The Research on Influence of the Acquaintance Between Teachers and Students on Students' Learning Effect in Dialogue Teaching

CHEN Liang[a],*; Wan Mazlini Binti Othman[b]; HE Xiaolan[c]

[a]UPSI doctoral candidate, Anhui Finance and Trade Vocational College, teaching assistant, Malaysia.
[b]Malaysian, UPSI Professor. School of Language and Media, UPSI, Malaysia.
[c]Teaching assistant of Anhui Finance and Trade Vocational College, China.
*Corresponding author.

Abstract

The acquaintance between teachers and students is one of the important factors that affects the quality of dialogue teaching. Previous researches that are did by experts focus on the effect of students' acquaintance mostly, but there is less research on the dependent variable of the acquaintance between teachers and students. In the study, the data were collected through teacher-student interview, supernova questionnaire survey and teacher-student interaction recording in class, and the relevant experimental data were analyzed in a quantitative way. Through the analysis of experimental data, it is found that the acquaintance between teachers and students is an important factor that affects the teaching effect, and the influence on each teaching dimension is not consistent. The results show that the close interaction that is produced between teachers and students in the class can promote the emotional communication between teachers and students, it has a positive impact on the knowledge communication and interactive experience between teachers and students, but the communication between teachers and students will also bring related adverse effects to the teaching effect. Therefore, it shows that the influence that teacher-student acquaintance exerts to the teaching effect is uncertain.

Key words: Acquaintance between teachers and students; Teaching dimension; Interaction between teachers and students

1. INTRODUCTION

As one of the main means of modern teaching, teacher-student dialogue teaching is widely used in college English teaching, and this practice is supported by corresponding theories, such as sociocultural theory and cognition-interaction theory. The teacher-student interaction practice is the prerequisite of students' interactive practice. Relevant experimental data also show that teacher-student interaction is of great help to the improvement of students' English proficiency.

Experts have conducted similar studies before, which are helpful for us to understand the interaction between teachers and students, and it also provides relevant theoretical support and practical experience for classroom practice teaching. However, the previous research focus of experts was mainly from the cognitive perspective, such as the social, behavioral, emotional, self and other perspectives were not considered. As far as learning itself is concerned, its learning effect is affected by many factors, such as self, social factors, emotional factors, etc. Of course, these factors will interact with each other to have a comprehensive impact on the learning effect. Therefore, students should not only learn from the perspective of language cognition, but also put more effort into the social, emotional and behavioral aspects to maximize the learning effect. Social, emotional, and behavioral factors are playing an increasingly important role in classroom teaching as experts continue to study them. Therefore, in order to have a comprehensive and clear understanding of teacher-student interaction, we

must comprehensively consider various factors and study the performance of teachers and students in the interaction from multiple perspectives at the same time, rather than being limited to a certain factor.

In recent years, experts have begun to pay attention to the role of "familiarity between teachers and students" in dialogue teaching, which also provides a new research perspective for the research of dialogue teaching, and at the same time can explore the dialogue teaching mode in a more comprehensive way. From the perspective of "familiarity between teachers and students", this study explores the influence of conversational teaching mode on students' learning results, so as to find some rules to provide relevant theoretical guidance for conversational teaching.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Some experts have used familiarity as a dependent variable in dialogue teaching before. In 1993, Plough and Gass conducted a relevant study, which showed that compared with conversational participants with low familiarity, participants with high familiarity would be more efficient in terms of communication efficiency, semantic supplement and meaning discussion. The more familiar the conversation participants are, the more willing they are to engage in deep meaningful communication, and they are more likely to regard the conversation as a formal communication. After that, there are few studies that put familiarity into conversation teaching, and experts have shifted their attention to other factors, but the few studies that do offer some reference for later studies.

From the few studies that have been done, participants with greater familiarity have an advantage in both learning and language expression. In 2011, Poteau studied the influence of familiarity between teachers and students on the acquisition of Spanish grammar in a conversational teaching model. After learning grammar, the students first apply the grammar they have learned to dialogue design, then practice the dialogue design with their classmates into dialogue practice, and finally complete the grammar practice test. The experimental data show that the more tacit understanding between teachers and students, the more firmly students master grammar and the stronger ability to apply grammar rules into practice. However, it should be noted that grammar learning is target-oriented and there is a certain gap between it and the actual dialogue and communication. These hidden factors may have a certain adverse impact on the teaching effect. The experts studied four different types of teaming, including assigned teacher and assigned student, non-assigned teacher and assigned student, assigned teacher and non-assigned student, and non-assigned teacher and non-assigned student, also known as free teaming. The research data showed that except for the non-assigned

teachers and non-assigned students, the other three types of teamwork had a higher frequency of errors in the logical expression, oral fluency and topic transition and cohesion. The results show that when teachers and students are familiar with each other, it is more conducive to the formation of a dialogue relationship between the two sides, steadily enhance the sense of trust between each other, and break the traditional impression of students on teachers. Philp, Mackey and Cao also showed that the familiarity of teachers and students is an important factor to improve the teaching effect.

