



The Journal of International Social Science Education



ISSN: 2146-6297 (Online) Journal homepage <https://www.dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/issej>

The Effect of Communicative Activities on Turkish Language Learners Speaking Ability

Parisa Yeganehpour

To cite this article: Yeganehpour, P. (2021). The Effect of Communicative Activities on Turkish Language Learners Speaking Ability, The Journal of International Social Science Education, 7(1), 126-150. DOI: 10.47615/issej.937760

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.47615/issej.937760>



© 2021 The Author(s). Reprints and permissions: Authors have permission to share their article after it has been published in ISSEJ/The journal of International Social Science Education, either in print or online as a First Edition

ISSEJ/The Journal of International Social Science Education is a double peer-reviewed online journal. This article can be used for research, teaching and private studies. Only the authors are responsible for the content of the article. The journal has the copyright of the articles. The publisher cannot be held liable for any loss, transaction, claim or damage arising directly or indirectly in connection with the use of the research material.

All authors are requested to disclose any actual or potential conflict of interest including any financial, personal or other relationships with other people or organizations regarding the submitted work.

The Effect of Communicative Activities on Turkish Language Learners Speaking Ability

Parisa Yeganehpour 

Department of Foreign Language, İbrahim Çeçen University, Ağrı, 04100, Turkey

ABSTRACT

Regarding the limited classroom and real-life opportunities for using and communicating in a second or foreign language, it is the language teachers' liability to provide learners with opportunities for positive communicative action. Based on the importance of speaking skill and its vital role in communication, this study aimed to see how communicative practices affected learners' ability to communicate. The participants were selected from random intermediate intact classes. English Language Test (CELT) was given to the participants prior to the treatment regarding their proficiency level. A post-test was given to the participants to contrast their results to the pre-test that was given before the procedure. Paired samples t-tested were run on the pre-test and post-test scores of participants, and then an ANOVA was run to see whether the results of the students in the groups varied substantially from those of the other groups. The findings of this study reveal that applied communicative strategies significantly affected the participants' speaking ability and improved it to a considerable extent. The research results imply that EFL teachers can strengthen their teaching practice in light of the application of communicative approaches leading to improvement in the speaking skill of the students.

ARTICLE HISTORY

Received 05 May 2021
Accepted 09 June 2021

KEYWORDS

Communicative
Activities, language
learner, speaking
ability

Type of the Paper

Research article

CONTACT Parisa Yeganehpour  yeganehpour.parisa@gmail.com

© 2021 The Author(s). Parisa Yeganehpour

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0>), which permits use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited and is not used for commercial purposes.

Introduction

As a social creature, human lives along with his fellow man which requires a communication system. To meet this need, human beings use language to associate with one another. In order to construct ideas in words and to express perceptions, feelings, and intentions, people need to speak. Therefore, communicating is one form of language. Beyond the basic need for communication, communication skills are considered to be one of the most essential skills that undergraduate students need to learn to secure their opportunities and roles in the world around them at higher levels in today's business and education world.

On the other hand, it should also be noted that for communication, humans use different forms of language. Boonkit says (2010) language is a method for transmitting meaning. Language, he claims, is primarily intended to serve as a means of interaction and communication. Humans use language to communicate and understand each other.

Regarding the diversity among the people of the world and their languages, to be able to understand each other and communicate more fluently, they tend to learn each other's language or widely spoken common one. Many people take English seriously as a foreign language to have a decent future in the international community. English has grown in importance as a foreign language in recent years. Since English is so significant, it is taught in formal schools from elementary school to universities and even educational institutes.

Elaborating more on the current status of the English language, it can be claimed that, it has gained an unprecedented position. It has a prominent global presence in science, trade, politics, finance, tourism, sport, and various forms of entertainment, making it a possible global lingua franca. As a result, English, as the world's most widely spoken and written language, has evolved into a functional tool for oral and written communication.

According to different scholars such as Shahini and Riazi (2011) and Farida and Sofwan (2012), in English language teaching and learning, applied researchers have been particularly interested in developing learners' communicative competence in recent years. On the other hand, given the relevance of English as a global language of communication, many students choose to use the language to communicate in a variety of situations. It should not be missed that people judge a person's language competence primarily based on his or her speaking ability, rather than any other language abilities. As an outcome, many researchers use learners' speaking involvements as part of their study to develop a technique for improving learners' speaking abilities.

Luoma (2004) asserts that teaching and testing experts have largely regarded speaking as a technical term because it is one of the skills that language learners can acquire and maintain. They should be able to communicate with others in an educational setting, such as peers and teachers. Brown (1994, as cited in Celce and Murcia, 2001) lists many characteristics and reasons why speaking is a difficult language ability. He assumes that fluent speech includes reduced forms such as constructions, vowel reduction, and elision, which learners who are not used to or practiced with will maintain their formal-sounding's full form. Highlighting the importance of speaking, Brown (2007) also asserts that a "teacher should be able to guide students into learning situation in order to enable them to master it because speaking is the key of communication" (p. 103). Ur (1996), who shares a similar viewpoint, argues that since people who know a language are called speakers of that language, speaking can be implemented as the most valuable

skill among the four skills of listening, speaking, reading, and writing. In other words, as Scrivener (2005) believes using a language and being able to communicate is more important than just knowing about it. Hence, scholars must devise and teachers use more effective teaching and learning strategies.

