

RESEARCH ARTICLE

**Using Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) On Speaking Fluency; A Case Study of Iranian EFL Students in Zahedan**

---

**Malek Ahmad Kord**

Assistant Professor, Resalat University  
Zahedan (Sistan & Baluchestan) Branch, Iran

**Shaghayegh Mojavezi\***

B.A. student, Resalat University  
Zahedan (Sistan& Baluchestan) Branch, Iran

---

**Abstract**

English, as strange as it can be, flows like blood through the veins of nations all over the world. For most people, having strong English communication skills is a burning ambition (Ahmad, & Rao, 2013). CLT is a method that was first used in the 1980s. It focuses on improving students' communication in the target language and encompasses all four skills. The purpose of this study was to examine the effect of CLT on speaking fluency. To this end, 35 intermediate EFL (English as a Foreign Language) female students were selected at random from two institutions. Initially, an Oxford Placement Test (OPT) test was provided to determine the homogeneity of these Iranian EFL students. The students were then divided into two groups, each with a different teaching system, and an International English Language Testing System (IELTS) test was given to assess the differences in their speaking abilities based on fluency and dysfluency steps. Finally, two independent

raters scored the transcriptions of what the students had produced. Documenting and reporting were used to gather data for this report. Multivariate analysis of covariance (MANCOVA) was used to analyze the data. The result of the study indicated that CLT significantly affects speaking fluency on EFL learners. Finally, suggestions for future research are made.

**Keywords:** Language Teaching, CLT, Speaking fluency

**1. Introduction**

English should be learned indefinitely. It is a literature-rich, humanistic, science, and technological language. We could cut ourselves off from the ever-growing stream of knowledge if we give up English due to sentimentality (Patel & Jain, 2008).

According to some research, the CLT system, as well as the audio-lingual

**RESEARCH ARTICLE**

(ALM) method, has a significant impact on students' English speaking capacity (Ghofur et al., 2017). According to research, using CLT in the classroom will help students improve their speaking fluency. However, no independent research has looked into the impact of CLT on speaking fluency. The aim of this study was to see how CLT affects students' ability to speak English fluently. The research was carried out among students in the 12th grade in an institution in Zahedan.

**1.1. ELT**

The history of ELT (English Language Teaching) shows the development of different types of approaches and methods as a response to meet the demands of English language teaching and learning (Richards & Rodgers, 2011). Throughout this history, the emergence and development of different theories in Applied Linguistics and Second Language Acquisition (SLA) have influenced the types of methods used in ELT. That is, ELT has moved its practices from general theories related to the nature of languages and language learning to more specific theories that reinforce the importance of language that language learners receive. Consequently, modern ELT methods have replaced traditional and old-fashioned methods to resolve issues that hinder successful language learning and application. That is, old instructional methods that emphasized the role of

translation and memorization of the L2 language rules and patterns failed to achieve the ultimate purpose, which is language communication. These have shifted to modern methods that prompt students' capacities to communicate language in real-life situations ((Richards, & Rodgers,2011;Wright, 2010)ELT has experienced three phases of instructional approaches and methods: the traditional methods phase, the modern approach phase, and the post-method phase. The first phase was based on multiple instructional approaches and methods, which include the Grammar Translation Method, the Direct Method (also called the Natural Method), the Audio-Lingual Method, the Community Language Teaching Approach, and the Total Physical Response Approach (also called the Comprehension Approach). Each of these has emerged subsequently as a reaction to a previously unsuccessful method as well as a way to meet and fulfill particular demands regarding language teaching and learning (Celce-Murcia, 2014). The second phase brought a modern approach to meet current ELT demands and to help language learners communicate the classroom language they learn and effectively use it in real situations beyond the classroom settings. This approach is known as the Communicative Approach and has two versions in ELT: the weak version that teaches English through content subjects (known as Content-Based Language Teaching), and the strong version

**RESEARCH ARTICLE**

that teaches English through tasks (known as Task-Based Language Teaching) (Richards & Rodgers, 2011).

The third phase is known as the post-method stage, and it was created as a reaction to the idea that certain methods are better than others. Based on this consensus, Prabhu (1990) explains that there are three possible answers to the question "Why is there no best method?" Different teaching and learning situations necessitate different methods; all methods have some validity and truth, and there is no such thing as a good or bad method (as cited in Celce-Murcia, 2014). It has been suggested, however, that the best classroom directions should be based on "well-established" language teaching and learning principles (Celce-Murcia, 2014)

Such principles were proposed by Kumaravadivelu (1994) and are summarized as following: "Maximize learning opportunity, facilitate negotiated interaction, minimize perceptual mismatches, activate intuitive heuristics, foster language awareness, contextualize linguistic input, integrate language skills, promote learner autonomy, raise cultural consciousness, ensure social relevance" (Celce-Murcia, 2014, pp. 10\_ 11). These concepts should be implemented in today's classroom instruction and practices, and English language teachers should pay particular attention to them, particularly in EFL contexts where TL interaction outside

the classroom is minimal (Ali Alghamdi et al., 2019)

**1.2. CLT**

CLT is a method that first appeared in the 1980s. It keeps a close eye on all four skills from the start of education and seeks toward communicative maturity rather than accuracy in its learners. CLT is also characterized as "the communicative approach," which seems to be a better description because that's more of a philosophy than a specific method. CLT employs a number of techniques, and it can be challenging at times (Diane Larsen-Freeman and Marti Anderson, 2011).

CLT is well developed as the prevailing conceptual perspective in ELT (English Language Teaching), regardless of context in terms of absolute teaching practices. There have been several attempts to assess CLT and describe its distinguishing characteristics (e.g., Richards and Rodgers 1986), CLT values are widely accepted and recognized in fields such as teacher education (Thompson, 1996).