But some experts disagree. Mozaffari's experimental research has found that familiar teacher-student relationships are not always positive. Mozaffari divided a class of students and their instructor into two groups. One group was paired freely with the teachers and students and the other group is assigned. The two groups used a conversational teaching model to study the same topic. The authors found that compared with assigned pairs, the free pairs were less efficient in topic selection, data collection, and data analysis. It can be seen from the experimental data that: in the pairing of non-designated teachers and students, teachers and students with high familiarity are more likely to combine into a teaching unit and establish a stable cooperative relationship, but they are more likely to produce some topics unrelated to the research topic in the process, which reduces the learning effect.

It can be seen that more and more scholars have joined in the research on the effect of teachers and students' familiarity on dialogue teaching, but the research results of experts are inconsistent. Therefore, further research should be carried out.

3. RESEARCH METHODS

3.1 Research Object

The 50 students are all first-year students majoring in accounting and finance from a university in Anhui. Their average age is 18 years old, and there are 23 male students and 17 female students. The two teachers, one female and one male, are also from the same university's Public English Teaching Department. In the course of teaching, the same textbook is used, and the teaching plan is designed exactly the same as the teaching time. The average score of the two classes (25 students respectively) is about the same, so there is not much difference in English proficiency. Before the beginning of this study, teachers and students are familiar with this activity because they have practiced the classroom teaching that mainly based on dialogue teaching for many times and recorded the conversations between teachers and students. The 50 students and 2 teachers are free to form a teaching class, with one teacher for each class and 25 students to form a "familiar class". Then, the 50 students were

disrupted, and the researchers randomly divided them into two classes, and the two teachers were also randomly assigned to form an "unfamiliar class".

3.2 Task Materials

Dialogue teaching mode is one of the main teaching methods used in college English classes. That is to say, the teacher gives a discussion topic, and the students and teachers discuss on this topic and express their own opinions, so as to promote the absorption of knowledge in the discussion. Therefore, in order to meet the requirements of dialogue teaching, the mode of free discussion between teachers and students is adopted, and the topics of discussion can be selected from the textbook. Topics can be environmental protection, modern technology, artificial intelligence and so on. Considering the teaching time of each class, teachers and students can complete a topic discussion between each other.

3.3 Steps for Collecting Experimental Data

First, the "familiar class" and the "unfamiliar class" completed the free discussion task between teachers and students at the same time. The researchers recorded the whole process of interaction between the two classes with a recorder. Second, after the completion of the classroom tasks, teachers and students were asked to fill in the questionnaire "Teacher and student interaction emotional investment in dialogue teaching" immediately. Thirdly, semi-structured interviews were conducted with teachers and students of the two classes, in order to fully understand the specific views of teachers and students on some issues in the dialogue teaching interaction.

3.4 Variable Statistics and Analysis

The researchers transcribed the recordings, coded them using the following measures, and counted all the variables.

The cognitive measurement will be carried out from the direction of teaching content, using language acquisition, meaning negotiation and interactive communication as its measurement indexes. For example, teachers and students agree or deny each other's views in free discussion; teachers and students ask each other questions; teachers and students affirm each other's views; teachers and students doubt each other's views; teachers and students persuade each other to accept their own views, etc. The above mentioned are the important aspects of teacher-student interaction in dialogue teaching that can help the teaching effect. Therefore, we refer to the interactive classification of examiners and examinees in IELTS speaking test by Dai and He, and analyze the interaction between teachers and students from eight aspects: 1. 2. Understand each other's viewpoints and information; 3. Analyze and question the opinions of the other side; 4, with some reasons to support the other side's views; 5. Clarify the requirements, confirm and check

for meaningful consultation; 6. Be persuaded to change your point of view; 7. Expand the ideas expressed by the other party; 8. Persuade them to accept your point of view. But need special emphasis on meaning consultations (refers to "to prevent ice, dialogue participants actively remedy", expressed in the specific occasion to positive interpretation of the content, confirm each other to express the meaning of the correct understanding of their) has important significance for dialogue teaching statistical interaction between teachers and students in language, Meaningful negotiation language is considered as a separate item. Language acquisition refers to the discussion between teachers and students on word spelling, word pronunciation and grammar learning.

