

2022

## The Effectiveness of an Instructional Program based on SCAMPER Strategy in Improving English Speaking Skills among Fifth-Grade Students in Jordan

Bayan Saleh alOmari  
balomari089@gmail.com

Dr. Hamzah Ali alOmari  
Faculty of Educational Sciences\ The University of Jordan\Jordan, Homari@ju.edu.jo

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.aaru.edu.jo/jaes>



Part of the [Education Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

alOmari, Bayan Saleh and alOmari, Dr. Hamzah Ali (2022) "The Effectiveness of an Instructional Program based on SCAMPER Strategy in Improving English Speaking Skills among Fifth-Grade Students in Jordan," *Jordanian Educational Journal*: Vol. 7: Iss. 3, Article 15.

Available at: <https://digitalcommons.aaru.edu.jo/jaes/vol7/iss3/15>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by Arab Journals Platform. It has been accepted for inclusion in Jordanian Educational Journal by an authorized editor. The journal is hosted on [Digital Commons](#), an Elsevier platform. For more information, please contact [rakan@aarj.edu.jo](mailto:rakan@aarj.edu.jo), [marah@aarj.edu.jo](mailto:marah@aarj.edu.jo), [u.murad@aarj.edu.jo](mailto:u.murad@aarj.edu.jo).

## **The Effectiveness of an Instructional Program based on SCAMPER Strategy in Improving English Speaking Skills among Fifth-Grade Students in Jordan**

**Bayan Saleh alOmari  
Dr. Hamzah Ali alOmari\***

Received 10/2/2020

Accepted 31/3/2020

### **Abstract:**

This quasi-experimental study aimed at investigating the effectiveness of an instructional program based on SCAMPER strategy in improving speaking skills among fifth-grade students. The participants of the study were chosen from Al-Marwa elementary school in First Educational Directorate of Zarqa district, which was selected purposefully. Sixty-two participants were distributed randomly into an experimental group (n=32) and control group (n=30). The experimental group received the SCAMPER strategy for eight weeks during the first semester of the academic year 2019-2020, while the control group was taught using the conventional method. Pre-post speaking test was applied to both groups to collect the data.

The results of this study showed that there were statistically significant differences at ( $\alpha=0.05$ ) between the mean scores of the two groups in the speaking test in favor of the experimental group. Therefore, the researcher recommended training teachers to use SCAMPER strategy in teaching English skills.

**Key Words:** SCAMPER strategy, speaking skills, Jordan, EFL.

## فاعلية برنامج تعليمي قائم على استراتيجية "سكامبر" في تحسين مهارات التحدث في اللغة الإنجليزية لدى طلبة الصف الخامس في الأردن

بيان صالح العمري

د. حمزة علي العمري\*

### ملخص:

هدفت هذه الدراسة شبه التجريبية إلى استقصاء أثر برنامج تعليمي قائم على استراتيجية سكامبر في تحسين مهارات التحدث لدى طلبة الصف الخامس الأساسي في الأردن، تكون أفراد الدراسة من (62) طالبة من مدرسة المروة الأساسية المختلطة في مديرية تربية الزرقاء الأولى التي تم اختيارها قصدياً بينما تم توزيع الأفراد عشوائياً إلى مجموعتين: تجريبية مكونة من 32 طالبة وضابطة مكونة من 30 طالبة.

أعدّ برنامج تعليمي قائم على استراتيجية سكامبر، وطبّق على المجموعة التجريبية لمدة ثمانية أسابيع في الفصل الدراسي الأول 2019-2020، أما المجموعة الضابطة فدرّست باستخدام الطريقة الاعتيادية. وطبّق اختبار التحدث القبلي والبعدي على أفراد المجموعتين التجريبية والضابطة لجمع البيانات.

أشارت نتائج الدراسة الى وجود فروق ذات دلالة إحصائية عند مستوى ( $\alpha=0.05$ ) بين متوسط المجموعة التجريبية والمجموعة الضابطة في اختبار التحدث ولصالح المجموعة التجريبية، وفي ضوء تلك النتائج أوصت الدراسة بتدريب المعلمين على استخدام هذه الاستراتيجية في تدريس مهارات اللغة الإنجليزية.

**الكلمات المفتاحية:** نموذج سكامبر، مهارات التحدث، الأردن، اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية.

\* كلية العلوم التربوية/ الجامعة الأردنية/ الأردن.

## 1. Introduction

English is of great importance today, since it is the language of science and technology, and a prerequisite for almost any career. It is also essential for communication worldwide, and so many countries assert teaching English as a foreign or second language at all educational levels. According to Mercier and Swan (1996), enabling the learners to develop their communicative competence is the main aim of teaching and learning English as a foreign language (EFL).

Speaking is the most important skill for oral communication in any language. This requires the mastery of specific points of language such as grammar, pronunciation and vocabulary besides understanding when, why and how to communicate with speakers of that language in different life situations. Therefore, it is very important to improve these skills among foreign and second language learners. (Sadiku, 2015, Baker and Westrup, 2003; Nunan, 1999; Ur, 2000). On the other hand, Batineh (2014) argues that speaking skills include: pronouncing word accurately with appropriate mechanics of speaking, using authentic English naturally with very few communication breakdown, using body language and facial expressions efficiently to aid meaning, using grammatical structure and difficult lexicons using aesthetic aspects of language.

Many teaching strategies are based on constructivist theory to teach English as a foreign language (EFL). The main characteristics of these teaching methods are as follows: the learner shares actively involved in learning, the environment is democratic, and the activities are interactive and student-centered. Accordingly, students have two main sources of constructing their knowledge: one that is gained from previous experiences, while the other is constructed from learning new experiences. The prior knowledge influences the knowledge that will be constructed. The teacher's role is to provide students with chances to actively think of and share their new understanding of the new experiences. (Hoover, 1996). Among the strategies that are based on constructivist theory is SCAMPER, which promotes interaction between the students and the teacher and enhances the students' oral skills. According to Fahmy, Qoura, and Hassan (2017), SCAMPER strategy offers students a systematic and practical way for enhancing divergent thinking, imagination and originality which enables them to substitute, combine, adapt, modify, put to use, eliminate, and reverse.