Introducing the problem

Speaking is one of the most important skills that any learner of a second or foreign language must master (Richards, 1990). Many students determine the efficacy of an English course and their language learning results based on how much they believe their spoken language proficiency has improved (Richards, 1990). Encouraging the major role of the speaking skill in mastering a language, Luoma (2004) claims that it is perhaps the most challenging and difficult language skill to teach, learn and test. Alderson and Bachman (2001) also assert that speaking in a foreign language is a difficult task that takes a long time to master and necessitates the use of a variety of abilities and reactions on behalf of both teachers and students.

Addressing the problem faced by learners, it should be mentioned that despite their adequate knowledge of vocabulary and grammar of the target language, as Brown (2007) asserts, most of the learners may feel isolated and hopeless to do the spoken task given. Furthermore, the majority of students are reserved and reluctant to talk. Another issue raised by Faulin and Soefendi (2013) is that learners are unable to share their thoughts when they have difficulty communicating, even when they have something to say. Another issue that makes it impossible for them to communicate their thoughts is lack of confidence. Some of them may attempt to communicate but become frustrated when they discover how difficult it is to express their ideas in English (Juhana, 2012). Since speech instruction in most of the educational settings is restricted to written practices, EFL students often lack the ability to articulate themselves in English.

Furthermore, according to Shumin (1997) to speak a language knowing more than the grammar and vocabulary of that language is needed. Learners should develop the skill by interacting with one another. Speaking is seldom done alone, so it automatically becomes a collaborative skill. In this vein, Widdowson (1978) believes that "what is said is dependent on understanding of what else has been said in the interaction" (p. 58). In other words, it can be claimed if a learner is not able to understand what is said, he/she will be unable to respond. As a result, there is a need for communication; however, since EFL students' real-life language usage is restricted, it is difficult for them to speak acceptable English in the classroom. In Turkey where English language is thought as a foreign language, the opportunities for the students to practice English out of the classroom is limited.

It should be remembered that the ability to communicate in a language is necessary. As either a result of the limited classroom and real-life opportunities for using and communicating in a foreign language, language teachers must provide learners with opportunities for meaningful communicative behavior about relevant topics by using interaction as the key to teach language for communication, since "communication derives essentially from interaction." As Tice (2007) asserts, the aim of language teaching in every part of the world is to cultivate a healthy attitude toward communicating in a second language by having simple realistic communication skill in

speaking. As a whole, students rely on their teachers to implement the necessary and appropriate methods to achieve this goal.

The current research sought to determine the impact of employing successful communicative practices and techniques (namely discussion/conversation, stimulation, and interview communicative strategies) which aim at solving the difficulty despite learning strategies that the learners attempt to establish competence in the target language.

Purpose

Based on the importance of speaking skill and its critical role in communication, as well as the importance of interaction in the process of speaking progress, the researcher has organized the current study to discover ways to improve teaching skills and methods in speaking classes by implementing communicative strategies, and thereby indirectly to improve students' speaking skills and language acquisition. Based on the literature analysis, observation over the teaching process and the experiment, it is aimed to accomplish this goal, and to draw attention to the efficacy and differential impacts of discussion/conversation, stimulation, and interview communicative strategies in speaking teaching and acquisition.

In this study, the following research question was answered and examined:

1. Is there any evidence that using a discussion/conversation communicative approach improves the speaking performance of female EFL students?
2. Does the use of a stimulation communicative technique have a substantial impact on the speaking capacity of female EFL students?
3. Does using the interview communicative technique have a major effect on the speaking skill of female EFL students?

Based on the above question, the following null-hypothesis was formulated:

H01: Using discussion/conversation communicative strategy has no significant effect on female EFL learners' speaking ability.

H02: Using stimulation communicative strategy has no significant effect on female EFL learners' speaking ability.

H03: Using interview communicative strategy has no significant effect on female EFL learners' speaking ability.

Method

A quantitative method was employed in the present study. To achieve the set goals for the study, it went through 3 different phases in each experiment group. The first one was to sample the population and homogenize them and omit the outliers. The second phase included a pre-test to check participants speaking ability prior to the treatments and also to check whether there existed a difference between groups regarding their speaking proficiency. The third phase that was treatment, was used to present the prepared strategies and activities to the participants in Discussion / Conversation, Stimulation and

Interview groups and the last post-test phase was to check the effect of treatments (Discussion / Conversation, Stimulation & Interview strategies) on participants' speaking proficiency. Consequently, the present study involved a pre-test and post-test as well as a comparison procedure. The design was a quasi-experimental one since the researcher was imposed to select the sample of the study from existing intact prep classes at foreign language school in a state university in Turkey.