Social engagement includes two meanings: 1. Feedback information during conversation; 2. 2, and the other party actively complete a topic of expression. Feedback information refers to the listener's response to the message conveyed by the speaker, such as en, oh, ah, etc., which is just a simple response. Actively completing a topic with the other person is when the interlocutor actively helps the other person to complete a topic that the other person did not complete.

Emotional engagement refers to the participants' evaluation of the conversation itself and the other party. This research is mainly carried out through questionnaire survey. The questionnaire survey adopted the form of Cao Zhongkai and Xu Jinfen's questionnaire of teacher-student interaction in dialogue teaching classroom and Egbert's "perception task" questionnaire. This questionnaire contains four aspects, which are task attitude, task evaluation, task completion perception and the evaluation of conversation participants and the interaction between the two sides. The overall Alpha value of the questionnaire was 0.927, and the reliability of the questionnaires for the familiar class and the unfamiliar class were 0.916 and 0.903, respectively.

Behavioral input includes three main aspects, which are the time taken to complete the task, the quantity of words produced and the trailing words. The time taken to complete the task refers to the time taken by teachers and students to complete the interaction without the influence of external factors. The unit of time can be accurate to "seconds". Word production refers to the statistics of the number of words produced in the dialogue between teachers and students. The statistics do not include repeated words, modal words and mispronounced words. Follow-up language refers to the complements and feedbacks made by the interlopers to other people's words, except in other cases, such as oh, en, ah, HMM, body language (shrug) and facial expression (smile). In general, the longer it takes to complete the task, the more words and tags used, and the more teachers and students engage in the task.

All the statistical quantitative data were input into SPSSAU for statistical analysis. Multivariate analysis of variance was used to analyze the collected data. It can be seen from the normal distribution diagram that most of the dependent variables conform to the normal distribution, except for meaning negotiation, feedback and combined completion sentences. Calculated square root is used to analyze the data that does not satisfy the normal distribution. In terms of Levene's homogeneity of variance hypothesis and Box's covariance matrix test (P =0.546>0.05), the data were satisfactory. When multiple dependent variables were involved in single-factor ANOVA, the significance level was calibrated to P=0.07/h using Bonferroni method. Qualitative data obtained from semi-structured interviews are used to prove quantitative data to explain the role of familiarity between teachers and students in dialogue teaching.

4. DISCUSSIONS

In terms of cognitive engagement, the familiar class was higher than the unfamiliar class in language acquisition, conversational language and meaning negotiation (see Table 1). According to the multivariate variance test, the familiarity of teachers and students is an important factor affecting the learning effect, $\eta2= 0.124$, P =0.027, Lambda=0.745, F(3,56)=2.475. Further study on the data showed that the familiarity of teachers and students had a certain influence on the meaningful negotiation.

$\eta2= 0.122$, P =0.003<0.015,F(1,58)=8.20. In teacher-student interaction language, $\eta2= 0.006$, P =0.407,F(1,58)=0.356 and related language acquisition $\eta2= 0.024$,F(1,58)= 1.623, The effect of P =0.178 has not reached a certain extent.

Table 1
Descriptive data and ANOVA from a cognitive perspective

		N	M	SD	F	Sig	Partial eta squared
Language acquisition	Familiarity class	26	1.74	1.18	1.601	0.173	0.024
	Unfamiliarity class	26	1.23	1.24			
Conversational language	Familiarity class	26	6.18	2.74	0.342	0.467	0.006
	Unfamiliarity class	26	5.94	3.61			
Meaning consultation	Familiarity class	26	0.64	0.79	8.979	0.003	0.129
	Unfamiliarity class	26	0.29	0.29			

As can be seen from the above table, familiarity between teachers and students has a great influence on meaning negotiation. When teachers and students who are familiar with each other encounter communication difficulties, they will constantly use communication strategies such as repeating language and clarifying opinions to eliminate communication difficulties. The above situation was also confirmed in the interview. The two teachers agreed that students would feel embarrassed because they could not answer questions, so teachers would try their best to start from basic questions and explain their problems step by step. As far as students are concerned, in order to save their own face, when the teacher raises some questions that they do not understand, they will repeat the words to shift the teacher's focus from the question itself to others, which seems to help them out.