It is possible to infer that communicative competence consists of linguistic comprehension, acceptable language use in various contexts, the relation of utterances in a discourse, and language strategies (Chang & S. Goswami, 2011).

**RESEARCH ARTICLE**

**1.3. ALM**

The ALM (Audio Lingual Method), which was proposed by American linguists in the 1950s, was developed from the principle that “ a language is, first of all, a system of sounds for social communication; writing is a secondary derivative system for the recording of spoken language” (Carrol,1963) As a result, the aim of ALM is to use the target language in a communicative manner (Mart, 2013). Language learning, according to audio lingualism, is similar to other types of learning. Language may be formally structured to optimize teaching and learning productivity since it is a formal, rule-governed structure. As a result, audio lingualism emphasizes the mechanistic nature of language learning and use(Richards& Rodgers, 2011). However, depending on language skill, language use needs, types of activities, and so on, this approach has some drawbacks. Visual learners tend to be strong readers, while auditory students are verbal and communicative(as cited in Mart, 2013).

The ALM is an oral language instruction approach based on Skinner's behaviorism theory. The theory proposed that by using a reinforcement method, a human being could learn a language in a short period of time. The approach is based on two main concepts: the behavioral theory of psychology and the structural view of language. To begin, the Audio-

lingual method's structural view of language focuses on the grammatical structure, which explains the ways in which grammatical elements can be combined. The teaching approach is based on the behavioural principle that learning a foreign language is accomplished by reinforcements, habit forming, and associations. The behavioral theory is based on the idea that if grammar is used properly and positively reinforced; a student is more likely to become proficient in language use (Mart, 2013)

**1.4. Speaking fluency**

One of the purposes of an EFL speaking class is to enhance student' communications competence thus that they can represent themselves accurately in the target language in sociocultural environment (Rachmawaty & Hermagustiana, 2015). Fluency is among the most key considerations.

“In an attempt to create a more coherent approach to measuring fluency, Skehan (2003), and Tavakoli and Skehan (2005) called for a more systematic measurement of fluency that represented three key characteristics of fluency: a) speed fluency, i.e. speed with which speech is produced, b) breakdown fluency, i.e. the pauses and silences that break down the flow of speech, and c) repair fluency, i.e. hesitations, repetitions and reformulations that are used to repair speech during the

**RESEARCH ARTICLE**

production process”(Tavakoli et al., 2017, p. 9).

“Fluency is specified as "the number of words per minute" which is one of the ways to demonstrate conversational skills (Rie Koizumi, 2005). Richards (2006) points out that fluency is the use of naturally occurring language when a speaker engages and maintains in meaningful communication. This communication would be comprehensible and ongoing despite limitations in one’s communicative competence. To Fillmore (1979), a fluent speaker knows what to say and how to say without frequent pauses to think. Besides, Harmer (2015) mentions that fluency refers to focusing on the content of speech to communicate as effectively as possible. Furthermore, Baily (2003) defines fluency as using language quickly and confidently, with limited hesitations, unnatural pauses, etc”. (Shahini & Shahamirian, 2017, p.100).

In English language learning, fluency can represent two different but interrelated concepts. In its broader sense, fluency refers to a speaker’s overall speaking proficiency and it may refer to his/her skills in use of language for communication purposes effectively. In its technical sense, fluency refers to ease or automaticity with which speech is produced, often demonstrated through flow, continuity and smoothness of speech

(Segalowitz, 2010; Skehan, 2014). Researchers have argued that L2 speech fluency is a complex and multifaceted construct that covers a multitude of different sub-components, e.g. linguistic, psycholinguistic and sociolinguistics factors, potentially interacting with one another during the speech production process (Kormos, 2006; Lennon, 1990; Segalowitz, 2000, 2010)

The ever-increasing demand for good English proficiency has led to a massive desire for English instruction everywhere around the world, as hundreds of individuals already choose to strengthen their knowledge of the language or ensure that their children do too... The widespread demand for English has attracted a great demand for high-quality language education, supplies, and services (Ahmad, & Rao, 2013).

Previous work in this field has found no significant difference between students who use ALM and those that use CLT in their classes, according to Gofour and Begneg (2017). In his study, Scherer (1964) found that adolescents who use ALM perform better in the domains of listening and speaking. In their experimental research, Akram and Mehmood (2011) emphasize the role of CLT in improving contact and speaking fluency. They write: CLT boosts students' morale and gives the impression that the

## RESEARCH ARTICLE

teacher is good in getting them to use the foreign language in their conversations. CLT clarifies the expression... In general, the communicative approach is superior to all other language teaching approaches (Ahmad, & Rao, 2013).

### 2. Statement of the problem

Although numerous studies have been conducted to examine the efficacy of communicative language teaching (CLT) on speaking fluency and complexity, the question of how this approach can influence speaking fluency and complexity remains unanswered. It is thought that learners receive comprehensible feedback, opportunities to negotiate meaning, and opportunities to generate changed output during classroom interactions (Gholizade, 2013).

This study looks at why, despite the fact that several studies have been done on CLT and ALM in the area of speaking, none have focused specifically on fluency and the communicative approach. According to certain findings, CLT, and even the ALM, will help students to develop their English speaking skills (Ghofur et al., 2017), However, we should keep in mind that people vary in terms of their ability to communicate fluently. Some people use short silent pauses, while others talk of longer silent pauses. So, in order to emphasize the importance of fluency, the researcher in this study uses fluency as a variable to demonstrate the value of CLT in teaching speaking.

### 3. Research question

The following research question is characterized by a focus according to the above information: To what extent CLT affects speaking fluency?

### 4. Research hypothesis

CLT doesn't have a significant influence on speaking fluency.