As the data were collected in 2019, the author confirms that the study does not need ethics committee approval according to the research integrity rules in their country.

Research variable and participants

This study investigated and compared the effect of different communicative techniques, including Discussion / Conversation, Stimulation and Interview on the speaking skill of Turkish Female EFL Learners. Communicative methods were therefore treated as the independent variables and speaking ability as the dependent variable. Since the present study was conducted on intermediate female EFL learners, it is worth mentioning that proficiency level and gender are regarded as the control variables.

The participants were chosen randomly from intermediate intact prep classes that the researcher was provided to perform the analysis on. Twenty people were assigned to the Discussion group, 18 to the Stimulation group, and 18 to the Interview group out of the total number of people who took part in the survey.

Their ages range from about eighteen to twenty-two years. Intermediate students are preferred because their syllabi have appropriate speaking ability instruction, and they are more willing to learn and become fluent. Therefore, they are conscious of the complexities of oral speech.

Participants were chosen from 3 separate classes including a total of 70 students. Although the students were admitted to this university through exemption test including paper-based sub-tests and interviews prior to their promotion from pre-intermediate to intermediate level suggesting their close homogeneity in overall language skills, they were asked to take a standardized Comprehensive English Language Test (CELT) to ensure their homogeneity of English language proficiency level. Based on the collected data 14 students whose scores were one standard deviation below and one standard deviation above the mean score were labeled outliers and excluded while the rest of the participants (N=56) whose performance was within the range participated in this study.

Instruments and materials

In this research, the following instruments were used to analyze the impact of communicative techniques on the speaking proficiency of Turkish female EFL learners.

1) Homogeneity Test

Participants were given a standardized Comprehensive English Language Test (CELT) to make sure that they were similar regarding their proficiency level.

Comprehensive English Language Test (CELT) is a standardized document designed to

measure the pre-intermediate to intermediate level English language abilities of EFL learners in this study. CELT is composed of three sections: Listening, structure and vocabulary.

2) Test of Spoken English (TSE) as Pre and Post Tests

TSE is an oral language exam for non-native English speakers and is a part of the Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL) test system established by the Educational Testing Service (ETS). The purpose of this test is to measure the ability of non-native English speakers to communicate in English orally.

In the present study, TSE was used once as a pre-test to check participants' speaking ability prior to the treatment (applying communicative strategies) and later, as a post-test, at the end of the study, to see how use of communicative techniques (Discussion / Conversation, Stimulation, and Interview) affected the speaking growth of Turkish EFL students.

Procedure

In order to conduct the present quasi-experimental study, three intact classes including 70 students were selected randomly from among pertinent prep classes held in 2019 in a state university in Turkey. Subsequently, the procedure of the study was introduced and explained by the researcher to the teachers of the classes and all the participants. After the study introduction, CELT was given to all the participants prior to the treatment to make sure that participants were similar regarding their proficiency level. In this study, the paper-based form of CELT was given to all of the participants as a test of homogeneity.

After taking the CELT exam, 14 outliers were omitted and the rest of the students (N=56) were assigned into Discussion (N= 20), stimulation (N=18), and Interview (N=18). All three groups were composed of just female intermediate students; accordingly, the proficiency level and gender were considered as control variables. A post-test was presented to the participants to equate their results to the pre-test that was given before the treatment.

The research involved 14 treatment sessions; the students received material just before the discussion for each class, for discussion group, and the instructors instructed them with certain vocabulary prompts and appropriate terms. The aim of this directed discussion was to provide them with encouragement and to assist them in improving their communication. For instance, one session before the treatment, the teachers told the students that they are going to discuss cooking preferences together and provided them with cooking-related vocabularies and expressions such as chopping, grating, boiling, roasting, grilling, etc. In the next session students are required to express their ideas and cooking preferences supporting them with proper reasons and also agreeing or disagreeing with a particular type of cooking or criticizing it. The students in this group were allowed to utter a conversation, by staring at the person they were answering and meaningfully expressing their words. To put it another way, they had to speak, not read the dialogue. As their duty to monitor language use, the teachers of the classes ensured that all students participated in the discussion.

The students were explained the different rules in attending an interview in the interview

group, and tips were given to successfully face interviews. Then, the entire class was told to consider one student at the top of the classroom asking her some questions. This interviewee had to respond to prove that either she had received or missed what they said. All students are required to take up a topic to be interviewed when their peers asking questions. For example, the interviewee is being interviewed about her music tastes while the other students start asking questions which are composed of two parts. The first part includes general and some demographic related questions while the next part include the topic related questions such as the interviewee's favorite type of music, favorite singer, the role of music in her life, etc. The interviewee is supposed to answer all the questions in full detail.