But there are also some exceptions, such as in the familiar class, there will be a teacher to save the student's face. A teacher said in the interview like that: in most cases all accept it, but there are exceptions, teacher asks a student to answer question, students seem to not understand what teacher said, but he still pretend to understand what teacher mean, and goes and answered teacher's question, because the teacher has close relations with the student, so the teacher also can't let him explain again. Sliman-Rolls has said in previous research that if teachers and students who are close to each other often work together, some problems can appear over time. Aston also said that the long-time use

of meaning negotiation teaching method may have some impact on the teacher-student relationship. According to the above experimental results and experts' opinions, social factors are an important factor affecting dialogue teaching. If we ignore the influence of this factor in dialogue teaching, we cannot accurately understand the investment behavior of teachers and students in dialogue teaching.

In this study, in terms of language acquisition, the gap between the familiar class and the unfamiliar class is not obvious, which means that the familiarity of teachers and students does not have a great impact on language acquisition. This is different from the research of Mozaffari. From the experimental data, Mozaffari found that compared with the unfamiliar teacher-student relationship, the language acquisition effect between familiar teachers and students is poor, but the output of topics unrelated to teaching is relatively large. Mozaffari believes that the familiarity between teachers and students will have a significant impact on the effectiveness of teacher-student dialogue teaching. However, in this experimental study, we did not find any topics unrelated to classroom teaching. This also verifies that not only the familiarity of teachers and students will have an impact on language acquisition from another aspect , but also other factors will have an impact on it.

In terms of social involvement, the familiar class had an advantage over the unfamiliar class in terms of cooperative sentence completion. However, in terms of feedback, the unfamiliar class had an advantage over the

familiar class (see Table 2). According to the multivariate data analysis of variance analysis, it can be seen that the familiarity of teachers and students has a great impact on social investment, Lambda=0.623,F(2.16)=12.654 ,P=0.001, skew η2= 0.311. Through further analysis of the experimental data, it can be seen that the familiarity of teachers and students has a significant effect on both the cooperative completion sentences and the feedback sentences. The cooperative completion sentences are F(1,16)=12.546, P =0.002, η2= 0.186, and the feedback sentences are F(1,16)=8.125, P =0.001, η2= 0.125. In terms of familiarity between teachers and students, when teachers and students are more familiar with each other, there will be more complementary dialogues, which is conducive to the improvement of teaching effect. When the teacher-student relationship is relatively unfamiliar, teachers will use more feedback to encourage students to complete the dialogue.

Table 2
Multivariate ANOVA and descriptive data of social dimension

		N	M	SD	F	Sig	Partial eta squared
Feedback language	Familiarity Class	26	1.21	1.01	12.765	0.001	0.173
	Unfamiliarity Class	26	0.39	0.49			
Combine complete sentences	Familiarity Class	26	2.14	1.81	8.234	0.003	0.129
	Unfamiliarity Class	26	4.56	3.47			

In terms of cooperative sentence production, the familiar class has more advantages, which indicates that the more familiar the teachers and students are, the stronger their cooperative desire will be. Among them, the social relationship between teachers and students is an important factor. The familiar teacher-student relationship generally presents a state of friendship, so in the dialogue teaching, it is easier for teachers and students to understand each other's inner meaning, and they can't help complementing each other's words. Therefore, the teachers and students said that because they were familiar with the students or teachers, they would timely supplement each other's words. For unfamiliar teachers or students, when they encounter ineffective communication, they will find it difficult to explain their own ideas. The results of this study are consistent with those of Plough and Gass. In the process of research, with the constant contact between teachers and students, their familiarity is becoming deeper and deeper, and both sides will gradually supplement each other's words.

In addition, the data also showed that there was more feedback between teachers and students who were unfamiliar with the class than those who were familiar with the class. This may be associated with the idea of cooperation between teachers and students who are not familiar with the class. Unfamiliarity between teachers and students will produce more obstacles in dialogue teaching. In order to eliminate these obstacles, teachers and students may use more feedback to show that they have responded to each other very actively. In the interview, some students or teachers described it like this: they want to leave a good impression on the other side. However, some teachers and students said that in dialogue teaching, when the other party can not understand the meaning of the feedback, but just out of respect for each other. Therefore, the teacher-student cooperative dialogue teaching may only be a surface phenomenon, because teachers who are not familiar with dialogue teaching or students with weak dialogue expression ability will use feedback to indicate the other. It also proves that unfamiliar classes rarely produce meaning negotiation in the cognitive dimension.