In Jordan, Action Pack is the English book for grade five which

includes a Student's Book, an Activity Book, a Teacher's Book and a cassette. As for Action Pack Grade five teacher's book, it contains many methods and strategies to be used for teaching the speaking skills and sub skills in class including active- based learning, games and simulations, group work, and critical thinking. Also, the Action Pack Grade five textbook contains many activities related to speaking skills including repeating the sentences, asking and answering the questions (pair work), describing the pictures or events using the given words, encouraging group work, demonstrating dialogues to the class and expressing feelings and ideas which enable students to communicate with each other (MOE, 2020).

## **2. Statement of the Problem**

Oral language proficiency of EFL students in Jordan is not satisfactory compared to global levels, although the Ministry of Education makes a great effort to ensure quality education to students from K-12 grade in order to meet the growing and increasing demands for effective teaching and learning in public schools. According to the Education First English Proficiency Index (EF EPI, 2014), Jordan has scored lower than the global average between 2013 and 2015. Moreover, students demonstrate low-level of writing, inability to read well, and inability to communicate orally in English. To this end, the majority of students leave secondary schools with insufficient English communicative skills to cope up at the university level (Al-Dweik, 2008; Al-Zaid, 2007; Al-Sohbani, 2013). On the other hand, teachers and supervisors often complain that EFL students have serious problems in using vocabulary to express themselves in English. (Al-Damiree and Bataineh, 2016; AlKawaldeh, 2011).

Based on the above mentioned reasons, the researcher proposes that using new strategies such as SCAMPER strategy might be effective in enhancing fifth grade students' English language skills, especially speaking skills.

## **3. Question of the study**

This study seeks to answer the following research question: *What is the effectiveness of an instructional program based on SCAMPER strategy in improving English-speaking skills among fifth-grade students in Jordan?*

## **4. Purpose of the study:**

This study is intended to investigate the effectiveness of an instructional program based on SCAMPER strategy in improving English-speaking skills among fifth-grade students in Jordan.

## 5. Significance of the study:

This study may be significant in that:

- It provides researchers with an adequate theoretical background about SCAMPER strategy, speaking skills, and vocabulary.
- It provides teachers and curricula designers with the knowledge about the useful effectiveness of SCAMPER strategy in improving students' speaking skills and vocabulary.
- It may help students to improve their speaking skills, which will make them communicate better.
- It provides teachers and students with effective, valuable and creative strategy such as SCAMPER in teaching and learning speaking skills.
- The results of this study may help decision makers to employ SCAMPER strategy in teaching English language skills.

## 6. Definitions of Terms:

- **SCAMPER Strategy:** It is a teaching strategy that stands for the following skills Substitute, Combine, Adapt, Modify, Put to other uses, Eliminate, Reverse, and Rearrange. It is a strategy that was originated by Michalko (2006). Operationally, it is defined as the strategy that will be used by the researcher to enhance the fifth-grade students' English language speaking skills.
- **Speaking Skills:** It is the complete process of constructing meanings, producing utterances and receiving and processing information (Brown, 1994).

Operationally, the researcher defines it as the oral skills, which should fifth-grade students in Jordan master, which includes: pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary, and fluency that will be measured by an achievement test.

## 7. Limitations of the Study:

1. The study was limited to fifth grade female students at Al-Marwa school at the First Directorate of Education in Zarqa during the first semester of the academic year 2019-2020.
2. Generalization of the results of the current study is limited to the nature of the study tools and their psychometric characteristics.
3. Generalization of the results of the current study is limited to the samples which are similar to this of the current study.

## **8. Theoretical Background:**

### **a- SCAMPER strategy**

SCAMPER is an acronym representing techniques for revising or generating ideas. The “S” stands for substitute where students can replace the given words with others. The “C” stands for combine where students can use words together. The “A” stands for adopt which is to make something one’s own. The “M” stands for modify which is to change the form of the given words. The “P” stands for put which means to put for other uses. The “E” stands for eliminate which means to omit. The “R” stands for reverse or rearrange which means to change the order or to turn around (Abu Joma’a, 2015).

There are seven principles of SCAMPER strategy which are: substituting, combining, adapting, modifying or minifying or magnifying, putting to other use, elaborating or eliminating, reversing or rearranging. (Glenn 1997, Serrat 2009). The purpose of substituting is to replace the chosen element, ideas, or procedures to reach new ideas. While combining aims at bringing together and combining different objects which will lead to create a new production that is different in characteristics from its components. As for adapting, it aims at adapting the object under consideration to different situations or uses. Modifying, minifying or magnifying principle involves changing the form of the original object by reducing or increasing its size, or by changing its quality. While putting to other use involves discussing the use of the element under consideration for its aims or locations that is different from what was originally intended. The principle of eliminating or elaborating is concerned with removing or adding a certain feature of an element. While reversing or rearranging in which the current state of the element will be considered, is concerned with changing the order or turning around.

As in other strategies which are based on constructivist theory, SCAMPER strategy is student-centered, it focuses on the development of the student in a way that makes his/ her role not traditional. Hence, the student is not merely a listener in the class to the teacher’s directions and explanation about a topic, rather a knowledge seeker who can substitute, combine, adapt, minify or magnify or modify, put to other use, eliminate or elaborate, reverse or rearrange. Therefore, the student can produce creative and new ideas, and can look for the information without depending only on the teacher as a source of information, participate in presenting and generating ideas in an effective way, transfer experiences and applying them

to similar situations, discuss the new ideas with the teacher and colleagues.