In the third group that was stimulation, the participants were stimulated to communicate and use the target language to learn it. In this class, the learners were not allowed to use the kind of language used by learners in a classroom; they could be shopkeepers or sellers, bankers or clients, doctors or patients; they could be scared, entertained, or irritated; they could even be in a Royal Palace or in a kingdom, and depending on the situation they could be advising, joking, or condoling. They were to use descriptive vocabulary that could differ according to the circumstances, the character's occupation, position, temperament or mood. All of these activities were carried out to fulfill the communicative purpose or functions expected.

The post-test was presented to all three groups at the end of the term to assess any potential impact of the procedure on the participants' ability to communicate and to compare the results of all groups in terms of speaking ability. The main goal was to see how using various communicative tactics resulted in a substantially positive change in their post-test results as opposed to their pre-test performance and the post-test performance of the other classes.

Findings

Examining the normality of the test results

The researcher used the Statistical Package for Social Sciences version 21 (SPSS) to analyze the related data. First, the statistical analysis of the normality of the distribution was performed on table 3.1:

Table 3.1 One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov and Shapiro-Wilk Tests for Checking the Normality of Pre and Post-Tests

	Tests of Normality					
	Kolmogorov-Smirnov ^a			Shapiro-Wilk		
	Statistic	df	Sig.	Statistic	df	Sig.
pre-test	.290	56	.089	.837	56	.080
post-test	.195	56	.119	.911	56	.088

A brief look at the above outcome reveals that the pre- and post-tests were usually distributed for the purposes of this study. After checking the normality of the samples it was revealed that test score samples were naturally distributed (i.e., pre-test=.08>.05 and post-test=.88>.05).

Normality tests are used to assess whether or not a data set is well-modeled by a regular distribution. Furthermore, they can be used to determine the likelihood that a random variable underlying the data set will be distributed correctly.

Checking the participants' speaking proficiency using their scores on pre-test

The researcher used the ANOVA test to determine the homogeneity of the participants' speaking ability as well as their pre-test results. The results are shown in Tables 3.2 and 3.3. Table 3.2 shows the performance and proficiency of the participants in different groups.

Table 3.2 Descriptive Statistics of Pre-Test Scores of All Groups

pre-test						
95% Confidence Interval for Mean						
	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	Lower Bound	Upper Bound
stimulation	18	29.34	7.254	1.710	25.84	33.05
discussion	20	32.40	11.180	2.500	27.27	37.73
interview	18	30.46	7.254	1.710	26.95	34.16
Total	56	30.79	8.796	1.175	28.54	33.25

As is shown on table above, the mean scores obtained for stimulation, discussion and interview groups are 29.34, 32.40 and 30.46 respectively which show that discussion group participants have performed better than the other groups and hence, possess a higher proficiency in speaking. This difference observed in the performances can affect the process of data analysis. As a matter of fact, the researcher used ANOVA test to check whether the observed difference in the performance is statistically significant or not. The results of the analysis are shown in Table 3.3.

Table 3.3 ANOVA Test Results Checking the Significance of the Observed Difference

pre-test					
	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	91.468	2	45.734	.582	.572
Within Groups	4163.889	53	78.564		
Total	4255.357	55			

The findings shown in Table 3.3 indicated that considering the disparity in their mean scores, there were no significant differences among the three groups because the significance level equaled .57, which was higher than the acceptable range, i.e. $p=.05$. To get assured more, the researcher used a post hoc test to compare pairs of variations. Table 3.4 displays the findings.

Table 3.4 Post Hoc Test Comparing the Significance of the Observed Difference in Pairs

Multiple Comparisons						
Post Hoc Test						
(I) grouping	(J) grouping	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
stimulation	discussion	-3.056	2.880	.542	-10.00	3.89
	interview	-1.111	2.955	.925	-8.24	6.01
discussion	stimulation	3.056	2.880	.532	-3.89	10.00
	interview	1.944	2.880	.779	-5.00	8.89
interview	stimulation	1.111	2.955	.915	-6.01	8.24
	discussion	-1.944	2.880	.779	-8.89	5.00

there were no significant differences between the stimulation and discussion groups, ($p=.53$) and stimulation and interview ($p=.91$) groups. The comparison of the interview

and discussion groups scores also showed no significance despite the trivial difference in the mean scores because the obtained p-values were less than the set alpha of .05. hence, it was concluded that none of the groups were significantly different in their speaking proficiency and performance before conducting the treatments to the participants. After the treatment sessions, the participants' speaking proficiency once more was evaluated to check the effect of the used strategies on their speaking performances.

Answering the first research question

The study's first research question was to determine whether or not using a discussion/conversation communicative approach has a significant impact on female EFL learners' speaking abilities. Tables 3.5 and 3.6 show the results of comparing their performance on the speaking pre and post-tests.

Table 3.5 Descriptive Statistics of Pre and Post-Test Scores of Discussion Group

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 1	prediscussion	32.50	20	12.180	2.500
	postdiscussion	41.00	20	9.522	1.906

According to the Table 3.5 the mean pre-test score for the discussion group is 32.5, with a standard deviation of 12.18, while the mean post-test score for this group is 41, with a standard deviation of 9.52. As the descriptive data of this table indicates, there has been an increase in the speaking mean scores of this group from pre-test to post-test. However, in order to determine if this increase is important, the researcher used a paired samples t-test on the results.