### 5. Methodology

#### 5.1. Participants

The researcher contrasts the effects of the CLT and ALM as dependent variables on speaking fluency as the independent variable in this quantitative analysis.

35 intermediate-level EFL students (female) were recruited for this study from two teacher education centers in Zahedan that were chosen based on random sampling. A special attempt was made to find students who were on the same academic level. To this end, 35 participants with a master's degree in language teaching were given the "Oxford Placement Test 2" (Allan, 1992) as a pre-test to identify students with comparable language proficiency at the start of the study. According to the test results, only 30 students in the entire group have the same degree of proficiency and are homogeneous. As a consequence, the remaining participants were not included in the sample.

## RESEARCH ARTICLE

**5.2. Speaking test** “An IELTS Speaking Test is a one-on-one interview between an applicant and an investigator that lasts 11 to 14 minutes. There are three major components. In terms of interaction pattern, task input, and candidate output, each component serves a distinct purpose.

- Part 1 (Introduction): candidates answer general questions about themselves, their homes/families, their jobs/studies, their interests, and a range of familiar topic areas. The examiner introduces him/herself and confirms the candidate’s identity. The examiner interviews the candidate using verbal questions selected from familiar topic frames. This part lasts between four and five minutes.
- Part 2 (Individual long turn): the candidate is given a verbal prompt on a card and is asked to talk on a particular topic. The candidate has one minute to prepare before speaking at length, for between one and two minutes. The examiner then asks one or two rounding-off questions.
- Part 3 (Two-way discussion): the examiner and candidate engage in a discussion of more abstract issues and concepts which are thematically linked to the topic prompt in Part 2”(Seedhouse & Harris, 2008, p. 4).

- A Smartphone was used to archive all of the previous tasks and events for later review.

## 5.3. Instrument

Fluency measures were used to assess the quality of the participants' spoken production in this study. In assessing speaking performance, two methods are commonly used, regardless of the field of study: rating scales and speaking performance measures, the latter of which is the focus of this study. A speaking performance measure, also known as a "discourse analytic" measure (Ellis, 2003), is interpreted as an indicator derived from quantifying target aspects in utterances and computing ideals that mirror a specific dimension of language use (Ellis, 2003) (e.g., “the number of error-free clauses divided by the number of clauses” for accuracy). While transcribing utterances is time consuming, and these measures may not reflect “how we judge communicative behavior in the real world” (Ellis, 2003), Ellis and Barkhuizen (2005) argue that this method has the advantage of obtaining measures more objectively than rating scales (Rie Koizumi, 2005).

For this

**5.3.1. Fluency measures** research project, the researcher used the Cambridge English IELTS 9 (Press, 2014) speaking test 4

## RESEARCH ARTICLE

Since the 1960s, estimating fluency as a component of speaking has been a hot topic. Hunt (1970) sought to identify learners' L1 speaking familiarity as the sole focus. He correlated the growth of a T-unit, or minor terminal unit, with any associated word provisions. He chose T-units over sentence length because it was thought that children in their local dialect could and would produce long sentences simply by coordinating their movements. Recent studies have used the number of syllables per minute to validate this construct (e.g., Chenoweth & Hayes, 2001, Ellis & Yuan, 2004).

According to the theoretical principle for measuring fluency, this study will use the same measures as Chenoweth and Hayes & Ellis and Yuan (2004) for measuring speaking fluency, i.e., syllables per minute: total number of syllables produced divided by total number of seconds a contributor will take to complete the task multiplied by 30.

### 5.3.1.1. Fluency

“In an attempt to create a more coherent approach to measuring fluency, Skehan (2003), and Tavakoli and Skehan (2005) called for a more systematic measurement of fluency that represented three key characteristics of fluency: a) speed fluency, i.e. speed with which speech is produced, b) breakdown fluency, i.e. the pauses and silences that break down the

flow of speech, and c) repair fluency, i.e. hesitations, repetitions and reformulations that are used to repair speech during the production process“(Tavakoli et al., 2017, p. 9).

“Skehan (2003) identifies four measures of speaking fluency: (i) breakdown fluency or pausing; (ii) repair fluency: reformulations, replacements, false starts, and repetition; (iii) speech rate: the number of words per minute or syllables per second; and (iv) length of bursts occurring between pauses. In addition to these measures, a few studies assessed speaking fluency non-quantifiably by depending on listeners’ perceptions”(Abdel Latif, 2013, p.100).

### 5.3.1.2. Dysfluency

Ums and uhs, among other signals of hesitation in the planning process, pepper human speech” (Corley & Stewart, 2008). “In comparison to read or laboratory expression, spontaneous speech has a high rate of dysfluencies” (e.g., repetitions, repairs, false starts). Based on observations of disfluencies in different corpora of spontaneous American English expression, two large claims are made. First, according to an Ecology Claim, disfluencies are linked to aspects of the speaking environments in which they occur. Task effects, position studies, speaker effects, and sociolinguistic effects all support this argument. Second, an Acoustics Claim



**RESEARCH ARTICLE**

asserts that disfluency has implications for phonetic and prosodic elements of speech that are not captured by laboratory speech patterns. Modifications in segment durations, intonation, voice quality, vowel quality, and co articulation patterns are examples of such effects (Shriberg, 2001).

**6. Procedure**

**6.1. Data collection**

The students in this study were divided into two groups, each of which had 15 students. One group was educated using the audio ALM method (group 1), while the other group was educated using the CLT method (group 2).