On the other hand, the teacher's role depends on being a facilitator and a leader inside the classroom to make sure that the student plays a positive role in learning. Hussein (2017) stated that the teacher's roles are the following:

1. Determining and classifying the objectives to be achieved by the students.
2. Presenting the idea to provoke brainstorming.
3. Asking students many questions to make them think, and answering the question raised by students.
4. Arranging the time to achieve the objectives.
5. Encouraging the students to share their ideas and thoughts and giving them self-confidence.

#### **b- Speaking Skills**

Speaking is a way for communication and there are a lot of definitions that have been raised by many researchers. Nunan (1991) defined it as a way for saying words orally, communicating by talking, making a request and making a speech. While it was defined as an interactive process of making meaning that include producing and receiving information by Brown (1994) and Burns and Joyce (1997). Another definition was raised by Howarth (2001) and Abd El Fattah Torky (2006) which is a two-way process including a true communication of opinions, information, or emotions.

People use language to communicate orally more than using it in a written form, they even speak before they learn to read and write. English speaking for EFL learners is not an easy task to some extent because they have to deal with many components such as pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension. Speaking and listening are the most important language tools. (Brown, 1994). According to Efrizal (2012), speaking is the most significant tool for people to interact with each other since they speak everywhere and every day. In order to encourage learners to communicate well, we have to teach them to speak well.

Besides, the importance of speaking skill stems from its necessity to be integrated with the other language skills. It helps learners to develop their vocabulary and grammar skills which will lead them to enhance their writing skill. Also, it is very important outside the school because language speakers will find better opportunities to work in many organizations and companies; in other words, Good English speakers can have better education, find better jobs (Baker and Westrup, 2003).



Speaking skill has sub skills which are:

1. Fluency: it is the learner's ability to speak well in order not to break down communication because listeners may lose their interest, and it is the ability to answer coherently by connecting the words and pronouncing the sounds clearly (Hughes, 2002; Hedge, 2000).
2. Accuracy: learners should pay attention to the exactness of language form when they speak such as focusing on grammar structures by using well-structured clauses, vocabulary by using the suitable words in the suitable context, and pronunciation by mastering the phonological rules (Hughes, 2002).
3. Vocabulary: it is the total number of words which learners use to express their ideas, learner will be disable to communicate successfully without having enough vocabulary.
4. Comprehension: it is the process of understanding the words sent by the speaker (Brown, 2001).
5. Grammar: according to Ur (2000), grammar is the way words are put together to make correct sentences. So, it is the ability to use structure and grammatical rules in a situation.

## 9. Previous Studies

### – Studies on SCAMPER strategy

A study conducted by Jouda (2019) aimed at identifying the impact of using SCAMPER Strategy on developing English vocabulary learning, accomplishment and retention for tenth graders in Gaza Governorate. The researcher used quasi-experimental approach and the sample consisted of 80 EFL male students who were selected randomly from Sulaiman Sultan Secondary School; then divided into two equivalent groups. Two instructions were used to collect data; an achievement vocabulary test of seven questions and a motivation scale to decide the students' motivation towards learning English in general and vocabulary in particular. The results showed that SCAMPER strategy had a positive effect on developing motivation among tenth graders. Besides, the findings of the study revealed that there were significant differences in learning vocabulary between the experimental group and control groups in favor of the experimental group.

A study conducted by Fahmy, Qoura, and Hassan (2017) aimed at examining the effect of using SCAMPER-based activities in teaching story in developing EFL primary stage pupil's speaking skills. The researchers used the quasi-experimental design and the sample consisted of 60 pupils who were selected randomly from six grades of Fakhr Dakhilia language

school; then divided into two groups. A pre-posttest for measuring the pupil's creative speaking skills and a rubric. The results indicated that there was a statistically significant difference between the mean scores of the experimental and control group in the post administration of the creative speaking skills test in favor of the experimental group. This revealed that the use of SCAMPER strategy led to a significant improvement in the pupil's creative speaking skills.

A study conducted by Al-Harithi (2015) aimed at investigating the effect of using SCAMPER program on developing English language vocabularies among first grade middle school students in Makkah Al Mukarrama. The sample consisted of 60 students who were divided into two groups (experimental and control), the researcher used quasi-experimental approach based on the test of English vocabulary as a tool for the study. The findings of the study indicated that there were significant difference at ( $\alpha=0.05$ ) between tribal and post application of the study group in favor of the post application to the study group.

#### – **Studies on Speaking Skills**

A study conducted by al-Jiboury (2018) aimed at investigating the effect of using dramatized activities on the secondary stage students' speaking skills and their role in enhancing their motivation. The sample consisted of 69 male fifth grade students during the first semester of the academic year 2017-2018 at al Makassid secondary school in Iraq. The sample was divided into two groups (experimental and control group). The instruments were a speaking skill test and a questionnaire to measure the students' motivation. The results indicated that the experimental group students have developed in all skills of speaking but it was very clear in speaking skills related to vocabulary growth and grammatical structure.

A study conducted by Amiri, Othman, and Jehadi (2017) aimed at describing the implementation of debate activities in teaching English to Malaysian secondary students which can enhance students' speaking skills. The study found that debate activities had an impact on the participants through improving collaborative skills, raising awareness of speakers' roles and guiding participants via prepared texts. Besides, the main communicative strategies employed by the participant were compensatory and avoidance strategies. The result has also shown the improvement of the participant's speaking skills after five rounds of debate activities.

After reviewing some of the most related studies to the topic of this study, the researcher found that there were few studies on using SCAMPER

strategy for teaching English speaking skills. A study by Fehmy, Qoura, and Hassan (2017) focused on using SCAMPER strategy for teaching story to enhance speaking skills, however they used the strategy itself without developing a program based on it, besides, they used it for teaching story only. There were no studies that build an instructional program based on SCAMPER strategy, to the best knowledge of the researcher. And this what makes this study significant.