In terms of emotional investment, both familiar and unfamiliar classes had higher emotional investment (see chart 3). In terms of the five sub-dimensions of total emotional immersion, process teaching perception, teacher-student interaction attitude, attitude towards each other and task evaluation, the familiar class has advantages. The results of multivariate analysis of variance show that the familiarity of teachers and students has a great influence on affective investment. Aiaa Lambda = 7.436, F (4) = 7.436, p = 0.001, partial eta 2 = 0.209. The further experimental data show that the familiarity of teachers and students has a great influence on the interaction attitude of teachers and students, F(1,32)= 11.785,P= 0.002, η2=0.084. The analysis of the familiarity of teachers and students on the task evaluation data shows that F(1,32)=0.199,P=0.594, η2=0.001. F (1, 32) = 2.379, p = 0.106, partial eta 2 = 0.011, and the attitude to treat each other F = (1, 32) = 4.199, p = 0.018, the influence of partial eta 2 = 0.037 are not obvious. Interviews with teachers and students also confirmed the above conclusions. Both teacher and fifty students said that the interactive in the dialogue teaching can effectively stimulate the learning enthusiasm of all teachers, teacher or students also not completely reject the other to complete the dialogue task, but if there are familiar between the teacher and students can be chosen, they will choose familiar team so as to avoid embarrass. This is consistent with previous studies. In a previous study, after 10 weeks of teacher-student interaction, fixed teachers and students became more and more satisfied with

conversational teaching, while non-fixed teachers and students gradually lost interest in conversational teaching.

Experts believe that the familiarity of both parties is an important factor affecting the teaching of dialogue.

Table 3
Multivariate ANOVA and descriptive data of sentiment dimension

		N	M	SD	F	Sig	Partial Eta Squared
Total emotional involvement	Familiarity Class	26	3.99	0.35	3.467	0.054	0.024
	Unfamiliarity Class	26	3.87	0.32			
Teacher-student interaction attitude	Familiarity Class	26	3.67	0.39	0.195	0.585	0.002
	Unfamiliarity Class	26	3.70	0.45			
Process teaching perception	Familiarity Class	26	4.03	0.45	2.285	0.106	0.019
	Unfamiliarity Class	26	3.86	0.41			
Attitude towards each other	Familiarity Class	26	4.13	0.39	11.985	0.001	0.086
	Unfamiliarity Class	26	3.87	0.40			
The task to judge	Familiarity Class	26	3.89	0.46	4.954	0.019	0.038
	Unfamiliarity Class	26	3.69	0.42			

In terms of behavioral engagement (see Table 4), the unfamiliar class was higher than the familiar class in terms of time consumed, word production and turn. However, according to the data of multivariate analysis of variance, the influence of familiarity between teachers and students on behavioral engagement has not reached the qualitative change. Lambda=0.903, $F(3,16)=1.901$, P=0.123, $\eta2=0.089$. There was no significant difference in the time spent on the task, the number of words produced, or the number of rounds when the teachers and students, whether familiar or not, worked together to complete the conversational teaching task. Such results are inconsistent with what was assumed before the study. Because of stereotyped thinking, one might think that a familiar teacher-student relationship would generate more rounds of words and consume more time. Such results may be related to the external environment, such as dialogue teaching content, students' mood on that day and so on.

As far as this research is concerned, such situation may be caused by some reasons. Due to the limited space, only analyze one of the reasons: the first impression of teachers and students on each other. College students just entering the university, compared to high school, they are full of curiosity in college life, which includes the instructor, when students see his youthful English teacher, although it is not familiar with the relationship between teachers and students, but of similar age and common interests and hobbies can close the distance between teachers and students, Therefore, they cherish the extra value of such courses. In short, they have a strong desire to learn. This can be found in the teacher-student interview: Wang thought that "the teacher is 8 years older than me, there is no age gap, so it is not so difficult to get along with." "The teachers are young and different from high school teachers," said Guo . "The students I teach are always 18 years old," Wang said. "I feel very young when I get along with them." These interview data suggest that the first impression of teachers and students on each other may have a positive impact on each other's behavioral investment. This can be explained by sociocultural activity theory. Socio-cultural activity theory holds that human beings can reposition their goals and needs according to the changes of the surrounding environment, and take positive behaviors to achieve the goals.