The communicative tasks for this quantitative study were completed in two-week sessions of 30 minutes in each of the two English classes. As previously stated, each session was divided into three stages. The first phase is the presentation, which lasts between four and five minutes. The second is an individual long turn, and the third is a two-way conversation linked to the previous session's subject prompt. First and foremost, the researcher introduced herself and explained the intent and significance of the target task that would be assigned to them. Furthermore, the researcher told them that the task's reports would really be kept fully private and would never be shared with any other association. A recorder and a timekeeper were allocated to two students. The recorder was told to use a Smartphone to

audio-record the participants. During the entire speaking process, the smart phone was positioned on the desk and the recording app was turned on. The timekeeper was instructed to pay close attention to the time limit during each part and ensure that every class member took part in completing the communicative activity within the allotted time. The participants engaged in the aim task of conversing and listening to one another during the speaking process. They were told to communicate only in English, but there were some instances of code switching between English and Persian. The instructor emphasized that the task's main goal was to provide students with numerous opportunities to express themselves without regard for grammatical correctness. In addition, as a learning technique for practicing speaking in English, the researcher advised them to speak in full sentences. Participants were also told to keep their voices at an acceptable level to avoid interfering with the interactions and recordings of other groups. The researcher walked around the class, offering affective encouragement to some participants in order to help them overcome L2 speaking anxiety and comfortably engage in L2 interaction, but she did not provide any lexical or phrasal assistance. The researcher congratulated them on their involvement and encouraged them to participate actively in the next communicative mission. Every group's recorders emailed the audio files to

**RESEARCH ARTICLE**

the researcher's email account. As shown in Table 1, different forms of measure exist that are used to evaluate the same level of output or the same construct (e.g. [Rod Ellis, Gary Barkhuizen] Analyzing Learner

Lan (Bokos-Z1), 2005; Fujimori, 2004; Ortega, 1999). There are 14 measures of fluency. Each test appears to evaluate its own dimension of the intended construct (Koizumi, 2005).

Table 1, Summary of speaking performance measures used in the previous studies(as cited in Koizumi, 2005)

Measure	Recent source
Fluency	
No. of words per minute	Freed, Segalowitz, & Dewey (2004)
No. of syllables per minute	Kormos & Dénes (2004)
No. of pauses per minute	Kormos & Dénes (2004)
No. of dysfluency markers per minute	Kormos & Dénes (2004)
No. of dysfluency markers per word	Freed (2000)
No. of dysfluency markers per unit	van Gelderen (1994) <sup>E</sup>

**6.2. Data analysis**

In this quantitative study, based on the measures chosen for evaluating fluency, the researcher segmented, coded, and scored all speaking productions of various groups under the aforementioned conditions. Two independent experts segmented, coded, and graded the data to ensure that the segmentation and scoring of the utterances were done correctly. The magnitudes of inter-coder/inter-rater reliability coefficients were calculated next. The skewness and kurtosis indices were used in SPSS version 26.0 to verify the normality of the distribution. MANCOVA was given each aspect of fluency and dysfluency. At the end, a triangulation of data sources was used to ensure the authority of the results.

**7. Results**

The effects of ALM and CLT methods on speaking fluency among 12th grade students were investigated in this research.

(Table 2)

**Descriptive Statistics**

Methods	Mea n	Std. Deviation	N
---------	----------	-------------------	---

**RESEARCH ARTICLE**

Words per minutes	Audio Lingual Method	10.8 7	.915	15
	Communicative Language Teaching	15.0 7	1.486	15
	Total	12.9 7	2.456	30
Syllables per minutes	Audio Lingual Method	10.8 7	.990	15
	Communicative Language Teaching	15.0 7	1.534	15
	Total	12.9 7	2.484	30
pauses per minutes	Audio Lingual Method	16.3 3	1.291	15
	Communicative Language Teaching	10.8 0	1.014	15
	Total	13.5 7	3.036	30
dysfluency per minutes	Audio Lingual Method	16.1 3	1.187	15
	Communicative Language Teaching	11.0 7	.884	15
	Total	13.6 0	2.774	30
dysfluency per words	Audio Lingual Method	15.8 0	1.146	15
	Communicative Language Teaching	10.9 3	.884	15
	Total	13.3 7	2.671	30
dysfluency per units	Audio Lingual Method	15.3 3	.900	15
	Communicative Language Teaching	10.4 7	.834	15

**RESEARCH ARTICLE**

Total	12.9 0	2.618	30
-------	-----------	-------	----

The results of descriptive statistics on speaking fluency using the ALM and CLT methods are shown in Table two. It means that the first group developed fewer words and syllables per minute than the second group. Furthermore, the mean results indicate that group 1 had more pauses per minute than the other group (group one: 16.33, group two: 10.10). Furthermore, group one had more dysfluency in terms of sentences, minutes, and units (mean in group one: dpm:16.13, dpw: 15.10, dpu:15.33) (mean in group two: dpm:11.07, dpw: 10.93, dpu: 10.47). In general, students in group two developed more words and syllables per minute, had fewer pauses, and were less dysfluent than students in group two.

**(Table 3)**  
**Multivariate Tests<sup>a</sup>**

Effect		Value	F	Hypothesis		Sig.
				df	Error df	
Intercept	Pillai's Trace	.998	2240.642 <sub>b</sub>	6.000	23.000	.000
	Wilks' Lambda	.002	2240.642 <sub>b</sub>	6.000	23.000	.000
	Hotelling's Trace	584.515	2240.642 <sub>b</sub>	6.000	23.000	.000
	Roy's Largest Root	584.515	2240.642 <sub>b</sub>	6.000	23.000	.000
Methods	Pillai's Trace	.977	163.925 <sup>b</sup>	6.000	23.000	.000
	Wilks' Lambda	.023	163.925 <sup>b</sup>	6.000	23.000	.000
	Hotelling's Trace	42.763	163.925 <sup>b</sup>	6.000	23.000	.000
	Roy's Largest Root	42.763	163.925 <sup>b</sup>	6.000	23.000	.000