A study conducted by Khweireh (2017) aimed at investigating the effect of applying role-play strategy on vocabulary development and speaking skill improvement among the Jordanian seventh grade EFL students in the second semester of the scholastic year 2015-2016. The sample consisted of 172 participants who were divided into two groups (experimental and control group). The instruments of the study were the speaking skill test, vocabulary test, and a speaking skill rating scale. The results of the study indicated that role-play (Shaftels' model) contributed significantly to the vocabulary development and the speaking skills improvement among the participants more than the conventional teaching methodology. Also the results showed that there were statistically significant differences between the mean scores of the participants who experienced role-play treatment in comparison with those who were exposed to the conventional teaching methodology in favor of the experimental groups.

## **10. Methods and Procedures**

This section discusses the methods and procedures of the study. It includes the participants of the study, design of the study, variables of the study, the instruments of collecting data and their validity, reliability, and data analysis.

### **10.1. Participants of the Study**

The participants of the study were sixty- two fifth-grade students in Al-Marwa School in First Educational Directorate of Zarqa district. This school has five classes of fifth grade students; two of which were randomly selected to comprise the experimental group and the control group. The experimental group consisted of 32 students while the control group consisted of 30 students. This school was selected purposefully because the school administration and the English language teachers agreed to conduct the study there.

### **10.2. Design of Study**

The design of this study is Quasi-experimental design where there are

two groups of students. The experimental group which underwent using the treatment which is the instructional program based on SCAMPER strategy; whereas the control group was taught using the conventional method.

### **10.3. Variables of the Study**

The study has the following types of variables:

1. **Independent variable** which has two levels:
  - The conventional method
  - The instructional program which is based on SCAMPER strategy.
2. **Dependent variable** which is:
  - English language speaking skills of fifth-grade students.

### **10.4. Instruments of the Study**

#### **Speaking Test**

A speaking test was developed by the researcher based on related literature (Younes, 2017; al-jiboury, 2018; and Fahmy, Qoura, and Hassan, 2017) in order to measure speaking skills of fifth-grade students.

The first version of the pre-test and the post-test consisted of three parts: the first part elicited general information about the students; the second part consisted of four different questions derived from the topics of Action Pack (5); and the third part addressed the ability of students to describe the given picture. Then the researcher developed speaking rubric based on related literature (Younes, 2017; and Qamar, 2016). The rubric consisted of five indicators of the speaking skills which are: pronunciation, fluency, comprehension, grammar and accuracy, and vocabulary. There are five scores for each indicator where 1 indicates the lowest level of the skill and 5 indicates the highest level of the skill. The duration of the test was from 5 to 7 minutes for each student.

#### **Validity of Speaking Test**

The speaking pre-test and post-test were given to twelve EFL professors and one supervisor in order to verify the relevance, comprehensiveness, accuracy and appropriateness of both tests. In light of their comments and recommendations, the final approved version of speaking test consisted of three parts, including warm-up questions, discussion of topics, and description the given picture, along with guiding questions for all three parts. Accordingly, the distribution of grades was modified.

#### **Reliability of Speaking Test**

Reliability of speaking pre-test was established by administering the test to 37 fifth grade students in one section in Hai-Ramzi school in Zarqa.

These students were not included in the two groups of the study. Two raters used a five- dimension rubric to measure students' speaking achievement. The researcher discussed the rubric with the second rater to make sure that both raters fully understand how to use the rubric.

Pearson Correlation Coefficient was computed and the percentage of consensus between the two ratings was (.995), which was considered appropriate to measure students' speaking skills.

### **The instructional Program based on SCAMPER strategy.**

The researcher developed an instructional program based related literature to use SCAMPER strategy. The aim of the program was to improve the speaking skills of fifth grade EFL students in Jordan. The necessary educational resources, the teaching strategies, the assessment strategies and tools, and the educational content based on SCAMPER strategy were described. In addition, the teacher's book was prepared. The lessons of the chosen units were prepared and modified based on SCAMPER strategy by revising the related literature and previous studies (such as Al Harithi, 2015; Fahmy, Qoura, and Hassan, 2017). The instructional program was applied during the first semester of the school year 2019/2020, starting from 24<sup>th</sup> of November, till 12<sup>th</sup> of January. Three units were included: (Are you going to see planes, Grandpa took this photo, She is the youngest in the family) each unit required ten sessions. A detailed description of the conventional method of teaching English speaking skills are taught is included. Both the conventional and the **SCAMPER** strategies were also validated by the same panel of experts. The researcher modified the instructional program based on the notes of the panel of experts.

### **10.5. Data Analysis**

In order to analyze the data of the study, the SPSS package was applied. The means and standard deviations were calculated for both groups. ANCOVA and MANCOVA were used to test the statistical differences in the mean scores between both groups with regard to their speaking skill in general and the five sub-skill.

### **11. Results of the Study**

This study aimed at answering the following question: *What is the effectiveness of an instructional program based on SCAMPER strategy in improving speaking skills among fifth-grade students in Jordan?*

In order to answer the first question, means and standard deviations of both groups on the speaking pre-test and post-test were computed. Results are presented in Table 1.

**Table 1. Mean Scores and Standard Deviations of the two groups on the speaking pre-posttest**

| Group        | N  | Means& standard deviations | Speaking pretest | Speaking posttest |
|--------------|----|----------------------------|------------------|-------------------|
| experimental | 32 | Mean                       | 7.2813           | 10.5938           |
|              |    | Std. Deviation             | 3.46628          | 3.83414           |
| control      | 30 | Mean                       | 7.0667           | 7.9333            |
|              |    | Std. Deviation             | 3.56161          | 2.94704           |
| Total        | 62 | Mean                       | 7.1774           | 9.3065            |
|              |    | Std. Deviation             | 3.48545          | 3.66010           |

Results in Table 1 show that there were differences in the mean scores of the two groups regarding their speaking achievement. In order to test whether these differences were statistically significant or not, one-way analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) test was used. Results are presented in Table 2

**Table 2. One Way Analysis of Covariance (ANCOVA) regarding the Speaking test**

| Source           | Type III Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F       | Sig.  | Partial Eta Squared |
|------------------|-------------------------|----|-------------|---------|-------|---------------------|
| Group            | 96.136                  | 1  | 96.136      | 22.100  | *.000 | .273                |
| Speaking-pretest | 450.932                 | 1  | 450.932     | 103.661 | .000  | .637                |
| Error            | 256.654                 | 59 | 4.350       |         |       |                     |
| Total            | 6187.000                | 62 |             |         |       |                     |

\*Significant ( $\alpha= 0.05$ )

Table 2 shows that the “F” value for the total score of the speaking test was (22.100) which is statistically significant at ( $\alpha=0.05$ ). This indicates that the differences were due to the teaching method used.

The adjusted means and standard errors were also computed for both groups. Results are presented in Table 3.

**Table 3. The Adjusted Mean Scores and Standard Errors of the Total Score of Both Groups in the Speaking Test due to the Teaching Strategy**

| Group        | The Adjusted Mean   | Std. Error |
|--------------|---------------------|------------|
| Experimental | 10.513 <sup>a</sup> | .369       |
| Control      | 8.020 <sup>a</sup>  | .381       |

Table 3 shows that the adjusted mean scores of the experimental group was (10.513) whereas the adjusted mean scores of the control group was (8.020). This result implies that SCAMPER strategy was more effective than the conventional method in developing the students’ speaking skills.

Table 3 also shows that the Eta Squared ( $\eta^2$ ) of the total score for the speaking skills test was (.273) which means that (27.3%) of the variance in the total score of the speaking test between the experimental and control groups is due to using the instructional program. This means that the effect size of the instructional program based on SCAMPER strategy is significantly large.

As far as domains of the speaking test are concerned, Table 4 displays the means and standard deviations of the two groups in the five speaking skills (i.e. pronunciation, fluency, comprehension, accuracy, and vocabulary).

**Table 4. Means and standard deviations of the two groups regarding the five domains of the speaking test.**

| Speaking domains | Group        | N  | Pretest |                | Posttest |                |
|------------------|--------------|----|---------|----------------|----------|----------------|
|                  |              |    | Mean    | Std. deviation | Mean     | Std. deviation |
| Pronunciation    | experimental | 32 | 1.31    | .644           | 1.81     | .78            |
|                  | Control      | 30 | 1.27    | .691           | 1.40     | .724           |
|                  | total        | 62 | 1.29    | .663           | 1.61     | .776           |
| Fluency          | experimental | 32 | 1.28    | .581           | 1.94     | .878           |
|                  | control      | 30 | 1.27    | .691           | 1.37     | .669           |
|                  | total        | 62 | 1.27    | .632           | 1.66     | .829           |
| Comprehension    | experimental | 32 | 1.94    | .982           | 2.84     | .847           |
|                  | control      | 30 | 1.73    | .868           | 2.23     | .626           |
|                  | total        | 62 | 1.84    | .927           | 2.55     | .803           |
| Accuracy         | Experimental | 32 | 1.31    | .592           | 1.75     | .880           |
|                  | control      | 30 | 1.23    | .679           | 1.27     | .640           |
|                  | total        | 62 | 1.27    | .632           | 1.52     | .805           |
| Vocabulary       | experimental | 32 | 1.44    | .840           | 2.25     | .803           |
|                  | control      | 30 | 1.57    | .858           | 1.67     | .711           |
|                  | total        | 62 | 1.50    | .844           | 1.97     | .809           |

As shown in Table 4, there were differences between the mean scores of the control and experimental groups on the five domains of speaking test. In order to test whether these differences were statistically significant or not, multivariate analysis of covariance (MANCOVA) test was used. Results are presented in Table 5

**Table 5. Multivariate Analysis of Covariance (MANCOVA) of the Speaking Test Domains among Fifth Grade Students due to the Teaching Strategy.**

| Effect |                   | Value | F                  | Hypothesis df | Error df | Sig. | Partial Eta Squared |
|--------|-------------------|-------|--------------------|---------------|----------|------|---------------------|
| group  | Hotelling's Trace | .351  | 3.585 <sup>a</sup> | 5.000         | 51.000   | .007 | .260                |

\*Significant ( $\alpha = 0.05$ ).

Table (5) shows that there were statistically significant differences at ( $\alpha=0.05$ ) in the total mean scores of students regarding the domains of the speaking skill.

In order to test if the differences in the mean scores of experimental and control groups regarding each of the speaking skill domains were statistically significant or not, multivariate analysis of covariance (MANCOVA) was used. Results are presented in Table 6.

**Table 6. Multivariate Analysis of Covariance (MANCOVA) on the Posttest for Each of the Speaking Skills Domains among Fifth Grade Students due to the Teaching Strategy.**

| source                | Dependent Variable | Type III Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F      | Sig. | Partial Eta Squared |
|-----------------------|--------------------|-------------------------|----|-------------|--------|------|---------------------|
| group                 | pronunciation      | 2.489                   | 1  | 2.489       | 8.797  | .004 | .138                |
|                       | fluency            | 2.846                   | 1  | 2.846       | 9.911  | .003 | .153                |
|                       | comprehension      | 3.167                   | 1  | 3.167       | 11.645 | .001 | .175                |
|                       | accuracy           | 3.253                   | 1  | 3.253       | 11.793 | .001 | .177                |
|                       | vocabulary         | 3.703                   | 1  | 3.703       | 12.029 | .001 | .179                |
| Pronunciation pretest | pronunciation      | .032                    | 1  | .032        | .115   | .736 | .002                |
|                       | fluency            | .288                    | 1  | .288        | 1.003  | .321 | .018                |
|                       | comprehension      | .261                    | 1  | .261        | .958   | .332 | .017                |
|                       | accuracy           | .094                    | 1  | .094        | .342   | .561 | .006                |
|                       | vocabulary         | .328                    | 1  | .328        | 1.067  | .306 | .019                |
| Fluency pretest       | pronunciation      | .029                    | 1  | .029        | .103   | .749 | .002                |
|                       | fluency            | .075                    | 1  | .075        | .261   | .611 | .005                |
|                       | comprehension      | .050                    | 1  | .050        | .185   | .669 | .003                |
|                       | accuracy           | .000                    | 1  | .000        | .000   | .993 | .000                |
|                       | vocabulary         | .007                    | 1  | .007        | .023   | .880 | .000                |
| Comprehension pretest | pronunciation      | .360                    | 1  | .360        | 1.274  | .264 | .023                |
|                       | fluency            | 1.889                   | 1  | 1.889       | 6.576  | .013 | .107                |
|                       | comprehension      | 2.897                   | 1  | 2.897       | 10.655 | .002 | .162                |
|                       | accuracy           | .000                    | 1  | .000        | .001   | .981 | .000                |
|                       | vocabulary         | 1.217                   | 1  | 1.217       | 3.954  | .052 | .067                |
| Accuracy pretest      | pronunciation      | .001                    | 1  | .001        | .002   | .965 | .000                |
|                       | fluency            | .632                    | 1  | .632        | 2.201  | .144 | .038                |
|                       | comprehension      | .342                    | 1  | .342        | 1.257  | .267 | .022                |
|                       | accuracy           | .132                    | 1  | .132        | .479   | .492 | .009                |
|                       | vocabulary         | .452                    | 1  | .452        | 1.470  | .231 | .026                |
| Vocabulary pretest    | pronunciation      | 1.363                   | 1  | 1.363       | 4.817  | .032 | .081                |
|                       | fluency            | .008                    | 1  | .008        | .029   | .865 | .001                |
|                       | comprehension      | .000                    | 1  | .000        | .000   | .985 | .000                |
|                       | accuracy           | .707                    | 1  | .707        | 2.565  | .115 | .045                |



| source       | Dependent Variable   | Type III Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F     | Sig. | Partial Eta Squared |
|--------------|----------------------|-------------------------|----|-------------|-------|------|---------------------|
|              | <b>vocabulary</b>    | .352                    | 1  | .352        | 1.143 | .290 | .020                |
| <b>Error</b> | <b>pronunciation</b> | 15.560                  | 55 | .283        |       |      |                     |
|              | <b>fluency</b>       | 15.795                  | 55 | .287        |       |      |                     |
|              | <b>comprehension</b> | 14.955                  | 55 | .272        |       |      |                     |
|              | <b>accuracy</b>      | 15.171                  | 55 | .276        |       |      |                     |
|              | <b>vocabulary</b>    | 16.930                  | 55 | .308        |       |      |                     |
| <b>Total</b> | <b>pronunciation</b> | 198.000                 | 62 |             |       |      |                     |
|              | <b>fluency</b>       | 213.000                 | 62 |             |       |      |                     |
|              | <b>comprehension</b> | 442.000                 | 62 |             |       |      |                     |
|              | <b>accuracy</b>      | 182.000                 | 62 |             |       |      |                     |
|              | <b>vocabulary</b>    | 280.000                 | 62 |             |       |      |                     |

\*Significant ( $\alpha = 0.05$ ).

Table 6 shows that “F” value for pronunciation domain was (8.797), for the fluency domain (9.911), for the comprehension domain (11.645), for accuracy domain (11.793), and for the vocabulary domain (12.029). All of these values are statistically significant ( $\alpha = 0.05$ ).

The adjusted means and standard errors regarding the domains of speaking test were also calculated. Results are presented in Table (7).

**Table 7. The Adjusted Means and Standard Errors for the Domains of Speaking Test due to the Teaching Strategy.**

| Dependent Variable   | group               | Mean               | Std. Error |
|----------------------|---------------------|--------------------|------------|
| <b>pronunciation</b> | <b>experimental</b> | 1.823 <sup>a</sup> | .098       |
|                      | <b>control</b>      | 1.389 <sup>a</sup> | .101       |
| <b>fluency</b>       | <b>experimental</b> | 1.886 <sup>a</sup> | .099       |
|                      | <b>control</b>      | 1.422 <sup>a</sup> | .102       |
| <b>comprehension</b> | <b>experimental</b> | 2.785 <sup>a</sup> | .096       |
|                      | <b>control</b>      | 2.296 <sup>a</sup> | .099       |
| <b>accuracy</b>      | <b>experimental</b> | 1.756 <sup>a</sup> | .097       |
|                      | <b>control</b>      | 1.260 <sup>a</sup> | .100       |
| <b>vocabulary</b>    | <b>experimental</b> | 2.224 <sup>a</sup> | .102       |
|                      | <b>control</b>      | 1.695 <sup>a</sup> | .106       |

Table 7 shows that the adjusted mean scores of the treatment group on the five domains of the speaking test (i.e. pronunciation, fluency, comprehension, accuracy, and vocabulary) were significantly higher than those of the control group.

To show the extent to which the instructional program based on SCAMPER strategy was effective, the effect size was computed. As shown in Table 6, the Eta Squared ( $\eta^2$ ) of pronunciation was (0.138) which means

that (13.8%) of the variance in the pronunciation domain between the experimental and control groups is due to using the instructional program based on SCAMPER strategy.

The Eta Squared ( $\eta^2$ ) of fluency was (0.153) which means that (15.3%) of the variance in the fluency domain between the experimental and control groups is due to using the instructional program based on SCAMPER strategy.

The Eta Squared ( $\eta^2$ ) of comprehension was (0.175) which means that (17.5%) of the variance in the comprehension domain between the experimental and control groups is due to using the instructional program based on SCAMPER strategy.

The Eta Squared ( $\eta^2$ ) of accuracy was (0.177) which means that (17.7%) of the variance in the accuracy domain between the experimental and control groups is due to using the instructional program based on SCAMPER strategy.

The Eta Squared ( $\eta^2$ ) of vocabulary was (0.179) which means that (17.9%) of the variance in the vocabulary domain between the experimental and control groups is due to using the instructional program based on SCAMPER strategy.

These results show that the effect size of the instructional program based on SCAMPER strategy was significantly large on all of the domains of the speaking skill.

## **12. Discussion and Recommendations:**

### **12.1. Discussion of the results**

The results of the research question revealed that there were statistically significant differences at ( $\alpha= 0.05$ ) between the experimental and control groups regarding their speaking achievement in favor of the experimental group this indicates that using an instructional program based on SCAMPER strategy was more effective in improving speaking skills of the experimental group compared to the control group. These results were consistent with those of other researchers who investigated the same strategy such as Jouda, 2015; Fehmy, Qoura, and Hassan, 2017; and Al-Harithi, 2015; besides, the results are consisted with other researches that are related to other strategies such as the researches of al-Jiboury, 2018, and Amiri, Othman, and Jehadi (2017).

SCAMPER is a student- centered strategy that emphasizes the role of the learner in an interactive classroom setting, which results in increasing the chances for collaborate learning. SCAMPER strategy requires the

teacher to be a guide and a facilitator, which seems to have reduced stress and hesitation among students of the treatment group.

Another explanation is that SCAMPER strategy helped students to express themselves by having more opportunities to participate without being afraid or hesitated to make grammatical or pronunciation mistakes. This, in turn, increased the opportunities for students to talk together, share their ideas, and negotiate meaning. Accordingly students' pronunciation, fluency, comprehension, accuracy, and vocabulary have improved greatly. Moreover, the immediate feedback provided by the teacher seemed to have helped enhancing a sense of achievement among students of the experimental group.

Applying SCAMPER strategy created a friendly environment which allowed for collaborative learning and interactive activities, hence, helping students to represent themselves better. In other words, through using well-prepared activities based on SCAMPER strategy, students improved their speaking skills by being allowed to articulate their opinions freely which in turn promoted their attitudes towards the English class.

With regard to speaking sub skills, i.e. pronunciation, fluency, comprehension, accuracy and vocabulary, SCAMPER strategy improved that it was helpful by increasing self-confidence among students which led to more fluency when delivering an answer or a speech. Also, it enhanced the fluency by allowing them to use paraphrasing when they lacked the word and by giving them more time to plan for the answer. In addition, it affected the level of accuracy by having correct use of negation and articles, tenses, and subject-verb agreement. Also, students had more control over vocabulary since they have variety in word choice and appropriate use in the given contexts due to the principles of SCAMPER which affect the quality and quantity of vocabulary. Besides, students paid more attention to pronunciation since they hear and learn from each other.

Another explanation is that SCAMPER strategy encourages learners to enrich their vocabularies and use them with flexibility, so students will think about many different alternatives to answer any given question which, in turn, increases the students' opportunities to speak freely. Besides, building new vocabularies will be possible when students share their answers and ideas no matter how many grammatical errors they will commit; and sharing the ideas means that there is more time to speak; and this what SCAMPER calls for. In this case, the teacher can tell the students that the content of the vocabulary is more important than grammatical position.

## **12.2. Recommendations:**

Based on the results of this study, it is recommended that:

1. The SCAMPER strategy be used to teach EFL because it proved its effectiveness in improving speaking skill in fifth-grade students.
2. The students be given the chance to work collaboratively rather than individually, so that they more knowledge and experience are shared and negotiated by all.
3. Other researchers investigate the effect of similar interactive strategies in teaching English to students at all grade levels.

## **References:**

- Abd El Fattah Torky, S. (2006). **The Effectiveness of a Task-Based Instruction Program in Developing the English Language Speaking Skills of Secondary Stage Students**. Unpublished Doctoral dissertation , Ain Shams University, Cairo, Egypt.
- Abdel Qader, A. and Ismeil, A. (2015). The Effectiveness of SCAMPER Model in Developing the Creative Linguistics Performance of Linguistically Gifted Pupils at the Preparatory Stage. **The International Journal for Educational Research, UAEU**. (37), 256- 301.
- Abu Jumaa, N. (2015). **Introduction to SCAMPER Creative Thinking Development**. Amman: DEBONO Learning Center.
- Al-Damiree, R. and Bataineh, R. (2016). Vocabulary Knowledge and Syntactic Awareness as Potential Catalysts for Reading Comprehension among Young Jordanian EFL Students. **Teaching and Teacher Education**. 4(2), 33-59.
- Al-Dweik, A. (2008). **Speaking Difficulties that Encountered by the Learners of English as a Foreign Language at the Upper Stage in Jordan**. Unpublished Master thesis. Amman Arab University for Graduate Students. Amman: Jordan.
- Al-Harithi, S. (2015). **The Effect of Using SCAMPER Program on Developing English Language Vocabularies among First Grade Middle School Students in Makkah Al Mokarrama**. Unpublished Master thesis, Um Alqura University, Makkah, KSA.
- Al-Heilat, M. (2015). **SCAMPER PROGRAM for Developing the Creative Thinking: Theory and Practice**. Amman: DEBONO Learning Center.
- Al-Jbouri, A. (2018). **The Effect of Using Dramatized Activities on Developing EFL Students; Speaking Skills**. Unpublished Master thesis. Electronic copy

- Al-Khawaldeh, A. (2011). EFL Reading Comprehension Interests among Jordanian high School Students and their Relationship with Gender Achievement Level and Academic Stream. **European Journal of Social Sciences**. 23(3), 454-465.
- Al-Sohbani, Y. (2013). An Exploration of English Language Teaching Pedagogy in Secondary Yemini Education: A Case Study. **International Journal of English Language and Translation Studies**. 1(3), 40-55.
- Al-Zaid, N. (2007). **The Effect of a Proposed Instructional Program Based on the Communicative Approach on Developing the Speaking Skill of the Basic Stage Students and Their Attitudes towards Speaking English in Jordan**. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Amman Arab University for Graduate Studies, Amman: Jordan.
- Amiri, F., Othman, M.m and Jehadi, M (2017). Case Study of the Development of an ESL Learner's Speaking Skills through Instructional Debate. **International Journal of Humanities and Social Science**. 7(2), 120-126.
- Baker, J. and Westrup, H. (2003). **Essential Speaking Skills: A Handbook for English Language Teachers**. London: Continuum.
- Beck, I. and Mckeown, M. (2007). Increasing Young Low-Income Children's Oral Vocabulary Repertoires through Rich and Focused Instruction. **The Elementary School Journal**. 107(3), 251-271.
- Bataineh, A. (2014). The Effect of Using Audiovisual Chat on Developing English as a foreign Language Learners' Fluency and Productivity of Authentic Oral Texts. **International Journal of Linguistics**. 6 (3), 85-108
- Brown, H. (1994). **Teaching by Principles-An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy**. Prentice Hall Regents.
- Burns, A. and Joyce, H. (1997). **Focus on Speaking**. Sydney: National Center for English Language Teaching Research.
- Eberel, B. (2008). **Scamper Creative Games and Activities (Let Your Imagination Run Wild)**. Waco. TX: prufrock press.
- Education First English Proficiency Index. (2014). Fourth Edition of the EF English Proficiency index. Retrieved from: <http://media.ef.com/~media/centralefcom/epi/v4/downloads/full-reports/ef-epi-2014-english.pdf>

- Efrizal, D. (2012). Improving Students' Speaking through Communicative Language Teaching Method at MtsJaalhaq, Sentot Ali Basa Islamic Boarding School of Bengkulu, Indonesia. **International Journal of Humanities and Social Science**. 2(20), 127-134.
- Fahmi, G. Qoura, A. and Hassan, S. (2017). Using SCAMPER-based Activities in Teaching Story to Enhance EFL Primary Stage Pupils' Speaking Skills. **Journal of Research in Curriculum, Instruction and Educational Technology (JRCIET)**, 3(4), 11-33.
- Glenn, R. E. (1997). SCAMPER for Student Creativity. **Education Digest**. 62, 67-68.
- Hedge, T. (2000). **Teaching and Learning in the Language Classroom**. Oxford: Oxford University press.
- Hoover, W. A. (1996). The Practice Implications of Constructivism. SEDL. Retrieved from: <http://www.sedl.org/pubs/sedletter/v09n03/practice.html>
- Howarth, P. (2001). Process Speaking. Preparing to Repeat Yourself. **MET**. 10(1), 39-44.
- Hughes, R. (2002). **Teaching and Researching Speaking**. New York: Pearson Education.
- Jouda, A. A. (2019). **The Impact of SCAMPER Strategy on Developing English Vocabulary Learning, Accomplishment Motivation and Retention for Tenth Graders in Gaza Governorate**. Unpublished master thesis. The Islamic University of Gaza. Gaza, Palestine.
- Khweireh, M. (2017). **The Effect of Role-Play Strategy on Vocabulary Development and Speaking Skills Improvement among the Seventh Grade EFL Students in Jordan**. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. The World Islamic Sciences and Education University, Amman, Jordan.
- Mercer, N. and Swan, J. (1996). **Learning English. Developing and Diversity**. New York. Routledge and Open university Press.
- Michalko, M. (2006). **Thinker Toys. A Handbook of Creative Thinking Techniques**. Berkerley, CA. Ten Speed Press.
- MOE, The Ministry of Education (2020). Retrieved on March, 2, 2020 from: <http://www.moe.gov.jo/>
- Naunan, D. (1991). **Language Teaching Methodology: A Textbook for Teachers**. New York: Prentice Hall.

- Qamar, M. (2016). The Impact of Learner's Autonomy on Teaching Oral Skills (Speaking Skills) in an EFL Classroom. **Journal of Language Teaching and Research**. 7 (2), 293-298.
- Richards, J., Platt, J. and Platt, H. (1992). **Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics**. Essex: Longman.
- Sadiku, L., M. (2015). The Importance of Four Skills: Reading, Speaking, Writing, Listening in a Lesson Hour. **European Journal of Language and Literature**. 1(1), 29-31.
- Serrate, O. (2009). The SCAMPER Technique. **Knowledge solutions, Asian Development Bank**. (31), 1-4.
- Toraman, S. and Altun, S. (2013). Application of the Six Thinking Hats and SCAMPER Technique on the 7<sup>th</sup> Grade Course Unit "Human and Environment": An Exemplary Case Study. **Mevlana International Journal of Education (MIJE)**. 3(4), 166-185.
- Ur, P. (2000). **A Course in Language Teaching: Practice and Theory**. Cambridge: Cambridge university press.
- Vidal, R. (2005). Creativity for Operation Researches. **Journal of Association to the Portugueses to the operational Research**. 25(2005), 1-24.
- Younis, M. (2017). **The Effect of Using the "Panuricon" Strategy on the Oral Skills of Eight Grade Students and on Their Attitudes towards Learning these Skills**. Unpublished Master Thesis. University of Jordan. Amman, Jordan.