noticed through self-review.

2.5 Test Instruments

Two types of tests, a paired conversation test and a speech test were prepared, and the same tests were used for the pretest and posttest. Regarding the conversation test, the students were randomly paired for each test and asked to talk about the following question—What

do you think about elementary and junior high school students having a smartphone? —for five to six minutes. As for the speech test, each student was asked to express their ideas, in the form of a speech, about the following question—English will be taught as a subject in elementary school from 2020. What do you think about teaching English as a subject in elementary school? — for two to three minutes. The students were given five minutes preparation time and allowed to do some research about the questions using their smartphones. They were also allowed to look at these notes during the test.

The pretests were held in the second lesson, and the posttests were conducted in the 15th lesson. All pairs' conversation performances and everyone's speech performances were video-taped for analysis. At the end of the course a questionnaire was given to the participants and the responses were reviewed.

3. Analysis

3.1 For RQ1 and RQ2

Two types of assessment rubrics, one for assessing communication ability (Appendix A) and the other for assessing speech ability (Appendix B) were developed for this study. Both consist of six categories and five scales and were used to evaluate the participants' performances in the pretests and posttests.

The three researchers of this study watched the recordings of all participants' conversation and speech performances in the pretests and posttests together and assessed the performances according to the rubric. Performing this activity together allowed for a significantly high intraclass correlation coefficient (ICC(3,3) = .9558 for the conversation pretest, ICC(3,3) = .9380 for the speech pretest, ICC(3,3) = .9141 for the conversation posttest, ICC(3,3) = .9558 for the speech posttest). Each student's pretest and posttest scores for both conversation and speech tests were calculated by obtaining the mean scores from the three assessors.

3.2 For RQ3

To answer the third research question, first, all LNFs were collected and the students' reflection comments they wrote while (1) receiving comments from their peers in class and (2) watching their own rehearsal performances at home were reviewed. The former comments were used to examine what they noticed

through peer-feedback, while the latter comments were used to examine what they noticed through self-review. Any aspects of language, communication, or speech were regarded as a 'noticed problem' (NP) and listed. Second, an iterative qualitative approach was taken, and coding categories were established, by examining student comments and finding common key words. As a result, 21 categories were established (Table 2). The number of comments students wrote down after (1) and (2) were counted as NPs. Two researchers (R1 and R3) counted and agreed (90.2%), and if disagreement arose, discussion led to mutually agreed upon classifications.

Table 2

Examples of NPs in Twenty-One Categories

Greetings & Closings	*"I should start with greetings like 'how are you?'"* *"Our greetings and closings became smooth and sounded natural."*
Individual Content	*"I should've added more details to my talk."* *"I must organize what I'm going to talk about in advance."*
Pair Content	*"We should've made a brief outline to what each of us will talk about."* *"Both of us should talk more about our memorable event."*
Asking Questions	*"I should ask my partner more questions."* *"5W and 1H questions might deepen our conversation."*
Listener Expressions	*"I need to use a variety of listener expressions."* *"Everyone told me that I could give listener expressions appropriately."*
English Fillers	*"It might be better to use English fillers when I don't know what to say next." "I need to learn more expressions to fill the pause."*
Negotiation of Meaning	*"I'm so happy to hear the compliment, that I asked my partner to clarify his meaning when I couldn't understand it."*
Vocabulary	*"It was so difficult to talk about physics in English. I should check more vocabulary." "treat someone 食事をふるまう" "autumn leaves 紅葉"*
Pronunciation	*"p in phenomena is not pronounced."* *"I'm glad to hear my pronunciation was good."*
Grammar	*"I noticed that my grammar was often incorrect." "I was relieved. Not I relieved," "Noun or -ing should come after about ~."*
Fluency	*"I should speak more fluently." "This time, I could speak fluently."* *"There were lots of unnatural pauses and silence."*
Task Completion	*"I finished my speech much earlier. I need to prepare more stories, so that I can talk fully until time is up".*
Non-verbal cues	*"I need to look at my partner's eyes more when communicating." "Smile more and be more cheerful." "My posture was not good."*
Thoughts & Feelings	*"I can always rehearse well when I say it in my mind, but I can't do well when rehearsing orally." "I want to practice speaking more."*
Changing the topic	*"I was waiting for my partner to change the topic. I should be able to change it when necessary." "That reminds me …"*
Flow of Conversation	*"I should think more about what to say to my partner while they are speaking to make our conversation flow smoothly."*
Atmosphere	*"It is important to make a good atmosphere to facilitate our conversation." "I could get a positive comment about the atmosphere of our conversation."*
Speed	*"I should speak more slowly to have my partner understand." "My speaking speed was good, I think."*
Voice	*"I should have spoken louder." "I could increase the volume of my voice." "The volume of my voice was changing. I always need to speak clearly."*
Making pauses	*"I should make pauses to check if my partner could understand me." "It might be important to make pauses intentionally to avoid making a monotonous speech."*
Memo	*"It was difficult to give a speech without looking at a memo." "I should look at the memo less." "It's better to write down some key points in a memo."*