Table 4
Multivariate ANOVA and behavioral descriptive data

		N	M	SD	F	Sig	Partial Eta Squared
Task Consumption Time	Familiarity Class	26	299.01	59.00	0.165	0.159	0.028
	Unfamiliarity Class	26	312.67	67.56			
Word production	Familiarity Class	26	317.67	70.56	5.011	0.016	0.075
	Unfamiliarity Class	26	348.56	79.45			
Turn.	Familiarity Class	26	14.45	7.56	1.145	0.254	0.016
	Unfamiliarity Class	26	16.45	6.34			

5. FINDINGS

The experimental study shows that the familiarity of teachers and students is an important factor affecting the learning effect of dialogue teaching. The influence is mainly reflected in the following three aspects: First, In the cognitive dimension of meaning negotiation, the familiar class is more effective than the unfamiliar class. Second, in the social dimension of the cooperation to complete the sentence, familiar class is more positive than unfamiliar class. Third, in the emotional dimension of the teacher-student interaction attitude and attitude towards each other, familiar classes are more positive than unfamiliar classes. However, in terms of feedback, the unfamiliar class used more feedback than the familiar class. In terms of task completion time, word output and turn, the familiar class was higher than the unfamiliar class, but the difference was not very obvious. This also indicates that the familiarity of teachers and students has different influences on all dimensions of the learning effect of dialogue teaching. For example, the high investment in emotional dimension does not receive the high investment in other dimensions. Therefore, it is necessary to study the cross-influence of the familiarity of teachers and students and other factors further on the effect of dialogue teaching in the future.

In terms of research inspiration, teachers and students choose freely to form classes, which have a positive effect on their emotional investment, meaning negotiation and interaction between teachers and students. But it is undeniable that the familiar teacher-student relationship will also have a negative impact, such as more digressions. Unfamiliar teacher-student relationships may also have beneficial effects, such as more behavioral investment in dialogue teaching. Therefore, whether teachers and students are familiar with each other or not, both advantages and disadvantages exist. This requires teachers to reflect constantly in the process of dialogue teaching, negate and negate the teaching process, so as to achieve the best teaching effect. In addition, teachers and students pay more attention to the social relationship between each other in all dimensions, so teachers should regard knowledge impart as a social and cognitive phenomenon, and make use of various modern teaching methods to create a lively and relaxed learning atmosphere, in order to achieve a good dialogue teaching effect.

REFERENCES

Baralt, M. (2013). The impact of cognitive complexity on feedback efficacy during online versus face-to-face interactive tasks. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, (4).

Cao, Y. Q., & Philp, J. (2006). Interactional context and willingness to communicate: A comparison of behavior in whole class, group and dyadic interaction. *System*.

Drnyei,Z., & Kormos, J. (2000). The role of individual and social variables in oral task performance. *Language Teaching Research*, (3).

Egbert, J. (2003). A Study of Flow Theory in the Foreign Language Classroom. *The Modern Language Journal* , (4).

Foster, P., & Ohta, A. S. (2005). Negotiation for meaning and peer assistance in second language classrooms. *Applied Linguistics*, (3).

Foster, P., & Skehan, P. (1996). The influence of planning and task type on second language performance. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, (3).

He, L. Z., & Dai, Y. (2006). A corpus-based investigation into the validity of the CET-SET group discussion. *Language Testing*, (3).

Leppink, J., Paas, F., van Gog, Y., van der Vleuten, C. P. M., & van Merri?nboer, J. J. G. (2014). Effects of pairs of problems and examples on task performance and different types of cognitive load. *Learning and Instruction*.

Skehan, P. (2009). Modelling second language performance: Integrating complexity, accuracy, fluency, and lexis. *Applied Linguistics*, (4).

Skehan, P., & Foster, P. (2008). The influence of task structure and processing conditions on narrative retellings. *Language Learning*, (1).

Skinner, E. A. (2009). A Motivational Perspective on Engagement and Disaffection. *Educational and Psychological Measurement,* (3).

Slimani-Rolls, A. (2005). Rethinking task-based language learning: what we can learn from the learners. *Language Teaching Research*, (2).

Svalberg, Agneta M.-L. (2009). Engagement with language: Interrogating a construct . *Language Awareness*, *29*(3-4).