Table 3.6 Checking the Significance of Observed Difference in mean Scores of Discussion Group

		Paired Differences						Sig. (2- tail ed)
		M ea n	Std. Devia tion	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference		t	
					Lower	Upper		
P	prediscussion	-					-	
a	-	-					-	
i	postdiscussio	8.	12.25	2.731	14.23	-	3.	.00
r	n	50	8		7	2.763	20	6
		0					1	
1								

Based on the results of the t-test in Table 3.6 [$t(19) = 3.2$, and $p = 0.00$], as well as the mean scores for the pre-test and post-test of the group, it is clear that using discussion/conversation communicative strategy has positive effects on Turkish female EFL learners' speaking proficiency; therefore, the first null hypothesis stating that discussion/conversation communicative strategy has no effect on Turkish female EFL learners' speaking proficiency is rejected.

Answering the second research question

The study's second research question was to determine whether or not using a stimulus communicative approach has a substantial impact on EFL learners' speaking capacity. The results of their speaking pre- and post-tests were compared to reach at the response.

Table 3.7 Descriptive Statistics of Pre and Post-Test Scores of Stimulation Group

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 1	preexstimulation	29.45	18	7.255	1.711
	poststimulation	48.34	18	10.433	2.460

As Table 3.7 shows, the mean score for pre-test of stimulation group is 29.45, and standard deviation is 7.26, while the mean score for post-test of this group is 48.34 and standard deviation is 10.44. As the descriptive data of this table indicates, there has been a considerable increase in the speaking mean scores of this group from pre-test to post-test. However, in order to determine if this substantial improvement is statistically significant, the researcher performed a second paired samples t-test on the results.

Table 3.8 Checking the Significance of Observed Difference in mean Scores of Stimulation Group

		Paired Differences							
		M	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference		t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
					Lower	Upper			
Pre	Stimulation	-							
Post	Stimulation	8.89	10.236	2.411	23.984	13.814	7.44	8	.000

According to the significance results shown in Table 3.8 and also based on the mean differences from pre to post-tests, it was revealed that that using stimulation communicative strategy had positive effects on Turkish EFL learners' speaking proficiency since the significance level equaled $p = .00$; therefore, the second null hypothesis stating that stimulation communicative strategy has no significant effects on improving speaking was rejected and the research hypothesis was accepted. The final study issue focuses on the efficiency of interview communicative approach on EFL learners' ability to communicate in English. Tables 3.9 and 3.10 present the findings.

Answering the third research question

Similar to the approaches taken for answering the first and second research questions, the searcher used another paired sample t-test to check the progress of the participants in improving from pre to post-test. First and foremost, objective statistics were used to assess and evaluate the group's mean ratings. The results are shown in Table 3.9.

Table 3.9 Descriptive Statistics of Pre and Post-Test Scores of Interview Group

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair	preinterview	30.57	18	7.255	1.711
	1 postinterview	37.79	18	10.034	2.366

The mean scores of the third group were compared to the mean scores of the other two groups to see whether they had increased their speech proficiency during the therapy session or not. Hence, according to table 4.9 the mean score for the pre-test of the group is 30.57, and standard deviation is 7.259, while the mean score for the post-test of this group is 37.79, and standard deviation is 10.034. According to table 4.9, the group's mean in pre-test scores is 30.57, with a standard deviation of 7.255, while the group's mean in post-test score is 37.79, with a standard deviation of 10.034.

Table 3.10 Checking the Significance of Observed Difference in Mean Scores of Interview Group

		Paired Differences							
		M	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference		t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
					Lower	Upper			
P a i r 1	preinterview -	-							
	postinterview	7.2	10.741	2.543	-12.673	-1.892	2.96	17	.011
		2							
		2							

According to Table 3.4, and the obtained results of a paired samples t-test [$t(17) = 2.96$, $p=0.01$], a statistically meaningful difference can be seen between the mean scores of this group in the pre and post-test. It can be inferred that using interview strategy had positive effects on the speaking skill of Turkish EFL learners; hence, the third null hypothesis was rejected and the research hypothesis was accepted. The next part of the chapter deals with comparing the performances of participants in three groups.

Comparing the performance of all groups to spot the most effective one

Based on the findings of paired sample t-tests, it was concluded that all three groups improved their speaking performance significantly, demonstrating the effectiveness of all three interventions on speaking proficiency, hence the researcher decided to perform further investigation and analyses on the data to spot the post effective strategy among the all three ones. On the other hand, due to the similarity of all group prior to the treatment in pre-test, the analyses were carried out on the post-test scores to spot the existence of any difference or outperformance. To start the required analyses, first the mean scores of all groups were compared using descriptive statistics. The results of mean comparing are shown in Table 3.11.