**RESEARCH ARTICLE**

a. Design: Intercept + Methods

b. Exact statistic

**(Table 4)**  
**Tests of Between-Subjects Effects**

Source	Dependent Variable	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	Words per minutes	132.300 <sup>a</sup>	1	132.300	86.822	.000
	Syllables per minutes	132.300 <sup>b</sup>	1	132.300	79.380	.000
	pauses per minutes	229.633 <sup>c</sup>	1	229.633	170.399	.000
	dysfluency per minutes	192.533 <sup>d</sup>	1	192.533	175.791	.000
	dysfluency per words	177.633 <sup>e</sup>	1	177.633	169.559	.000
	dysfluency per units	177.633 <sup>f</sup>	1	177.633	236.095	.000
Intercept	Words per minutes	5044.033	1	5044.033	3310.147	.000
	Syllables per minutes	5044.033	1	5044.033	3026.420	.000
	pauses per minutes	5521.633	1	5521.633	4097.325	.000
	dysfluency per minutes	5548.800	1	5548.800	5066.296	.000
	dysfluency per words	5360.033	1	5360.033	5116.395	.000

**RESEARCH ARTICLE**

	dysfluency per units	4992.300	1	4992.300	6635.335	.000
Methods	Words per minutes	132.300	1	132.300	86.822	.000
	Syllables per minutes	132.300	1	132.300	79.380	.000
	pauses per minutes	229.633	1	229.633	170.399	.000
	dysfluency per minutes	192.533	1	192.533	175.791	.000
	dysfluency per words	177.633	1	177.633	169.559	.000
	dysfluency per units	177.633	1	177.633	236.095	.000
Error	Words per minutes	42.667	28	1.524		
	Syllables per minutes	46.667	28	1.667		
	pauses per minutes	37.733	28	1.348		
	dysfluency per minutes	30.667	28	1.095		
	dysfluency per words	29.333	28	1.048		
	dysfluency per units	21.067	28	.752		
Total	Words per minutes	5219.000	30			
	Syllables per minutes	5223.000	30			
	pauses per minutes	5789.000	30			
	dysfluency per minutes	5772.000	30			

**RESEARCH ARTICLE**

	dysfluency per words	5567.000	30		
	dysfluency per units	5191.000	30		
Corrected Total	Words per minutes	174.967	29		
	Syllables per minutes	178.967	29		
	pauses per minutes	267.367	29		
	dysfluency per minutes	223.200	29		
	dysfluency per words	206.967	29		
	dysfluency per units	198.700	29		

- a. R Squared = .756 (Adjusted R Squared = .747)
- b. R Squared = .739 (Adjusted R Squared = .730)
- c. R Squared = .859 (Adjusted R Squared = .854)
- d. R Squared = .863 (Adjusted R Squared = .858)
- e. R Squared = .858 (Adjusted R Squared = .853)
- f. R Squared = .894 (Adjusted R Squared = .890)

The researcher hypothesized that CLT has no impact on speaking fluency in this analysis. A one-way MANCOVA (Table 3&4) was also used to see how the ALM and CLT methods affected certain aspects of fluency and dysfluency. In both the ALM and CLT methods, major differences were observed between the two groups on both fluency and dysfluency assessments.

**8. Discussion**

The aim of this analysis was to see how the CLT approach affected speaking

fluency. According to the results of this report, the CLT approach improves fluency in terms of words and syllables per minute, while decreasing pauses per minute and dysfluency per minute and unit.

The findings of this study agree with those of Anora (2020), who argues that CLT is focused on real-life contact circumstances. Students would be able to communicate with each other in the target language if this approach is used in ESL classes. In summary, ESL teachers should develop a classroom atmosphere that

**RESEARCH ARTICLE**

promotes oral language through real-life contact, authentic activities, and meaningful tasks. This happens as students work together in groups to accomplish a mission or complete an assignment (Anora, 2020)

This study's results back up Akram and Mehmood's (2011) experimental study. They write that CLT boosts students' morale and gives teachers a sense of accomplishment in that they were effective in getting students to use the foreign language in their conversations. CLT clarifies the expression...

All other types of language teaching are inferior to the communicative approach. The communicative approach creates a clear link between the experience and the speech (Ahmad, 2013)

The findings of this investigation contradict those of Mart (2013). In his thesis, he mentioned that the ALM is a simple way to improve students' communicative competence through dialogues. Students must repeat dialogues and pattern exercises in order to develop habits that will enable them to develop fast and automatic responses. Drills are useful in foreign language teaching because they enable students to put what they've learned into practice (Mart, 2013).

The Audio-Lingual system, according to Nunan, "has possibly had a greater effect on second and foreign language teaching than any other method." It was, in reality, the first approach to teaching that could be defined as a

"technology" based on "scientific" principles" (Mart, 2013)

The findings of this study differ from those of Mart (2013), who claims that the Audio-Lingual Method aims to improve students' communicative competence through dialogues and drills.

According to (Ghofur et al., 2017), ALM appears to more efficiently improve students' English-speaking skills in a relatively short period of time in line with the current time allocation.

The findings of this study invalidate those of (Maaliah et al., 2017), who claim that using an audio-lingual method can help students improve their speaking abilities. When using the audio-lingual process, speech skills such as fluently comprehending the topics being communicated; selecting appropriate vocabularies for dialog blanks; pronouncing terms and voicing sentences with good intonation and pronunciation; and using the correct grammar structures are required. Finally, the audio-lingual method is suitable in teaching speaking skills. An instructor should use an audio-lingual method to address students how to communicate in English in a safe and comfortable setting. Since the students are categorized as infants, the instructor must be able to handle the class. A concentration approach should be used to direct the students (Maaliah et al., 2017).