Note. NP = Noticed Problem; Words translated from Japanese into English are italicized.

4. Results

4.1 RQ1: Do oral rehearsals promote L2 communication ability?

Table 3 shows the mean scores of the conversation pretests and posttests. All groups, PR, IR, and PIR improved their scores, specifically, PR increased 3.6 points; IR: 4.3; PIR: 3.6. Although statistical analysis could not be used to further examine whether the improvement within groups is significant due to the small sample size, it was found that 11 out of 13 students in PR and all students in both IR and PIR improved their scores from the pretest to the posttest. Therefore, it can be said that the answers for RQ1. a and b turned out to be affirmative. Concerning RQ1. c, the PIR group did not improve any more than PR and IR; hence, it turned out to be negative. In terms of the results for the six categories in the conversation (Table 4), all groups could improve their scores from the pretest to the posttest.

Table 3

Conversation Test Scores

	Pretest		Posttest	
	M	SD	M	SD
PR (n=13)	20.6	3.3	24.2	3.0
IR (n=6)	22.1	2.3	26.4	1.8
PIR (n=5)	19.6	2.1	23.2	1.8

Note. Maximum score was 30 in both tests; *M* = mean; *SD* = standard deviation.

Table 4

Conversation Test Scores in all Categories

	PR				IR				PIR			
	Pretest		Posttest		Pretest		Posttest		Pretest		Posttest	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
Opinion/Quantity	3.63	0.37	4.11	0.65	3.89	0.12	4.67	0.20	3.53	0.57	3.83	0.26
Opinion/Quality	3.31	0.62	4.01	0.50	3.66	0.40	4.36	0.40	3.10	0.54	3.77	0.34
Production	3.29	0.73	3.92	0.53	3.61	0.57	4.31	0.47	3.13	0.29	3.77	0.48
Flow	3.44	0.72	3.91	0.64	3.69	0.55	4.33	0.33	3.17	0.28	3.97	0.25
Vocabulary	3.44	0.51	4.13	0.39	3.67	0.44	4.42	0.37	3.17	0.33	3.87	0.29
Attitude	3.51	0.65	4.09	0.59	3.53	0.49	4.31	0.26	3.53	0.22	3.97	0.32

Note. Maximum score was 5 in both tests; *M* = mean; *SD* = standard deviation.

4.2 RQ2: Do oral rehearsals promote speech ability?

Table 5 shows the mean scores of the speech pretests and posttests and indicates that the PR, IR, and PIR groups improved their scores. Specifically, a 2.2 point increase in PR; 2.3 in IR; 4.2 in PIR. Moreover, all students in PR, five out of six in IR, and all in PIR improved their scores from the pretest to the posttest. Therefore, the answer for RQ2 a, b, turned out to be affirmative. In addition, it appeared the mean scores of

the PIR group improved greatly, compared to PR and IR. However, due to the limited number of participants in the present study, further statistical analysis to examine the effectiveness among groups could not be conducted; hence, the significant effectiveness of PIR for improving speech ability is not statistically supported. As hypothesized, the fact that PIR students engaged in about twice as many rehearsals as those in PR and IR might have contributed to their larger improvement. The relatively lower pretest scores of PIR than those of PR and IR might have been the cause as well. Regarding the results for the six categories in the speech (Table 6), all groups could improve their scores from the pretest to the posttest.