Table 3.11 *Descriptive Statistics Comparing the Mean scores in Post-Tests*

post-test								
	N	Me an	Std. Deviati on	Std. Erro r	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Mini mu m	Maxi mu m
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
stimul ation	18	49. 34	10.442	2.45 9	43.15	53.52	30	60
discus sion	20	42. 00	8.532	1.90 6	37.01	44.99	30	60
intervi ew	18	38. 89	10.043	2.36 5	32.79	42.77	20	50
Total	56	44. 53	10.553	1.39 6	39.52	45.12	20	60

According to the comparison done on post-test mean scores of all three groups, the mean scores and standard deviations of stimulation, discussion and interview groups are $M = 49.34$, $SD = 10.44$, $M = 42$, $SD = 8.53$ and $M = 38.89$, $SD = 10.04$ respectively. A brief glance at the mean scores shows that the participants in different groups have performed differently indicating that different strategies have improved participants' speaking proficiency to a different extent. Therefore, the researcher used another ANOVA test to check whether the difference in performance is statistically significant. Table 3. 12 displays the required outcomes.

Table 3.12 ANOVA Test Results Checking the Significance of the Observed Difference in Post-test Performances

post-test					
	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	1057.103	2	538.553	5.669	.006
Within Groups	4941.111	53	94.228		
Total	5998.214	55			

According to the findings, an ANOVA test was used to compare the mean performance of the groups in the post-test in terms of their differences in speaking proficiency. Table 3.12 shows that there were major variations among the three classes, supporting the disparity in their mean score, since the significance amount equaled.00, which was smaller than the appropriate range, i.e. $p=.05$. this finding showed that some of the classes performed better than the others. To get assured more, the researcher applied a post hoc test to compare the differences in pairs. The results are shown in Table 3.13.

Table 4.13 Post Hoc Test Comparing the Significance of the Observed Difference in Pairs

Multiple Comparisons						
(I) grouping	(J) grouping	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
stimulation	discussion	7.343	3.147	.048	-.24	14.91
	interview	10.557*	3.218	.004	2.78	18.33
discussion	stimulation	-7.343	3.147	.058	-14.91	.24
	interview	3.232	3.138	.562	-4.33	10.78
interview	stimulation	-10.557*	3.218	.005	-18.33	-2.78
	discussion	-3.232	3.137	.564	-10.78	4.35

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

According to the analysis obtained from Table 4.13 there were substantial variations between the stimulation and discussion groups ($p=.48$) and the stimulation and interview groups ($p=.00$). However, the comparison of the interview and discussion groups scores showed no significance despite the trivial difference in the mean scores because the obtained p-values were less than the set alpha of .05. Because of the significance of the difference and checking the mean differences, it was concluded that the stimulation group outperformed the two other ones, meaning that stimulation strategy was the best among these three strategies in improving learners' speaking. On the other hand, the insignificant difference between the interview and discussion groups, it was concluded that these two strategies have almost affected the speaking proficiency of Turkish EFL learners' speaking to the same extent.

Discussion and Conclusion

As it was discussed earlier, one of the factors that make the ability to speak a very important skill is the diversity among the people of the world and their languages, therefore, the people around the world need to learn each other's language or widely spoken common one to be able to understand each other and communicate more fluently. On the other hand, being able to speak in another language as Ur (1996) asserts should be in the center of attention in educational environment even should be taken more important skill than listening, reading, and writing because one can be taken as a person who knows the language when he/she can speak it. In other words, being able to use a language is more critical than learning it, and understanding a lot about a language is useless if you can't understand it (Scrivener, 2005).

Considering the significance of students being able to speak a language rather than only learning its vocabulary and grammar, speaking is one of the most difficult language skills to teach, master, and assess (Luoma, 2004). According to Alderson and Bachman (2001), mastering speaking in a foreign language is a difficult ability that requires a long time to master and necessitates the use of a variety of abilities and responses on the part of both instructors and learners. Therefore, it is important to be able to communicate in a foreign language. Language teachers, on the other hand, have a greater obligation to provide learners with resources for positive communicative activity on related subjects through interaction due to the restricted classroom and real-life options for using and engaging with a second or foreign language. Hence, the present study aimed to find the effect of using communicative strategies (namely discussion/conversation, stimulation and interview communicative strategies) to solve the faced difficulty by the students.

The results of this research show that all three communicative techniques used had a positive impact on the participants' speech capacity and increased it substantially. According to the findings of the present research, the experimental group members outperformed the control group after treatment when they used interaction techniques.

Thornbury (2005) agrees with the general findings of the current research, believing that the instructor should perform certain communicative activities to make the speaking class productive. He also claims that by using communicative methods to teach speaking, students would be able to naturally generate English.