**RESEARCH ARTICLE**

ALM's behavioristic learning approach tends to aid in the creation of fundamental speaking skills, while CLT's constructivist learning method is more likely to form speaking competences in suitable contexts. As a result, it is recommended that the two methods be used together in EFL classrooms (Ghofur et al., 2017).

it was discovered that the Communicative Approach evaluates utterances based on their pragmatic importance rather than their prepositional sense. Whatever its merits, the Communicative Approach is not a revolution in any way. In retrospect, it's likely to be remembered as more than a fascinating blip on the surface of twentieth-century language instruction (Swan, 1985).

According to (Patiung et al., 2015), students serve as a focal point for teaching and learning events, as well as for negotiation between teachers and students. This results in learning environments that are adjusted to the students' needs. Teachers and students collaborate in a way that stems from a shared appreciation of learning experiences.

**9. Conclusion**

In this investigation, the researcher planned to compare the impact of ALM and CLT method on intermediate students' speaking ability. An IELTS speaking test was administered to both groups, and a transcription of the students' performance

was prepared. Finally, each student's scores were entered into spss version 26 for further study. Data collected in the classroom, including transcription records and written language, is summarized in the notes sector.

When opposed to the ALM approach, the CLT method was found to be substantially more successful in developing speaking skills. Teachers used interactive media and realistic videos in the CLT process, which included real-life teaching materials. As a result, the researcher discovered that CLT could certainly improve learners' speaking abilities. Despite the fact that the ALM is focused on oral communication, it has not been effective in improving speaking skills. The ALM focuses on structural linguistics and ignores the importance of vocabulary (Bagheri et al., 2019).

Some conclusions may be drawn based on the observations and discussion. First, the English-speaking skills of students taught using CLT and those taught using ALM vary significantly. Second, it was found that students who were taught using the CLT method had more self-confidence than those who were taught using the audio-lingual method because they were able to communicate more successfully. Third, Students are more enthusiastic about the CLT method because the materials used are genuine materials and the instruction is focused on real-life situations. However, in ALM, only a series

**RESEARCH ARTICLE**

of drills is repeated over and over, which is tedious for the students. Fourth, in terms of words, syllabus, and units, students who were taught using the CLT approach were more fluent and less dysfluent.

The behavioristic learning method of ALM tends to lead to the creation of basic speaking skills, while the constructivist learning method of CLT is more likely to form speaking competences in appropriate contexts, according to this report. As a result, it is recommended that the two approaches be used together in EFL classrooms (Ghofur et al., 2017).

Furthermore, more studies may make use of a wider range of topics and media. further research is needed to probe the way that CLT method affects speaking fluency. Such studies will help us better understand how CLT improves communication skills.

**References**

Abdel Latif, M. M. M. (2013). What do we mean by writing fluency and how can it be validly measured? *Applied Linguistics*, 34(1), 99–105.  
<https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/ams073>

Ali Alghamdi, Y., Mohammed Alghamdi, A., & Gabr Alsolami, T. (2019). English Language Teaching: Historical Overview, Current Issues and Suggestions for Enhancing Speaking Proficiency in EFL Contexts. *Arab World English Journal*, 10(2), 270–

283.

<https://doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol11no2.21>

Arevart, S., & Nation, P. (1991). Fluency Improvement in a Second Language. *RELC Journal*, 22(1), 84–94.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/003368829102200106>

Bygate, M. (2013). Effects of task repetition on the structure and control of oral language. *Researching Pedagogic Tasks: Second Language Learning, Teaching, and Testing*, 23–48.

Celce-Murcia, M. (2014). An overview of language teaching methods and approaches. *Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language*, 4, 2–14.

Chang, M., & S. Goswami, J. (2011). Factors Affecting the Implementation of Communicative Language Teaching in Taiwanese College English Classes. *English Language Teaching*, 4(2), 3.  
<https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v4n2p3>

Chenoweth, N. A., & Hayes, J. R. (2001). Fluency in writing: Generating text in L1 and L2. *Written Communication*, 18(1), 80–98.

Corley, M., & Stewart, O. W. (2008). Hesitation disfluencies in spontaneous speech: The meaning of um. *Linguistics and Language Compass*, 2(4), 589–602.  
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1749-818X.2008.00068.x>

Diane Larsen-Freeman and Marti

RESEARCH ARTICLE

- Anderson. (2011). *Techniques-Principles-Language-Teaching*.
- Dörnyei, Z. (1995). On the teachability of communication strategies. *TESOL Quarterly*, 29(1), 55–85.
- Douglas, D. (1994). Quantity and quality in speaking test performance. *Language Testing*, 11(2), 125–144.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/026553229401100203>
- Dr. M.F. Patel, & Jain, P. M. (2008). *English Language Program English Language Program*.
- Ellis, R. (2003). *Task-based language learning and teaching*. Oxford university press.
- Ellis, R., & Yuan, F. (2004). The effects of planning on fluency, complexity, and accuracy in second language narrative writing. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 59–84.
- Freed, B. (2000). Is fluency, like beauty, in the eyes (and ears) of the beholder? *Perspectives on Fluency*, 243–265.
- Freed, B. F., Segalowitz, N., & Dewey, D. P. (2004). CONTEXT OF LEARNING AND SECOND LANGUAGE FLUENCY IN FRENCH: Comparing Regular Classroom, Study Abroad, and Intensive Domestic Immersion Programs. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 26(02), 275–301.  
<https://doi.org/10.1017/s0272263104262064>
- Fujimori, C. (2004). Speech production no sokutei houhou: seikakusa, ryuuchousa, fukuzatsusa [Measures of speech production: Accuracy, fluency and complexity]. *KATE (Kanto-Koshinetsu Association of Teachers of English) Bulletin*, 18, 41–52.
- Ghofur, A., S. Degeng, I. N., Widiati, U., & Setyosari, P. (2017). the effect of communicateive language teaching and audio-lingual method on english speaking skill across different learning styles. *KnE Social Sciences*, 1(3), 1.  
<https://doi.org/10.18502/kss.v1i3.719>
- Gholizade, R. (2013). *The Investigation of Differential Effects of Recast and Metalinguistic Feedback on Accuracy, Fluency, and Complexity of Speaking Performance of Male and Female EFL Learners*. 1997, 417–428.
- Iwashita, N., McNamara, T., & Elder, C. (2001). Can We Predict Task Difficulty in an Oral Proficiency Test? Exploring the Potential of an Information-Processing Approach to Task Design. *Language Learning*, 51(3), 401–436.  
<https://doi.org/10.1111/0023-8333.00160>
- Kamimoto, & Kawauchi. (2000). The effects of repetition on EFL oral fluency: A quantitative approach. *Kumamoto Gakuen University Journal of Language and Literature*, 7(1), 1–24.
- Kawauchi. (1998). Cued/uncued oral narrative tasks in foreign language