Table 5

Speech Test Scores

	Pretest		Posttest	
	M	SD	M	SD
PR (n=13)	20.2	2.8	22.4	3.0
IR (n=6)	20.2	3.4	22.5	3.4
PIR (n=5)	18.0	1.8	22.2	2.0

Note. Maximum score was 30 in both tests; *M* = mean; *SD* = standard deviation.

Table 6

Speech Test Scores in all Categories

	PR				IR				PIR			
	Pretest		Posttest		Pretest		Posttest		Pretest		Posttest	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
Vocabulary	3.45	0.54	3.81	0.54	3.69	0.59	3.81	0.54	3.00	0.28	3.76	0.28
Pronunciation	3.31	0.62	3.63	0.56	3.39	0.72	3.72	0.63	2.97	0.12	3.53	0.46
Fluency	3.23	0.45	3.74	0.51	3.28	0.65	3.81	0.52	2.97	0.44	3.73	0.37
Content	3.36	0.46	3.79	0.49	3.31	0.64	3.72	0.64	3.13	0.39	3.73	0.31
Grammar	3.54	0.54	3.72	0.52	3.44	0.52	3.75	0.55	3.07	0.23	3.63	0.31
Attitude	3.33	0.60	3.76	0.50	3.14	0.55	3.78	0.56	2.87	0.64	3.80	0.49

Note. Maximum score was 5 in both tests; *M* = mean; *SD* = standard deviation.

Interestingly, these results indicate that (1) practicing speaking on their own for a speech can promote L2 communication ability, (2) practicing speaking with a partner for a conversation can promote L2 speech ability, (3) doing only one type of rehearsal benefits learners as much as doing both types.

4.3 RQ3: What do students notice through self-review and peer-feedback?

4.3.1 Noticing after paired conversation rehearsal and class performance.

Table 7 shows the number of NPs (noticed problems) that the PR and PIR students wrote in their LNFs while engaging in self-review after their paired conversation

practice out of class as well as while receiving peer-feedback after their conversation performances in class. The top five NPs through self-review were Vocabulary (18%), Non-verbal Cues (11%), Individual Content (10.1%), Asking Questions (9.2%), and Listener Expressions (8.3%), while through peer-feedback, they wrote down about Thoughts & Feelings (13.7%), Asking Questions (11.3%), Non-verbal Cues (11.3%), Listener Expressions (10.8%), and Flow of conversation (9.8%).

It appears that students were more concerned with the content of their conversation during self-review as the Vocabulary and Individual Content NPs were high. On the other hand, peer-feedback seemed to affect their inner thoughts such as motivation. For example, there were comments, such as "I want to make more effort to develop my conversation ability" and "I think all I can do is to practice". Peer-feedback also seemed to help learners realize the importance of managing the flow of conversation with their partner.

4.3.2 Noticing after speech rehearsal and class performance.

Table 8 shows the number of NPs that the IR and PIR students wrote in their LNFs while doing self-review after their speech rehearsal out of class as well as while receiving peer-feedback after their speech performance in class. The five categories they noticed the most through self-review were Vocabulary (22.1%), Individual Content (13.2%), Non-verbal Cues (12.1%), Thoughts & Feelings (10.5%), and Task Completion (8.9%). After considering what their peers thought, the top five categories of NPs were Individual Content (19.2%), Non-verbal Cues (16.9%), Thoughts & Feelings (14.1%), Voice (9%), and Vocabulary (8.5%).

Although students cared about the content of their conversations while doing self-review, they did not care about it much while receiving peer-feedback in a paired conversation. However, students who gave speeches seemed to be quite concerned about the content during both self-review (13.2%) and peer-feedback (19.2%), as Individual Content percentages show (Table 8).

Hence, it can be assumed that peer-feedback for a conversation helped L2 learners mainly reflect on the non-linguistic features (e.g., non-verbal cues, flow of a conversation) of a conversation but peer-feedback for a speech encouraged learners to notice both the content and non-linguistic features.

Table 7 *Noticed Problems for Self-review and Peer-feedback for Conversation*

	GSC	IC	PC	AQ	LE	EF	NM	V	P	G	F	TC	NC	T&F	CT	Flow	Atm	Sp	Vo	MP	Me	Total
Self-review	5	23	12	21	19	5	1	41	2	3	14	2	25	13	7	9	9	12	3	2	0	228
%	2.2	10.1	5.3	9.2	8.3	2.2	0.4	18.0	0.9	1.3	6.1	0.9	11.0	5.7	3.1	3.9	3.9	5.3	1.3	0.9	0.0	100
Peer-feedback	3	9	8	23	22	2	4	18	2	3	9	2	23	28	5	20	8	5	9	1	0	204
%	1.5	4.4	3.9	11.3	10.8	1.0	2.0	8.8	1.0	1.5	4.4	1.0	11.3	13.7	2.5	9.8	3.9	2.5	4.4	0.5	0.0	100

Table 8 *Noticed Problems for Self-review and Peer-feedback for Speech*

	GSC	IC	PC	AQ	LE	EF	NM	V	P	G	F	TC	NC	T&F	CT	Flow	Atm	Sp	Vo	MP	Me	Total
Self-review	0	25	0	0	0	2	0	42	11	7	13	17	23	20	0	0	1	7	10	1	11	190
%	0.0	13.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.1	0.0	22.1	5.8	3.7	6.8	8.9	12.1	10.5	0.0	0.0	0.5	3.7	5.3	0.5	5.8	100
Peer-feedback	0	34	0	4	0	1	0	15	13	6	4	8	30	25	1	0	0	6	16	9	5	177
%	0.0	19.2	0.0	2.3	0.0	0.6	0.0	8.5	7.3	3.4	2.3	4.5	16.9	14.1	0.6	0.0	0.0	3.4	9.0	5.1	2.8	100

Notes: GSC=Greetings, Small talk, Closings, IC=Individual Content, PC=Pair Content, AQ=Asking Questions, LE=Listener Expressions, EF=English Fillers, NM=Negotiation of Meaning, V=Vocabulary, P=Pronunciation, G=Grammar, F=Fluency, TC=Task Completion, NC=Non-verbal Cues, T&F=Thoughts and Feelings, CT=Changing the Topic naturally, Flow=Flow of conversation, Atm=Atmosphere, Sp=Speed, Vo=Voice, MP=Making Pauses, Me=Memo

5. Discussion

Although the authors' previous study (Nagasaki, Armitage, & Orimoto, 2020) claimed that learners should engage in both types of rehearsals because they promote the development of different aspects of L2 communication, the present study found that doing only one type of rehearsal can improve both dialogic (conversation) and monologic (speech) speaking abilities. There are several explanations for this finding.

First, there are many learner and contextual factors, such as task type, setting, learner proficiency, age, and pair dynamics that can shape the success of interaction for L2 development (Philp, Adams, & Iwashita, 2014). In this study, it seems that the proficiency of learners had a much bigger impact than task type and enabled the current study's participants to apply what they had learned from practicing for a speech on their own, into positive gains conversing with their partner. Also, the participants of this study were enrolled in a special

elective English course and had already completed the required first-year course (the previous study participants were first-year students).

Second, receiving extensive peer-feedback might have contributed to the results. It helped learners increase their awareness of what they needed to work on to improve their conversation and/or speech. In the questionnaire distributed at the end of the course, almost all participants wrote that peer-feedback clarified the points they needed to work on for further improvement or helped them notice something that they could not realize when working on their own (c.f., Barker, 2014; Hyland, 2004; Philp et al., 2014). They also appreciated peer feedback because "other students are objective", and many also stated, it motivated them, in the sense of initiating modifications themselves, to practice more. In addition, giving feedback to others helped all students develop a deeper understanding of the rubric as they had to refer to it many times while giving feedback. Thus, just doing one type of rehearsal might have been effective enough to develop L2 communication and speech abilities.

6. Conclusion

The results of this study revealed that interactive rehearsals for a conversation can prompt L2 communication ability as well as L2 speech ability and individual rehearsals for a speech also prompt both. Therefore, the results imply that learners' engaging in either type of rehearsal can develop L2 communication and speech abilities. However, the results may have been impacted by the participants' higher English proficiency and motivation aroused through classmates' encouragement. In addition, due to the small sample size, any statistical analysis to examine the effects of rehearsal types within groups and between groups could not be conducted. Hence, future research with more participants of different proficiencies and motivation is necessary to further investigate the potential of interactive and individual oral rehearsals.

Acknowledgment

References

Barker, D. (2004). Encouraging students to take their language learning outside the classroom. *JALT Hokkaido Journal, 8*, 879-886.

de Saint Léger, D. (2009). Self-assessment of speaking skills and participation in a foreign language class. *Foreign Language Annals, 42*(1), 158-178

Hyland, F. (2004). Learning autonomously: Contextualizing out-of-class English language learning. *Language Awareness 13*, 180-202.
158-178.

Izumi, S. (2013). Noticing and L2 development: Theoretical, empirical, and pedagogical issues. In J. M. Bergsleithner, S. N. Frota, & K. Yoshioka (Eds.), *Noticing and second language acquisition: Studies in honor of Richard Schmidt* (pp. 37-50). Honolulu: University of Hawaii, National Foreign Language Resource Center.

Keck, C., Iberri-Shea, G., Tracy-Venture, N., & Wa-Mbaleka, S. (2006). Investigating the empirical link between task-based interaction and acquisition: A quantitative meta-analysis. In J. M. Norris & L. Ortega (Eds.), *Synthesizing research on language learning and teaching* (pp.91-131). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Lee, Y. (2017). Sharing peer feedback: How does it affect EFL learners' oral presentation skills? *Asian-pacific Journal of Multimedia Services Convergent with Art, Humanities, and Sociology, 7*, 307-322.

Littlewood, W. (2011). Communicative language teaching: An expanding concept for a changing world. In E. Hinkle (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning: Volume II* (pp. 541-558), New York, NY: Routledge.

Mackey, A., & Goo, J. (2007). Interaction research in SLA: A meta-analysis and research synthesis. In A. Mackey (Ed.), *Conversational interaction in second language acquisition*, (pp. 407-452). Oxford University Press.

Nagasaki, M., & Orimoto, S. (2016). Effects of oral rehearsal on L2 speaking improvement. *JACET Chugoku-Shikoku Chapter Bulletin, 13*, 53-70.

Nagasaki, M., Orimoto, S., & Armitage, K. (2019). The contribution of noticing and self-modification through repetitive oral output to second language learners' monologic speaking performances. *JACET Chugoku-Shikoku Chapter Bulletin, 16*, 103-120.

Nagasaki, M., Armitage, K., & Orimoto, S. (2020). The benefits of interactive and individual rehearsals for developing second language communicative ability. *RELC Journal*. Online first. https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688220901348

Nejad, A. M., & Mahfoodh, O. H. A. (2019). Assessment of oral presentation: Effectiveness of self-, peer-, and teacher assessments. *International Journal of Instruction, 12*(3), 615-632.

Philp, J., Adams, R., & Iwashita, N. (2014). *Peer interaction and second language learning.* New York: Routledge.

Schmidt, R. (2001). Attention. In P. Robinson (Ed.), *Cognition and second language instruction* (pp. 3-32). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Swain, M. (1995). Three functions of output in second language learning. In G. Cook & B. Seidlhofer (Eds.), *Principle and practice in applied linguistics: Studies in honour of H. G. Widdowson* (pp. 125-144). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Swain, M., & Lapkin, S. (1995). Problems in output and the cognitive processes they generate: A step towards second language learning. *Applied Linguistics, 16*, 371–391.

White, W. (2009). Student perspectives of peer assessment for learning in a public speaking course. *Asian EFL Journal-Professional Teaching Articles*, 33, 1-36.

Appendix A
Conversation Rubric

Overall Goal: Speakers can express their opinions and agree/disagree with others logically and fluently.

		1: Under performing (1.0)	2: Developing (2.0)	3: Satisfactory (2.5/3.0)	4: Accomplished (3.5/4.0)	5: Exemplary (4.5/5.0)
Expressing opinions (Quantity)	**Goals:** Can fully express opinions by adding appropriate detailed information.	**Almost no** opinions.	Expresses **a few** opinions. Gives **a little** information to explain the opinions.	Expresses **some** opinions. Gives **some** information to explain the opinions.	Expresses **enough** opinions. Gives **enough** information to explain the opinions.	**Fully expresses** opinions. Gives **a lot of** information.
Expressing opinions (Quality)	**Goals:** Can fully express opinions with clear, logical, and persuasive reasons/examples.	Gives some reasons/examples, but they are **not clear and/or logical**, so they **severely affect** listeners' (assessors') **understanding**.	Gives some reasons/examples, but they are **not very clear and/or logical**, so they **cause occasional misunderstanding** for listeners (assessors).	Gives some reasons/examples, but some of them might **not be clear and/or logical** but could be **understood** by listeners (assessors). A **few** reasons/examples are **persuasive**.	Gives **mostly clear and logical** reasons/examples. **Some** reasons/examples are **persuasive**.	**Overall**, gives **very clear and logical** reasons/examples. **Overall**, reasons/examples are **very persuasive**.
Production (Fluency & Pronunciation)	**Goals:** Can speak smoothly at a pace which is suitable for listeners. Can speak with natural pronunciation, intonation, and rhythm.	The speech is **mostly halting** with long unnatural pauses. **A lot of mispronunciation**, and **almost no natural** rhythm and **proper** intonation, which **affects listener comprehension greatly**.	Speech production is **slow**. **Occasional mispronunciation** and **unnatural** rhythm and intonation that may cause **misunderstanding** for listeners (assessors).	Speech production is **fairly smooth** but **a little slow**. Pronunciation, rhythm, and intonation are **good enough to be understood by** those (assessors) who are **accustomed to** dealing with **Japanese learners** of English.	Speech production is **fairly smooth** and **rapid**. Generally uses **good** pronunciation and **natural** rhythm and intonation, which could be **understood** by listeners (assessors) who are **unfamiliar with Japanese learners**.	Speech production is **smooth and appropriate**. Uses **natural** pronunciation, rhythm, and intonation clear enough to be **understood with no effort by all listeners**.
Maintaining the flow of conversation	**Goals:** Can maintain a good flow of conversation and achieve mutual understanding by using appropriate **communication skills/strategies**.	Conversation exchanges are **mostly halting** with **many unnatural** hesitations or long pauses.	Conversation exchanges **often stop** and there are **many unnatural** hesitations or long pauses.	Conversation exchanges are **smooth to some extent** due to the use of communication strategies*. Some **unnatural** pauses or hesitations are apparent, but they do not reduce listeners' (assessors') attentiveness.	Conversation exchanges are **generally smooth** due to the use of communication strategies*. **Mostly natural** pauses are apparent.	Conversation exchanges are **very smooth and natural** due to the use of communication strategies*. Pauses are **effectively used to enhance the discussion**.

*Communication Strategies: fillers, listener expressions**, natural repetitions, rephrasing, paraphrasing, turn-taking expressions, negotiation of meaning, or agreeing/disagreeing with others.

**Listener expressions include: Uh(Ah)-huh / Yes / I see / Me too / Right / Sounds good / Great! (e.g., Wow / Amazing / Wonderful / Awesome ..) That's great! / I know what you mean. / Sure. / Too bad. / I'm sorry to hear that. / Really? / I can't believe it! / You're kidding. etc...

		1: Under performing (0.5/1.0)	2: Developing (2.0)	3: Satisfactory (2.5/3.0)	4: Accomplished (3.5/4.0)	5: Exemplary (4.5/5.0)
Vocabulary & Phrases	**Goals:** Can use a range of vocabulary and phrases. Can use vocabulary and phrases appropriately according to the context and situation.	Uses **a very limited range** of vocabulary and phrases to express ideas and opinions. Makes **many major mistakes** that **prevented comprehension**.	Uses **a limited range** of vocabulary and phrases to express ideas and opinions. Makes **some mistakes** that might cause **misunderstanding** for listeners who are not **accustomed to** dealing with **Japanese learners** of English.	Uses **some range** of vocabulary and phrases to express ideas and opinions. Makes **some mistakes** that might cause confusion to listeners, but is **understandable with some effort**.	Uses **a good variety** of vocabulary and phrases to express ideas and opinions. Generally uses appropriate vocabulary, but may make **minor mistakes** that do **not affect comprehension**.	Uses **a wide variety** of vocabulary and phrases **well** to express ideas and opinions. Effectively uses vocabulary and phrases **in the context and situation naturally**.
Attitude	**Goals:** Can use non-verbal communication skills such as non-verbal cues* and paralanguage** effectively and appropriately.	**Almost no** appropriate use of non-verbal cues and paralanguage.	**A few appropriate** non-verbal cues and paralanguage are used. **A few major inappropriate** cues/gestures may be apparent (e.g., voice is not loud enough throughout the speech, or it frequently affects listener's comprehension and/or attentiveness).	**Non-verbal cues** are **appropriately** used **some of the time**. **Paralanguage** is **appropriately** used **some of the time**.	**Non-verbal cues** are **appropriately** used **most of the time**. **Paralanguage** is **appropriately** used **most of the time**.	**Non-verbal cues** are **effectively used to enhance the speech**. **Paralanguage** is **effectively used to enhance the speech**.

*Non-verbal cues include: eye-contact, gestures, positioning, and facial expressions.
** Paralanguage here includes: volume of voice and emotional tone.

Appendix B
Speech Rubric

Overall Goal: Speakers can express their opinions about a social issue clearly, logically, and fluently.

Vocabulary & Phrases

Goals	1: Under performing (1.0)	2: Developing (2.0)	3: Satisfactory (2.5/3.0)	4: Accomplished (3.5/4.0)	5: Exemplary (4.5/5.0)
Can use a range of vocabulary and phrases. Can use vocabulary and phrases appropriately according to the context and situation.	Uses **a very limited range** of vocabulary and phrases to express ideas and opinions. Makes **many major mistakes** that **prevent comprehension**.	Uses **a limited range** of vocabulary and phrases to express ideas and opinions. Makes **many mistakes** that cause **misunderstanding** for listeners.	Uses **some range** of vocabulary and phrases to express ideas and opinions. Makes **some mistakes** that cause some confusion to listeners, but is **understandable with some effort**.	Uses **a good variety** of vocabulary and phrases to express ideas and opinions. Generally uses appropriate vocabulary, but may make **some minor mistakes** that do **not affect comprehension**.	Uses **a wide variety** of vocabulary and phrases **well** to express ideas and opinions. Effectively uses vocabulary and phrases **in the context and situation naturally**.

Pronunciation, Rhythm, & Intonation

Goals	1: Under performing (1.0)	2: Developing (2.0)	3: Satisfactory (2.5/3.0)	4: Accomplished (3.5/4.0)	5: Exemplary (4.5/5.0)
Can speak with natural pronunciation, intonation, and rhythm.	Uses a lot of incorrect pronunciation and has a strong accent, which **affects listener comprehension greatly**. Uses **almost no natural** English rhythm or proper intonation.	Uses several words that are mispronounced and/or a strong accent that cause **occasional misunderstanding** for listeners. Uses **quite unnatural** rhythm and intonation which could lead to **occasional misunderstanding** by the listener.	Uses a mixture of Japanese and English pronunciation but **good enough to be understood** by listeners who are **accustomed to dealing with Japanese learners** of English. Uses **quite natural** rhythm and intonation that can be **understood with some effort** by the listener.	**Generally** uses pronunciation **well enough to be understood** by listeners who are **unfamiliar with Japanese learners** of English. **Generally** uses **natural** rhythm and intonation.	**Natural and clear** pronunciation. Uses **natural** rhythm and intonation.

Fluency

Goals	1: Under performing (0.5/1.0)	2: Developing (2.0)	3: Satisfactory (2.5/3.0)	4: Accomplished (3.5/4.0)	5: Exemplary (4.5/5.0)
Can speak smoothly at a pace which is suitable for listeners. Listeners can easily understand the speaker.	The speech is **mostly halting** with long unnatural pauses. The speaker **often exhibts false starts** or **repeats words** over and over, which **greatly affects listener comprehension** and/or reduces listener's attentiveness.	Speech production is **slow**. **Many unnatural hesitations and long pauses** which **occasionally affect listener comprehension** and/or reduces listener's attentiveness.	Speech production is **fairly smooth** but **a little slow**. **Some unnatural hesitations and pauses** that **do not affect listener comprehension** very much.	Speech production is **fairly smooth** and **rapid**. **A few unnatural hesitations and pauses** that **do not affect listener comprehension**.	Speech production is **smooth and appropriate**. Most hesitations and pauses occur at **appropriate places** that **maximize the impact of the speech**.

Content & Organization

Goals	1: Under performing (1.0)	2: Developing (2.0)	3: Satisfactory (2.5/3.0)	4: Accomplished (3.5/4.0)	5: Exemplary (4.5/5.0)
Can talk about their thoughts clearly and coherently and order their main points logically. Can give supporting ideas and reasons to support their opinion using specific examples.	**Almost no logical structure**. **Almost no** clear expression of ideas and opinions.	**Very little logical structure, little use of simple cohesive devices**. **Very few** ideas and opinions, **lacking** concrete examples or reasons.	**Several problems with structure** but still understandable. Some use of cohesive devices. Ideas and opinions are **not entirely clear**, with **only a few** concrete examples or reasons.	**Good logical structure** demonstrated by fairly strong unity and cohesion. Ideas and opinions are **clear** with **some** concrete examples or reasons.	**Excellent logical structure.** Consistent use of appropriate cohesive devices. Ideas and opinions are **clear** with **a lot of** concrete and effective examples or reasons.

Grammar

Goals	1: Under performing (1.0)	2: Developing (2.0)	3: Satisfactory (2.5/3.0)	4: Accomplished (3.5/4.0)	5: Exemplary (4.5/5.0)
Appropriate mixture of **simple sentences, compound sentences and complex sentences**. Can use grammar accurately (**control of tense, pronouns, subject, and verb agreement**).	Very few full sentences. Mostly uses **only single words and phrases**. **Hardly** any **control** of basic grammar.	Uses **only simple sentences**. **Little control** of basic grammar.	Uses **mostly simple sentences** along with **a few compound and complex** sentences. **Some control** of grammar.	Uses **mostly simple sentences** along with **some compound and complex** sentences. **Generally** has **good control** of grammar.	Uses an **appropriate mixture of simple** sentences, **compound** sentences, and **complex sentences**. Has **good control** of grammar **throughout** the speech.

Attitude

Goals	1: Under performing (1.0)	2: Developing (2.0)	3: Satisfactory (2.5/3.0)	4: Accomplished (3.5/4.0)	5: Exemplary (4.5/5.0)
Can demonstrate non-verbal skills such as non-verbal cues* and paralanguage** effectively and appropriately.	**Almost no** appropriate use of non-verbal cues and paralanguage.	**A few appropriate** non-verbal cues and paralanguage are used. **A few major inappropriate** cues/gestures may be apparent (e.g., voice is not loud enough throughout the speech, or it frequently affects listener's comprehension and/or attentiveness).	**Non-verbal cues** are **appropriately** used **some of the time**. **Paralanguage** is **appropriately** used **some of the time**.	**Non-verbal cues** are **appropriately** used **most of the time**. **Paralanguage** is **appropriately** used **most of the time**.	**Non-verbal cues** are **effectively used to enhance the speech**. **Paralanguage** is **effectively used to enhance the speech**.

*Non-verbal cues include: eye-contact, gestures, positioning, and facial expressions.
** Paralanguage here includes: volume of voice and emotional tone.