The study's findings can be explained by paying close attention to the fact that communicative methods provided students with chances to practice speaking in a real-life environment, since these strategies and the approaches they include are structured as if the learners are communicating in a real-life situation. Richards' (2006) claim is consistent with the current assertion of effectiveness learners are involved in practices and projects where they use language in a true communicative sense and rely on a virtually real exchange of knowledge where the language used is not fully predictable, which is consistent with the current assertion of effectiveness. Further investigation of the data resulted in finding out that stimulation strategy significantly outperformed the other two strategies i.e. discussion and interview in improving the learners' speaking skill. However, the discussion and interview did not show any significant difference in their effect on improving learners' speaking proficiency and improved participants' ability to almost same extent. The reason related to the outperformance of the

stimulation group was that the participants were stimulated to communicate and use the target language to learn it. The students were placed in various social contexts, such as being and using the language of a variety of occupations or individuals such as shopkeepers or consumers, bankers or clients, doctors or patients, which caused them to use languages related to situations such as being scared, entertained, or annoyed, and they may be advising, joking, or condoling depending on the situation. However, the other strategies and activities were somehow more limited when compared to this strategy.

Comparing the results of current study to the ones carried out on speaking ability and different strategies affecting the speaking proficiency, the results of current study in particular are in line with the one carried out by Charina (2013) who conducted his research to find out the effect of information gap activities and games as the communicative actions. Similar to the results of current study i.e. efficacy of communicative activities, the results of their research showed that the speaking skills of the students improved through communicative activities. Gradually, the improvements were achieved which covered certain aspects, such as responsiveness, fluency, accuracy, self-confidence and cooperation. The researcher has stated by speaking in English they became more confident.

In addition, the results of current study regarding the efficacy of interaction and communicative strategies are confirmed by the results obtained by Marzuki, Prayogo and Wahyundi (2016) trying to improve the EFL learners' speaking ability through interactive storytelling. In a study similar to this one, the researchers found that the approach used in this study resulted in 100 percent of learners meeting the success criterion for speaking ability that had been established previously. Simply stated, they discovered that the treatment improved the learners' fluency, understandability, and consistency as they spoke.

The study by Benlagha (2015) tried to enhance speaking through interaction. Her study investigated the possibility of promoting learners' speaking skill. In fact, the research attempted to probe the effectiveness of classroom interaction as a pedagogical strategy in enhancing EFL

In terms of the effectiveness of the strategy in enhancing speaking ability, the results of this study also agree with those of Nezhadmehr and Shahidy (2014), who investigated the effects of contact strategy training on the speaking ability of intermediate EFL students.

As a developing nation, Turkey has seen a large spread of the English language, especially at the educational level. EFL students, on the other hand, face challenges in learning English that stymie their progress. These impediments occur due to lack of real-world language use at the oral performance stage. Improving students' speaking skills, especially EFL students' speaking proficiency, is a difficult task for teachers, owing to time constraints in the classroom, a lack of authentic contexts to use and practice with students, and the pressure to complete those resources, all of which restrict teachers' creativity. On the other hand, it is commonly known that in an EFL context, the classroom is the primary and almost the only source of English, and also the only place where English can be practiced, since when the students get out of the class, they are not

provided with any opportunities to try out the English they learned in the class. One effective way in the researcher's opinion was using communicative strategies rather than traditional rote learning ones in the classroom environment. Speaking is one of the most important aspects of communication that needs extra focus and direction. As Rivers (1981) points out, speaking is as common as reading and writing in terms of communication. The aim of teaching speaking, which most instructors follow is to see their students being able to use words as fluently and accurately as possible. Successful teaching that promotes constructive participation of learners and the improvement of speaking skills is a challenge for English teachers as a foreign language. That is to say, being able to successfully communicate orally in the target language is essential nowadays. It is important to emphasize that learners who are unable to communicate fluently in a foreign language cannot be considered successful language consumers. As the acts were carried out, the findings demonstrate that all of the actions improved the students' speech ability significantly. The results also revealed that the students' speech ability had increased, as post-test scores were higher than pre-test scores. In other terms, communicative practices and techniques were generally effective in fostering the speaking skill of learners as they provided the learners with authentic situations to allow them to exercise and improve their vocabulary and solve one of the main challenges of the EFL setting, i.e. speech normally in real time. The results can be accomplished when learning environments integrating certain strategies and activities facilitated student participation, boosted self-confidence, prepared students for real-world encounters, and provided opportunities for them to improve their speech skills.

Implication and Suggestions

The research described here was modest, with a small sample size and a restricted scope that included just a few hours of strategy instruction. Because strategy usage and task type are inextricably connected, the target strategies taught to learners must be tested with different task types. As a consequence, performing another research with a bigger population and a longer treatment duration may provide more accurate findings.

- On the other hand, the current study was conducted only on the intermediate language proficiency level; therefore, applying the aimed strategies and activities to other proficiency levels, and even comparing the outcomes among different proficiency levels, can yield broader results and broaden our perspectives on how to apply them.

- The participants in this research were Turkish EFL students. Other types of research may be conducted in ESL environments. If feasible, a comparison research should be carried out to compare EFL and ESL settings.

Because the present study excluded male learners, further research may be conducted to determine the impact of the targeted variable on male learners and perhaps create a comparison between the two groups.