RESEARCH ARTICLE

- fluency. *JACET Bulletin*, 29, 83–96.
- KAWAUCHI, C., & KAMIMOTO, T. (2000). Distinctive Features of Oral Production by Fluent and Nonfluent EFL Learners. *Language Laboratory*, 37, 21–36. [https://doi.org/10.24539/llaj.37.0\\_21](https://doi.org/10.24539/llaj.37.0_21)
- Kawauchi, & Nagasawa. (2000). Developing second language proficiency in a study abroad context. *Bulletin of the Institute of Foreign Language Education Kurume University*, 7, 49–79.
- Koizumi, R., & Kurizaki, I. (2002). Speaking characteristics of monologues given by Japanese junior high school students. *English Language Education Society*, 16, 17–28.
- Koizumi, R., & Yamanouchi, I. (2003). Nihonjin chuugakusei no speaking ability no hattatsu [Development in speaking ability among Japanese junior high school students: Using self-introduction task]. *Bulletin of the Kanto-Koshin-Etsu English Language Education Society*, 17, 33–44.
- Koizumi, Rie. (2005). Speaking performance measures of fluency, accuracy, syntactic complexity, and lexical complexity. *Japan-Britain Association for English Teaching (JBAET) Journal*, 9, 5–33.
- Kormos, J. (2006). *Speech production and second language acquisition*. Routledge.
- Kormos, J., & Dénes, M. (2004). Exploring measures and perceptions of fluency in the speech of second language learners. *System*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2004.01.001>
- Lennon, P. (1990a). Investigating Fluency in EFL: A Quantitative Approach. *Language Learning*, 40(3), 387–417. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-1770.1990.tb00669.x>
- Lennon, P. (1990b). The advanced learner at large in the L2 community: Developments in spoken performance. *IRAL: International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 28(4), 309.
- Mart, C. T. (2013). The Audio-Lingual Method: An Easy way of Achieving Speech. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 3(12), 63–65. <https://doi.org/10.6007/ijarbss/v3-i12/412>
- Mehnert, U. (1998). the Effects of Different Lengths of Time for Planning on Second Language Performance. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 20(1), 83–108. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0272263198010141>
- Murphy, J. (2003). Task-based learning: the interaction between tasks and learners. *ELT Journal*, 57(4), 352–360.
- Ortega, L. (1999). Planning and Focus on Form in L2 Oral Performance. *Studies*

RESEARCH ARTICLE

- in Second Language Acquisition*, 21(1), 109–148.  
<https://doi.org/10.1017/s0272263199001047>
- Press, C. U. (2014). *Cambridge English IELTS 9*.  
<https://www.ieltsxpress.com/wp-content/uploads/2020/10/ieltsxpress-Cambridge-IELTS-9-book-pdf-free-download.pdf>
- Rachmawaty, N., & Hermagustiana, I. (2015). Does Retelling Technique Improve Speaking Fluency? *TEFLIN Journal - A Publication on the Teaching and Learning of English*, 21(1), 01.  
<https://doi.org/10.15639/teflinjournal.v21i1/1-8>
- Richards, J. C. & Rodgers, T. S. (2011). Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching (third edition). In *Cambridge University Press, Year: 2014* (Vol. 71, Issue 1).  
<https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccw083>
- Riggenbach, H. (1991). Toward an understanding of fluency: A microanalysis of nonnative speaker conversations. *Discourse Processes*, 14(4), 423–441.
- Seedhouse, P., & Harris, A. (2008). Topic development in the IELTS Speaking Test. In *IELTS Research Reports* (Vol. 12, Issue March). [www.ielts.org](http://www.ielts.org)
- Segalowitz, N. (2000). Automaticity and attentional skill in fluent performance. *Perspectives on Fluency*, 200–219.
- Segalowitz, N. (2010). *The cognitive bases of second language fluency*. Routledge.
- Segalowitz, N., & Freed, B. F. (2004). CONTEXT, CONTACT, AND COGNITION IN ORAL FLUENCY ACQUISITION: Learning Spanish in At Home and Study Abroad Contexts. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 26(02), 173–199.  
<https://doi.org/10.1017/s0272263104262027>
- Shahini, G., & Shahmirian, F. (2017). Improving English Speaking Fluency: The Role of Six Factors. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, 8(6), 100.  
<https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.all.v.8n.6p.100>
- Shriberg, E. (2001). *To `errrr` is human : ecology and acoustics of speech dis `uencies*.  
<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0025100301001128>
- Skehan, P. (2014). The context for researching a processing perspective on task performance. *Processing Perspectives on Task Performance*, 5, 1–26.
- Takiguchi, H. (2003). A study of the development of speaking skills within the framework of fluency, accuracy and complexity among Japanese EFL junior high school students. *Unpublished Master's Thesis, Joetsu University of Education, Japan*.

**RESEARCH ARTICLE**

- TAKIGUCHI, H. (2004). A Study of the Developments of Speaking Ability Among Japanese Junior High School Students from the Viewpoints of Fluency, Complexity, and Accuracy. *The Bulletin of the Kanto-Koshin-Etsu English Language Education Society*, 18, 1–13.  
[https://doi.org/10.20806/katejo.18.0\\_1](https://doi.org/10.20806/katejo.18.0_1)
- Tavakoli, P., Nakatsuhara, F., & Hunter, S.-M. (2017). Scoring validity of the aptis speaking test: investigating fluency across tasks and levels of proficiency. *ARAGs Research Reports Online*, 1–56.
- Temple, L. (1992). Disfluencies in learner speech. *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics*, 15(2), 29–44.  
<https://doi.org/10.1075/ara1.15.2.03tem>
- Thompson, G. (1996). Some misconceptions about communicative language teaching. *ELT Journal*, 50(1), 9–15.  
<https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/50.1.9>
- Towell, R., Hawkins, R., & Bazergui, N. (1996). The development of fluency in advanced learners of French. *Applied Linguistics*, 17(1), 84–115.  
<https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/17.1.84>
- Van Gelderen, A. (1994). Prediction of global ratings of fluency and delivery in narrative discourse by linguistic and phonetic measures- oral performances of students aged 11-12 years. *Language Testing*, 11(3), 291–319.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/026553229401100304>
- Wright, W. E. (2010). *Foundations for teaching English language learners: Research, theory, policy, and practice*. Caslon Pub.
- Yamakawa, K. (2004). Task no kurikaeshi ga gakushuusha gengo ni oyobosu eikyō [Effects of task repetition on learner language]. *Journal of English Language and Literature (Yasuda Women's University)*, 13, 173–185.
- Yashima, & Viswat. (1997). Acquisition of " Fluency in L2" through an Overseas Study Program. *JACET Bulletin*, 28, 193–206.
- Yuan, F., & Ellis, R. (2003). The effects of pre-task planning and on-line planning on fluency, complexity and accuracy in L2 monologic oral production. *Applied Linguistics*, 24(1), 1–27.

**10. Appendix**

Appendix A Summary of ratio measures of speaking performance measures used in the previous studies Measure(Rie Koizumi, 2005)

Measure	Source
---------	--------

**RESEARCH ARTICLE**

No. of words per minute	(Arevart & Nation, 1991), (Dörnyei, 1995), (B. Freed, 2000), (B. F. Freed et al., 2004), (Fujimori, 2004), (Kamimoto & Kawauchi, 2000), (Kawauchi, 1998), (KAWAUCHI & KAMIMOTO, 2000), (Kawauchi & Nagasawa, 2000), (R Koizumi & Kurizaki, 2002), (R Koizumi & Yamanouchi, 2003), (Lennon, 1990b), (Lennon, 1990a), (Murphy, 2003), (Riggenbach, 1991), (Segalowitz & Freed, 2004), (Takiguchi, 2003), (TAKIGUCHI, 2004), (Yamakawa, 2004), (Yashima & Viswat, 1997)
No. of syllables per minute	(Kormos & Dénes, 2004), (Mehnert, 1998), (Ortega, 1999), (Temple, 1992), (Towell et al., 1996), (Van Gelderen, 1994), (Yuan & Ellis, 2003)
No. of pauses per minute	(Iwashita et al., 2001), (Kormos & Dénes, 2004), (Takiguchi, 2003), (Yashima & Viswat, 1997)
No. of dysfluency markers per minute	(Iwashita et al., 2001), (Kormos & Dénes, 2004), (Takiguchi, 2003), (Yashima & Viswat, 1997)
No. of dysfluency markers per word	(Arevart & Nation, 1991), (Bygate, 2013), (Douglas, 1994), (B. F. Freed et al., 2004), (Lennon, 1990b), (Yashima & Viswat, 1997)
No. of dysfluency markers per unit	(R Koizumi & Yamanouchi, 2003), (Lennon, 1990b), (Lennon, 1990a), (Van Gelderen, 1994)

**Appendix B**

In this analysis, this IELTS speaking test was used(Press, 2014)

**RESEARCH ARTICLE**

**Speaking**

**PART 1**

The examiner asks the candidate about him/herself, his/her home, work or studies and other familiar topics.

**EXAMPLE**

**Bicycles**

- How popular are bicycles in your home town? Why?
- How often do you ride a bicycle? Why? Why not?
- Do you think that bicycles are suitable for all ages? Why? Why not?
- What are the advantages of a bicycle compared to a car? Why

**PART 2**

**Describe a person who has done a lot of work to help people.**

**You should say:**

**Who this person is/was?**

**Where this person lives/ lived**

**What he/ she has done to help people**

**And explain how you know about this person.**

You will have to talk about the topic for one to two minutes.

You have one minute to think about what you are going to say.

You can make some notes to help you if you wish.

**PART 3**

**Discussion topics:**

**Helping other people in the community**

**Example questions:**

- What are some of the ways people can help others in the community? Which is most important?
- Why do you think some people like to help other people?
- Some people say that people help others in the community more now than they did in the past. Do you agree or disagree? Why?

**Community Services**

**Example questions:**



**RESEARCH ARTICLE**

- What type of services, such as libraries or health centers, is available to the people who live in your area? Do you think there are enough of them?
- Which groups of people generally need most support in a community? Why?
- Who do you think should pay for the services that are available to the people in a community? Should it be the government or individual people?