Research Limitations and Future Research

In terms of the research's limitations, it is probable that no study is without its own set of constraints. As a result, this research has its own unique set of limitations.

- One important drawback of the majority of research, including this one, is the difficulty in evaluating individuals' learning processes. That is, each individual has his or her own

peculiarities in the learning process, as well as his or her unique learning style. As a result, it was difficult to control and even guess which additional methods learners used to acquire or practice speaking outside of the classroom setting in this research.

- Another significant drawback of this research may be linked to gender. Because the present study was conducted on just one gender without comparing the two, findings for male students cannot be addressed. As a consequence, the findings with the opposite gender are ambiguous.

- Another significant limitation of this research may be its failure to adequately address all proficiency levels. The researcher only addressed one degree of proficiency, intermediate. The results in this respect may not be extended to other proficiency levels such as elementary, pre-intermediate, and advanced.

- A major delimitation of this study was the lack of generalizability to other skills and components of language such as grammar, vocabulary, listening, reading, or writing because the study focused on speaking skill; additionally, because the study was conducted with students in a foreign school of university, the results may not be generalizable to other contexts or educational environments.

Author Contributions

The author herself contributed at every stage of the study. She has read and accepted the published version of the article.

Publication Ethics

As the data were collected on 2019, the author confirms that the study does not need ethics committee approval according to the research integrity rules in their country.

ORCID

Parisa Yeganehpour  <http://orcid.org/0000-0003-2982-9085>

References

- Alderson, C., & Bachman, L. F. (2001). *Preface*. In *Buck G: Assessing listening*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Benlagha, M. (2015). *Enhancing EFL Learner 's Speaking Skill through Classroom Interaction*, (Unpublished Doctoral thesis), Briska University, Algeria.
<http://archives.univbiskra.dz/bitstream/123456789/6025/1/Meriem%20BENLAGHA.pdf>
- Boonkit, K. (2010). Enhancing the Development of Speaking Skills for Non-Native Speakers of English. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 2(2010), 1305–1309.
- Brown, H. (2007). *Principles of Language Teaching and Learning Fifth Edition*. White Plains, NY: Pearson Longman.
- Celce-Murcia, M. (2001). *Teaching English as a second or foreign language*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle.
- Charina, I. N. (2013). Improving students 'speaking skills Using communicative activities: a classroom action research at ABE's class, a pre-intermediate class of English made easy (Unpublished Doctorial Thesis), Yogyakarta State University, Indonesia.
<http://eprints.uny.ac.id/21048/1/Intan%20Nur%20Charina%2008202241007.pdf>
- Farida, L. A., & Sofwan, A. (2012). Interactive Materials for Teaching Spoken Narrative Texts Based on Indonesian Folktales. *Lembaran Ilmu Pendidikan*, 41(1), 333-342.
- Faulin, A., & Soefendi. (2013). Cooperative Group Learning Strategy.
<http://eprints.unsri.ac.id/4360/>
- Juhana, K. (2012). Psychological Factors that Hinder Students from Speaking in English Class (A Case Study in A Senior High School in South Tangerang, Banten, Indonesia). *Journal of Education and Practice*, 3(12), 100-110.
- Luama, S. (2004). *Assessing Speaking*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Marzuki, M. Prayogo, J. & Wahyudi, A. (2016). Improving the EFL Learners 'Speaking Ability through Interactive Storytelling. *DINAMIKA ILMU Journal*, 16(1), 15-34.
- Nezhadmehr, M., & Shahidy, H. (2014). The impact of interaction strategy training on the speaking skill of intermediate Iranian EFL learners. *International Journal of Language Learning and Applied Linguistics World (IJLLALW)*, 6(4), 635-653.
- Richards, J. (2006). *Communicative Language Teaching Today*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J. C. (1990). Conversationally Speaking: Approaches to the Teaching of Conversation. In Jack. C. Richards. *The Language Teaching Matrix*. New York: Cambridge University Press. 67-85.
- Rivers, W. (1981). *Interactive language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Scrivener, J. (2005). *Learning Teaching*. Oxford: MacMillan.

Shahini, G., & Riazi, A. M. (2011). A PBLT Approach to Teaching ESL Speaking, Writing, and Thinking Skills. <http://eltj.oxfordjournals.org/content/65/2/170.full.pdf+html?sid=5d190ba9-9f26-4695-b044-dab5ad0f4da4>

Shumin, K. (1997). Factors to Consider: Developing Adult EFL Students' Speaking Abilities. *English Teaching*

Thornbury, S. (2005). *How to Teach Speaking*. London: Longman.

Tice, D.M., Baumeister, R.F., Shmueli, D., Muraven, M. (2007). Restoring the self: Positive affect helps improve self-regulation following ego depletion. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 43, 379–384.

Ur, P. (1996). *A Course in Language Teaching: Practice and Theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Widdowson, H. G. (1978). The teaching of English as communication. *English Language Journal*, 27(1), 15-19.

: