

People's Democratic Republic of Algeria

Ministry of Higher Education & Scientific Research

University of Chadli Bendjedid

Faculty of Letters and Languages

Department of English



***Exploring the Role of Communicative
Activities in Enhancing EFL Learners'
Grammatical Accuracy & Fluency in Oral
Production***

Dissertation submitted to the Department of English in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Master Degree in Didactics of English

Submitted by:

Ms. Sehili Narimane

Supervised by:

Dr. Nasri Fatima

Board of Examiners

President : Ms. Boussaha Samira

MMA

University of Chadli Bendjedid El_Taref

Supervisor : Dr. Nasri Fatima Zorha

MCB

University of Chadli Bendjedid El_Taref

Examiner : Dr. Mefteh Asmaa

MCB

University of Chadli Bendjedid El_Taref

Academic Year:

2025/2026

Acknowledgments

First, I want to say a huge thank you to my supervisor, Dr. Nasri Fatima. Thank you for your wonderful guidance, your incredible patience, and for always being there to support me. Your helpful advice, kind encouragement, and the time you spent helping me made this thesis possible. I am truly grateful for everything you have done for me.

I express my profound apperciation to the honorable members of the viva committee Dr. Mefteh Asmaa & Ms. Boussaha Samira for your willingness to read, discuss, and assess this study. I am truly honored by your presence and look forward to your guidance to further refine this dissertation.

I also want to thank all the teachers who took the time out of their busy schedules to answer my questionnaire. Your experience and cooperation gave this study great value.

A special thanks goes to all the students who were so helpful and willingly filled out the questionnaire. Your kindness and cooperation made the practical part of this work a success.

Finally, thank you to everyone who helped or supported me in any way during this journey.

Dedication

To myself... for holding on, being patient, and fighting through every hard time to reach this moment.

To my wonderful father... the reason behind my success after Almighty Allah. Your love and support gave me the strength to keep going.

To my mother... whose beautiful prayers always protected me and kept me safe throughout this journey.

*To my dear sisters **Nour & Chahinez**... my lifelong companions, the light of my life, and the ones I can always lean on.*

*To the sweetest gifts in my life, my nephew and niece **Tedj Eddine & Chahed**... you are the hope of my tomorrow and the joy of my today.*

*To the chosen few who made this hard journey so much easier, the sisters my mother didn't birth **Chaima, Nawel, Rime, Aya, & Basma** ... thank you for your true friendship and for always being there.*

I dedicate this simple work, the fruit of all my patience and hard work, to you. Thank you from the bottom of my heart to everyone who supported me, even with just a kind word or a warm smile that brought comfort to my soul.

Abstract

The role of communicative activities in enhancing oral proficiency is a central issue in English as a foreign language (EFL) learning. These activities are widely recognized as effective pedagogical tools that influence both grammatical accuracy and fluency. Therefore, the present study aims to investigate the extent to which communicative tasks contribute to improving learners' oral production and to explore their perceptions of such activities. To achieve these aims, two groups were selected from Chadli Bendjdid-Taref University: 32 first-year LMD students and 13 EFL teachers. The study adopted a quantitative survey approach, using structured questionnaires to capture both learner and teacher perspectives. The investigation examined the impact of interactive tasks such as debates, role plays, and oral presentations on learners' confidence, fluency, and grammatical accuracy. The findings reveal that communicative activities significantly enhance confidence and fluency, with most students reporting smoother speech and reduced reliance on mental translation. However, sustaining grammatical accuracy proved more challenging, as learners often struggled to recall rules under time pressure. Teachers emphasized the importance of structured feedback and formal tasks to support accuracy, while students highlighted the motivational benefits of interactive practice. Overall, results confirm that communicative activities are highly effective for oral proficiency development, though a balanced approach is required to integrate fluency gains with grammatical precision.

Keywords: Communicative activities, oral proficiency, grammatical accuracy, fluency, EFL learning

.

List of Acronyms

CAF: Complexity Accuracy Fluency.

CLT: Communicative Language Teaching.

EFL: English as a Foreign Language.

ICC: Intercultural Communicative Competence.

SLA: Second Language Acquisition.

Table of contents

Acknowledgments	I
Dedication	II
Abstract	III
List of Acronyms	IV
List of Tables	VIII
Chapter One: Introductory Chapter	IV
Introduction	1
Background of the Study	1
Aims of the Study	5
Problem Statement	5
Research Questions	6
Research Hypotheses	6
Significance of the study	6
Research Methodology	7
Structure of Thesis	8
Limitations	8
Conclusion	9
Chapter Two	9
Literature Review	9
Introduction	9
Communicative Language Teaching	9

Definition & Evolution	10
Understanding Speaking Skill & Oral Proficiency.....	12
The Components of Oral Production: CAF Framework.....	16
The CAF: A Multidimensional Perspective	16
Definition of Grammar	17
Definition of Fluency.....	23
Characteristics of Fluency.	23
Fluency and Oral spontaneity.	24
The Interplay and Balance between Accuracy & Fluency.....	24
Definition of Communicative Activities.....	25
Classification of Communicative Activities.....	26
The Role of Communicative Activities in Enhancing oral Proficiency.....	28
Conclusion	29
Chapter Three: Research Methodology	31
Introduction.....	31
Research Design.....	31
Population & Sampling.....	31
Description of EFL Students Questionnaire	32
Section One: Impact of Communicative Activities	32
Section Two: Communicative Tasks and Grammatical Accuracy.....	32
Section Three: Communicative Tasks and Fluency.....	33
Section Four: Perceptions of Communicative Activities	33
Description of Teachers' Questoinnaire.....	34

Section One: Impact of Communicative Activities	34
Section Two: Communicative Tasks and Grammatical Accuracy.....	35
Section Three: Communicative Tasks and Fluency.....	35
Section Four: Perceptions of Communicative Activities	35
Conclusion	36
Chapter Four: Analysis of the Findings	31
Introduction.....	37
Analyses of Students' Questionnaire	37
Analysis of Teachers' Questionnaire	52
Conclusion	66
Chapter Five: Discussion of the Findings.....	37
Introduction.....	66
Discussion of both Students' & Teachers' Questionnaires	66
Pedagogical Recommendations.....	69
For Course Design and Administration	70
Suggestions for Future Research.....	70
Conclusion	71
General Conclusion	66
References.....	72
ملخص	75
Appedices.....	75

List of Tables

Table 1: <i>Students' Level of Confidence in Speaking English After Group Discussion</i>	37
Table 2 : <i>Students' Perceptions of Communicative Tasks in Reducing Classroom Speaking Anxiety.</i>	38
Table 3 : <i>Frequency of Students' motivation to Participate in Real-Life Scenarios.</i>	39
Table 4: <i>Students' Perceptions of Peer-Led Learning in Enhancing Vocabulary Retention.</i>	40
Table 5: <i>Students' Degree of Attention to Correct Grammar in Oral Communicative Tasks.</i>	41
Table 6: <i>The Impact of Time pressure on Students' Ability to Apply Grammatical Rules.</i>	42
Table 7: <i>Students' Perceptions of Delayed Teacher Feedback in Improving their Grammar.</i>	43
Table 8: <i>Influence of Collaborative Pair Work on Grammatical Error Noticing & Correction.</i>	44
Table 9: <i>Students' Perceptions of Communicative Activities in Developing Smooth Spontaneous Speech.</i>	45
Table 10: <i>Frequency of Students' Focus on Meaning over Individual Linguistic Components.</i>	46
Table 11: <i>Impact of Frequent Classroom Interaction on the Development of Speaking Skill.</i>	47

Table 12: <i>The Role of Information-Gap Activities in Enhancing Students' Lexical Retrieval speed.</i>	48
Table 13: <i>Evaluation of the Role of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) in Enhancing Oral Production.</i>	49
Table 14: <i>Students' Preferences for Communicative Tasks vs. Traditional-Translation Exercises.</i>	50
Table 15: <i>Students' Perceptions of the Primary Benefits of Participating in Oral Communicative Tasks</i>	51
Table 16: <i>Frequency of Integrating Communicative Activities Within the Teachers' Syllabus.</i>	52
Table 17: <i>Teachers' Observations Regarding the Impact of Communicative Activities on Students Engagement Levels.</i>	53
Table 18: <i>The Influence of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) on Classroom Dynamics & Peer Support.</i>	54
Table 19: <i>Educators' Assessment of Pair Work as a Tool for Collaborative Meaning Negotiation.</i>	55
Table 20: <i>Correlation Between Students' Communicative Engagement & Grammatical Error Fluency.</i>	56
Table 21: <i>Teachers' Strategies for Balancing Grammatical Accuracy & Communicative Fluency During Oral Tasks.</i>	57
Table 22: <i>Educators' Observations on the Effectiveness of CLT in Promoting Subconscious Grammar Acquisition.</i>	58
Table 23: <i>Ranking Communicative Activities Based on Observed Grammatical Accuracy Outcomes.</i>	59

Table 24: <i>Impact of Continuous CLT Implementation on Learners' Average Speech Rate.</i>	60
Table 25: <i>Educators' Assessment of CLT in Promoting Direct Thinking & Spontaneous Expression in English.</i>	61
Table 26: <i>Teachers Methods & Criteria For Assessing Oral Fluency During High-Stakes Communicative Tasks.</i>	62
Table 27: <i>Impact of Fluency-Focused Communicative Activities on General Oral Proficiency.</i>	63
Table 28: <i>Teachers' Descriptions of Students' General Attitudes Toward Communicative- Based Instruction.</i>	64
Table 29: <i>Identifying the Primary Challenge in Implementing Communicative Activities</i>	65
Table 30: <i>Balancing Accuracy & Fluency in Communicative Activities vs. Traditional Methods</i>	65

Chapter One:

Introductory

Chapter

Introduction

This chapter outlines the introduction, background, aims, research problem, questions, hypotheses, and significance of the study. It briefly presents the methodology, describes the overall structure of the thesis, and acknowledges its limitations.

Background of the Study

In recent decades, speaking has become the main measure of English ability, since it shows whether learners can manage real communication. In contexts like Algeria, grammar knowledge alone is not enough; learners must also use it fluently. The challenge is balancing accuracy and fluency. Traditional methods stressed grammar memorization, while newer ones often prioritize free conversation, but both extremes leave learners frustrated either unable to speak or speaking with many errors. To address this, teachers now use interactive tasks such as role plays, discussions, and presentations, aiming to help learners practice grammar meaningfully while improving fluency. Whether these activities succeed in developing both skills together remains under investigation, especially in Algeria's unique learning environment.

Speaking is widely recognized as a central skill in English language learning, as it directly influences learners' communicative competence and overall proficiency. Research has consistently highlighted that oral production is not only a measure of language mastery but also a means of fostering fluency and grammatical accuracy. For instance, Asmae and Sana (2024) emphasized that listening and speaking are often neglected in Moroccan EFL classrooms, yet they are crucial for boosting learners' fluency and accuracy. Similarly, Nazarie and Beigzadeh (2025) argued that speaking fluency is increasingly prioritized by learners due to its role in enhancing communication, academic success, and employability.

González Reséndez (2024) demonstrated that communicative activities such as discussions, debates, and oral presentations significantly improve oral proficiency among Mexican EFL learners, supporting the idea that interactive speaking tasks reduce affective barriers and promote accuracy. In the Algerian context, Belfar and Kaddour (2023) found that oral presentations serve as effective tools for improving speaking proficiency, as they encourage learners to practice language in authentic communicative situations. Moreover, Lalaibia (2023) confirmed that the communicative language teaching approach enhances oral proficiency by integrating fluency-focused activities with grammatical awareness. Collectively, these studies underscore that speaking is not merely one of the four skills but the most visible indicator of language learning success, making it indispensable in EFL pedagogy.

Grammar plays a crucial role in oral communication, as it provides the structural foundation that enables learners to convey meaning accurately and fluently. Febriyanti, Izdiyar, and Hairulla (2024) found that EFL students perceive grammar as essential in conversations, noting that grammatical competence allows them to avoid misunderstandings and express ideas more clearly. Similarly, Normawati (2023) emphasized that grammar is closely tied to both speaking and writing, with learners acknowledging its importance in producing coherent and intelligible oral discourse. Al-wossabi (2014) argued that spoken grammar, often overlooked in traditional EFL instruction, is an urgent necessity, since discrepancies between textbook grammar and authentic spoken usage can hinder learners' communicative effectiveness. Collectively, these studies highlight that grammar is not merely a set of rules but a communicative resource that supports fluency, accuracy, and confidence in oral production.

Accuracy and fluency are widely acknowledged as two fundamental dimensions of oral proficiency in EFL contexts, often studied alongside complexity to capture the full scope

of learner performance. Neumanová (2025) investigated the interplay of complexity, accuracy, and fluency (CAF) in the oral production of learners at different proficiency levels, concluding that these dimensions provide a valid framework for describing developmental progress in speaking. Rahnema (2016) similarly emphasized that accuracy and fluency are inseparable in developing speaking ability, noting that fluency reflects communicative ease while accuracy ensures grammatical correctness and intelligibility. Askari and Langroudi (2014) tested Ur's model in Iranian classrooms and found that targeted communicative activities significantly improved both fluency and accuracy, demonstrating that balanced attention to these dimensions enhances learners' oral competence. Collectively, these studies highlight that accuracy and fluency are not competing goals but complementary aspects of oral production, essential for evaluating and fostering effective EFL speaking skills.

Communicative activities are widely recognized as effective tools for enhancing oral proficiency in EFL contexts, as they provide learners with authentic opportunities to practice that communicative activities significantly improved learners' speaking performance in a classroom action research design, showing gains in both fluency and accuracy. In a related study, Rezalou and Yağiz (2021) explored students' perceptions of communicative activities and found that learners viewed them positively, noting reduced speaking difficulties and increased confidence. Kaddour (2016) further confirmed that communicative strategies such as role plays, debates, and discussions fostered fluency and grammatical accuracy among first-year EFL students, emphasizing the importance of interactive practice. Collectively, these studies highlight that communicative activities not only strengthen linguistic competence but also reduce affective barriers, making them indispensable in oral production pedagogy.

Although prior studies have examined the importance of speaking (Asmae & Sana, 2024; Belfar & Kaddour, 2023), the role of grammar in oral communication (Febriyanti et

al., 2024; Normawati, 2023), and the dimensions of accuracy and fluency within the CAF framework (Neumanová, 2025; Rahnama, 2016), these investigations have largely treated the variables in isolation. For example, communicative activities have been shown to enhance fluency and sometimes accuracy (Rezalou & Yağiz, 2023; Kaddour, 2016), yet they were not systematically linked to grammatical development. Similarly, grammar-focused studies emphasized correctness but did not measure its interaction with fluency in oral production. As a result, there is a fragmented body of literature: speaking, grammar, accuracy, fluency, and communicative activities have each been studied, but rarely in an integrated manner. This leaves a gap in understanding how communicative activities can simultaneously foster grammatical accuracy and fluency in EFL learners' oral production, a gap that the present study seeks to address.

The present study seeks to address this fragmentation by investigating the integrated effect of communicative activities on grammatical accuracy and fluency in EFL learners' oral production. Unlike previous research, which has examined speaking, grammar, or the CAF; Complexity, Accuracy, Fluency dimensions in isolation, this study brings these variables together within a single framework. By situating communicative activities as the pedagogical intervention, the research aims to demonstrate how interactive tasks can simultaneously foster learners' grammatical competence and fluency, thereby bridging the divide between linguistic accuracy and communicative ease. This integrated approach not only contributes to the theoretical understanding of oral proficiency but also offers practical insights for classroom pedagogy, particularly in contexts where learners' performance and perceptions must be aligned. In doing so, the study occupies a unique space in the literature, responding to calls for more holistic investigations of oral production and providing empirical evidence that communicative activities can serve as a comprehensive tool for developing both accuracy and fluency in EFL speaking.

Aims of the Study

This study seeks to investigate the integrated effect of communicative activities on EFL learners' oral production, with particular attention to how such tasks influence both grammatical accuracy and fluency. In doing so, it examines the relationship between these two dimensions of oral performance, exploring whether communicative activities can foster a balanced development rather than privileging one aspect over the other. Beyond performance outcomes, the research also evaluates learners' perceptions of communicative activities as pedagogical tools, considering how interactive tasks such as debates, role plays, and oral presentations shape their confidence, motivation, and willingness to speak. This study also aims to contribute to a more holistic theoretical understanding of oral proficiency development. Finally, it intends to provide practical recommendations for EFL pedagogy and curriculum design, demonstrating how communicative activities can be systematically integrated to enhance both grammatical competence and communicative ease in classroom contexts.

Problem Statement

While prior studies have investigated speaking proficiency, grammar instruction, and the dimensions of accuracy and fluency within the complexity-accuracy-fluency (CAF) framework, these aspects have frequently been examined separately. Communicative tasks such as debates, role plays, and oral presentations have been shown to improve speaking performance, yet their combined influence on both grammatical accuracy and fluency remains underexplored, particularly in EFL contexts. This fragmentation in research and classroom practice highlights the need for studies that assess whether communicative activities can simultaneously promote accuracy and fluency in learners' oral production. Addressing this gap is crucial for offering clearer pedagogical guidance and advancing a more integrated understanding of oral proficiency development.

Research Questions

The current study aims to address the following questions:

1. What are EFL learners' perceptions of communicative activities as a tool for improving their oral proficiency?
2. To what extent do communicative activities enhance EFL learners' grammatical accuracy and fluency in oral production?
3. How do communicative activities influence the balance between grammatical accuracy and fluency in learners oral performance?

Research Hypotheses

1. Learners will report positive attitudes toward communicative activities, highlighting their role in boosting confidence, reducing anxiety, and supporting oral proficiency.
2. Learners engaged in communicative activities will demonstrate measurable gains in grammatical accuracy and fluency during oral production.
3. communicative activities encourage a more even growth of both accuracy and fluency, helping to prevent one skill from overshadowing the other.

Significance of the study

The primary value of this research lies in its holistic approach to oral proficiency within EFL settings. Rather than analyzing grammatical accuracy and fluency in isolation, this study examines how they interact during communicative activities. By bringing these elements together, we gain a clearer, more complete picture of how speaking skills actually develop.

The significance extends beyond theory into practice. On the theoretical side, the study contributes to a broader understanding of oral proficiency as an integrated skill, showing that communicative tasks can support balanced growth in accuracy and fluency.

This perspective encourages future research to move away from treating these dimensions separately and instead consider their combined role in language development.

On the practical side, the study highlights the pedagogical value of communicative activities. Learners' perceptions of debates, role plays, and oral presentations reveal how such tasks not only improve language performance but also build confidence, motivation, and willingness to speak. These findings imply that communicative activities can be systematically integrated into curricula to strengthen both grammatical competence and communicative ease.

In general terms, the implications suggest that EFL teaching should place greater emphasis on interactive tasks that prepare learners for authentic communication. By doing so, educators can foster not only linguistic correctness but also the confidence and ability to use language effectively in real-world contexts.

Research Methodology

This study adopts a quantitative based design to examine the impact of communicative activities on EFL learners' oral proficiency. Two structured questionnaires serve as the primary instruments of data collection. The student questionnaire was designed to capture learners' perceptions of communicative classroom practices. It asked about confidence, anxiety reduction, vocabulary learning, grammatical accuracy, and fluency development through tasks such as debates, role-plays, and group discussions. While the teacher questionnaire focused on professional perspectives. It explored how instructors implement communicative activities, their observations of student engagement, strategies for balancing accuracy and fluency, and the challenges they face in assessing oral performance.

Structure of Thesis

This thesis is organized into five main chapters, beginning with a general introduction that presents the background of the study, the problem statement, the research questions, and the hypotheses, while also outlining the study's aims, significance, methodology, structure, and limitations. The second chapter consists of a comprehensive literature review that explores the key theoretical concepts related to the research topic and establishes the academic foundation for the study. Chapter Three explains the research methodology, detailing the design and implementation of the two data collection tools used: a questionnaire for learners and another for teachers, both aimed at investigating their views on communicative activities. Chapter Four focuses on data analysis, presenting the results of both questionnaires along with a clear commentary on the findings. Finally, the last Chapter provides a detailed discussion of the results, compares them to previous studies, and offers practical pedagogical recommendations, followed by a general conclusion that summarizes the entire research journey.

Limitations

Despite efforts to gather a larger dataset, the study faced several practical challenges. First, finding recent academic sources was difficult because many specialized references were locked behind paywalls. To solve this and keep the study rigorous, an extensive search was done using open-access databases and digital repositories like Springer and Zenodo. Second, fieldwork faced obstacles regarding participant cooperation. Some students refused to fill out the questionnaires, and many teachers were unable to participate due to their busy schedules. This limited the final sample to just 13 teachers. While this small sample size means the results cannot be generalized to all EFL contexts, the strong literature review and the deep insights from the participants still provide a reliable baseline for understanding communicative activities in the EFL classroom.

Conclusion

In summary, this chapter has provided an overview of the study's introduction, background, aims, research problem, key questions, and hypotheses—as well as its methodological approach, significance, structure, and limitations. With these foundations laid, we are now equipped to delve deeper into each component in the following chapters.

Chapter Two

Literature Review

Introduction

This chapter provides a comprehensive theoretical foundation for the study, beginning with an exploration of the speaking skill and its critical role in EFL learning. It examines the nuances of oral proficiency, distinguishing it from general speaking abilities while highlighting the inherent challenges learners face. A significant portion of the review is dedicated to the CAF (Complexity, Accuracy, and Fluency) framework, which serves as the primary lens for analyzing learner performance. Specifically, the chapter delves into grammatical competence and the multifaceted nature of accuracy—including morphological correctness, syntactic control, and discourse appropriateness—alongside the defining characteristics of fluency.

The discussion further situates these linguistic components within the broader context of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT). It evaluates the implementation of various communicative activities, such as role-plays, debates, oral presentations, and group discussions, as catalysts for linguistic development. By synthesizing the relationship between these pedagogical interventions and the enhancement of oral proficiency, this chapter establishes the necessary framework to investigate how active classroom engagement can bridge the gap between theoretical grammatical knowledge and spontaneous, accurate speech.

Communicative Language Teaching

Communicative language teaching (CLT) represents a significant shift in pedagogical approaches, moving away from traditional structural methods toward a focus on functional language use. To fully understand its impact on modern classroom practices, it is essential to first establish a clear conceptual framework and trace its historical development.

Definition & Evolution

Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) has consistently been defined as a learner-centered approach that prioritizes communicative competence over grammatical accuracy, yet scholars diverge in how they frame its evolution. Early theorists such as Hymes (1972) and Canale and Swain (1980) emphasized the multidimensional nature of communicative competence—grammatical, sociolinguistic, discourse, and strategic—contrasting sharply with structuralist methods that focused narrowly on form. Later reviews (Salam & Luksfinanto, 2024; Tian, 2025) highlight that while CLT initially emerged in Europe as a reaction to the inadequacies of grammar-translation and audio-lingual approaches, its global diffusion required adaptation to exam-oriented and culturally diverse contexts. For instance, Salam and Luksfinanto (2024) argue that CLT's strength lies in fostering learner autonomy and authentic interaction, but they caution that its implementation often falters due to insufficient teacher training. Tian (2025), by contrast, underscores CLT's resilience, noting its integration with task-based learning and digital pedagogy as evidence of its adaptability. Thus, while early definitions positioned CLT as a radical departure from traditional methods, contemporary scholarship portrays it as an evolving framework—balancing ideals of communicative competence with pragmatic adjustments to institutional and cultural realities.

Principles and Conceptual Framework of CLT

The principles underlying Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) are often framed around authentic communication, learner-centeredness, and the integration of cultural awareness, yet scholars diverge in how they interpret its conceptual framework. Zoyirova (2025) highlights CLT as a methodology that nurtures confidence and creativity, arguing that its emphasis on meaningful interaction transforms classroom dynamics and motivates learners. Syarief (2016), however, situates CLT more firmly within theoretical

models of communicative competence, stressing that while the framework is conceptually sound, its translation into practice is hindered by curriculum design and assessment constraints. Salam and Luksfinanto (2024) adopt a middle ground, recognizing the strength of CLT's principles in fostering interaction but cautioning that their effectiveness depends heavily on teacher training and institutional support.

Together, these views show a clear tension: some scholars see CLT as highly transformative, while others point out the gap between its theory and classroom practice. They suggest that CLT works best when teachers and schools have enough support and resources.

The Shift from Traditional Methods to CLT

The transition from traditional methods to Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) reflects a deeper pedagogical shift shaped by globalization and the demand for authentic language use. Rezi and Bedra (2024) argue that while grammar-focused approaches offered structural rigor, they often failed to prepare learners for real-world communication, prompting reforms toward CLT and task-based learning that enhance motivation and proficiency, though contingent on teacher training and institutional support. Salam and Luksfinanto (2024) similarly highlight dissatisfaction with grammar-heavy instruction as a catalyst for CLT's rise, noting its strength in fostering interaction and communicative competence but warning that cultural and resource constraints can limit its effectiveness. Maxmudova (2025) adds nuance by contrasting the strengths of both traditions: traditional methods excel in grammatical accuracy and translation, whereas CLT better supports fluency, engagement, and practical language use. She proposes a hybrid model that integrates the structural benefits of older methods with the communicative ethos of CLT. Collectively, these perspectives suggest that the move to CLT was not a wholesale

rejection of tradition but a pragmatic response to its limitations, with scholars increasingly advocating integrative approaches that balance accuracy with communicative effectiveness.

Challenges of Implementing CLT in EFL Contexts

In exploring the challenges of implementing Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) in EFL contexts, scholars consistently point to the tension between its communicative ideals and classroom realities. Yin and Puteh (2026) categorize barriers into institutional, socio-cultural, and teacher-related factors, noting that exam-driven curricula and communication anxiety are the most persistent obstacles, requiring reforms at both policy and pedagogical levels. Chen and Shuib (2026) echo this concern, showing that while CLT enhances oral proficiency, its effectiveness is undermined by mixed-ability classes, limited instructional time, and insufficient teacher training, with grammar and writing outcomes remaining inconsistent under accuracy-focused assessment systems. From the learners' perspective, Alharbi (2021) highlights motivational and affective barriers, such as anxiety, inhibition, and reliance on the mother tongue, which reduce participation despite students' appreciation of communicative activities. Taken together, these studies suggest that CLT's success in EFL settings depends on contextual adaptation: institutional support, teacher readiness, and learner motivation must align for communicative competence to flourish, and hybrid approaches that integrate structural accuracy with communicative practice may offer a pragmatic balance.

Understanding Speaking Skill & Oral Proficiency

Compared to the other four language skills, speaking is uniquely complex because it happens in real-time. This section defines the speaking skill by looking at both the physical act of talking and the social side of communication.

Definition of speaking skill

To understand the speaking skill within the EFL context, researchers have offered a range of complementary definitions that highlight its multifaceted nature. Wang, Abdullah, and Leong (2022) frame speaking as a central component of communicative competence, emphasizing that it involves not only grammatical accuracy but also fluency and interactive skills. Similarly, Kouti (2023) enriches this definition by incorporating a discourse perspective, noting that effective speaking requires an understanding of pragmatic and sociocultural norms, allowing learners to participate meaningfully in real-life discourse.

These studies show that speaking is more than just making correct sentences. It is a dynamic skill that combines accuracy, fluency, and the ability to handle conversations. In this way, they highlight speaking as a complex and interactive skill that can be improved through communicative and discourse-based teaching methods.

Importance of speaking skill

Speaking skill has been consistently identified as a central element of language learning because it directly reflects learners' communicative competence and their ability to function in academic and social settings. Wang, Abdullah, and Leong (2022) stress that speaking is the most visible indicator of proficiency, making it indispensable for success in both educational and professional domains. Kouti (2023) adds that speaking is crucial since it enables learners to engage in authentic discourse, bridging classroom practice with real-life communication. Rahnama (2016) highlights its importance in integrating accuracy and fluency, two dimensions that determine clarity and confidence in oral expression. Hasnain and Halder (2024) further argue that speaking is vital in task-based pedagogy, as oral interaction fosters linguistic growth and learner motivation. Similarly, Lintunen, Mutta, and Peltonen (2020) emphasize that speaking is essential for fluency development, which enhances learners' confidence and willingness to communicate.

These studies agree that speaking well is closely linked to social and psychological factors. Such influences are important for helping learners become more independent and communicate smoothly in the classroom.

Challenges of speaking skill

Developing speaking skill in EFL classrooms is often hindered by a range of challenges that affect both accuracy and fluency. Wang, Abdullah, and Leong (2022) note that speaking remains under-researched compared to other skills, leaving teachers with limited pedagogical models to address learners' oral difficulties. Kouti (2023) highlights that many learners struggle with pragmatic and sociocultural aspects of discourse, which prevents them from transferring classroom knowledge into authentic communication. Rahnama (2016) identifies the tension between accuracy and fluency as a persistent challenge, with learners often focusing on one dimension at the expense of the other. Hasnain and Halder (2024) add that task-based approaches, while effective, can overwhelm learners who lack confidence, making oral interaction a source of anxiety rather than growth. Similarly, Lintunen, Mutta, and Peltonen (2020) emphasize that fluency difficulties—such as inappropriate pauses, hesitations, and lack of rhythm—remain a major obstacle to effective communication.

These studies show that speaking difficulties are not only about language itself but also involve psychological and situational factors. They include issues such as confidence, motivation, discourse skills, and finding balance between accuracy and fluency.

Oral proficiency definition

Oral proficiency is often defined as a broader construct than speaking skill, encompassing not only the ability to produce accurate and fluent sentences but also the competence to communicate effectively in diverse contexts. Abdullaev (2021) explains that while speaking refers to the mechanical act of producing language, oral proficiency requires

coherence, interaction, and appropriateness, making it a more comprehensive measure of communicative ability. Consolo (2006) reinforces this view by noting that oral proficiency integrates grammar, vocabulary, discourse, and interactional strategies, highlighting its multidimensional nature. Smit (2019) adds that teachers frequently struggle to assess oral proficiency because it goes beyond pronunciation and grammar, requiring evaluation of confidence, pragmatic competence, and interactional skills. González Reséndez (2024) demonstrates that communicative tasks such as debates and oral presentations enhance oral proficiency by fostering learners' ability to negotiate meaning and manage discourse spontaneously. Similarly, Tiu, Groenewald, Kilag, and Balicoco (2023) argue that oral proficiency cannot be achieved through speaking practice alone; it demands sociocultural awareness and communicative strategies that allow learners to adapt language use to varied contexts.

These studies agree that speaking is part of oral proficiency, while oral proficiency itself is a broader skill. It involves using spoken language effectively, interactively, and appropriately.

Differences & the Relationship between Speaking skill and Oral Proficiency

Researchers generally agree that speaking skill and oral proficiency are related but distinct constructs. Abdullaev (2021) explains that speaking skill refers to the mechanical production of language pronunciation, grammar, and vocabulary while oral proficiency encompasses a broader communicative ability, including coherence, appropriateness, and interaction. Consolo (2006) reinforces this distinction by noting that oral proficiency integrates multiple domains such as discourse management and pragmatic competence, whereas speaking skill is only one component of this larger framework. Smit (2019) highlights the relationship between the two, observing that while speaking skill provides the foundation for oral proficiency, proficiency requires learners to use those skills effectively

in authentic communication. González Reséndez (2024) demonstrates this connection in practice, showing that communicative tasks like debates and oral presentations not only improve speaking skill but also develop oral proficiency by fostering negotiation of meaning and spontaneous interaction. Similarly, Tiu, Groenewald, Kilag, and Balicoco (2023) argue that oral proficiency cannot be achieved through speaking practice alone; it requires sociocultural awareness and communicative strategies that extend beyond linguistic accuracy.

In summary, these studies concur that speaking skill is a component of language proficiency. In contrast, oral proficiency represents the integrated ability to use spoken language effectively in authentic environment.

The Components of Oral Production: CAF Framework

To study oral production in detail, researchers often divide speaking ability into separate but connected dimensions. Looking at speaking from this multidimensional perspective makes it possible to track learner progress more clearly. The next section introduces the Complexity, Accuracy, and Fluency (CAF) framework as the main model for assessing these different aspects of performance.

The CAF: A Multidimensional Perspective

The Complexity, Accuracy, and Fluency (CAF) framework is increasingly understood as a dynamic and multidimensional construct rather than a set of isolated measures. Révész, Ekiert, and Torgersen (2016) show that fluency markers such as pauses and false starts often carry more weight in determining communicative adequacy than syntactic complexity or grammatical accuracy, underscoring fluency's central role in real-time interaction. Li and Sui (2025), adopting a Complex Dynamic Systems Theory perspective, extend this view by demonstrating that the relationship among CAF dimensions

shifts across learners and over time sometimes competitive, sometimes mutually supportive depending on individual trajectories and task conditions. Rausch (2012) critiques the narrow use of CAF as a performance metric, arguing instead for a broader conceptualization that integrates sociolinguistic and communicative theories, situating CAF within discourse adequacy and sociocultural context.

Taken together, these studies highlight that while traditional approaches often treated complexity, accuracy, and fluency as competing dimensions, contemporary research emphasizes their interdependence, variability, and sensitivity to communicative context. The CAF framework thus functions not only as an assessment tool but also as a theoretical model for understanding how language develops dynamically through interaction.

Definition of Grammar

grammar is generally described as the underlying system of rules that organizes words into meaningful structures. Erkulova (2021) stresses that grammar should not be viewed merely as abstract regulations but as a practical framework that enables learners to produce coherent and contextually appropriate utterances. Ali, Joshi, and Hareesh (2018) similarly argue that grammar is inseparable from communicative competence, since its value lies in being applied meaningfully in authentic contexts rather than memorized in isolation. Ur (1988) reinforces this perspective by portraying grammar as the structural foundation of language, the mechanism that allows words to form phrases and sentences. Experimental work on grammatical sensitivity further demonstrates that grammar encompasses both recognition and production processes, making it indispensable for accuracy in oral and written communication (Anonymous, 2019).

In short, grammar is seen as the basic map for language. It gives students the system they need to speak fluently and make sure their ideas are understood by others.

Definition of Grammatical Competence

Grammatical competence, by contrast, refers to the learner's ability to apply grammatical knowledge effectively in communication. Erkulova (2021) defines it as mastery of the rule system that governs sentence formation, highlighting its role in enabling speakers to construct coherent utterances in real interaction. Ali, Joshi, and Hareesh (2018) extend this definition by emphasizing that competence requires not only recognition of forms but also their meaningful use in authentic communicative settings. Ur (1988) underscores that competence involves both knowledge of grammar and the skill to apply it in speech and writing. Evidence from studies on grammatical sensitivity shows that competence integrates recognition and production, making it essential for accurate language performance (Anonymous, 2019).

Taken together, these perspectives present grammatical competence as both a cognitive and communicative ability: learners must understand the rules of grammar and demonstrate the capacity to use them appropriately in real-life interaction.

grammar is essentially the system of rules and structures that govern how language works. Grammar is the blueprint of a language, it tells how words can and should fit together to form sentences.

On the other hand, grammatical competence is about how well someone can actually use that blueprint in real-life communication. It's like knowing the rules of the road (grammar) versus actually being able to drive effectively (grammatical competence).

In short, grammar is the set of rules, and grammatical competence is how well someone can use those rules.

Grammatical Accuracy Definition

Grammatical accuracy is generally defined as the ability to produce language that conforms to the structural rules of grammar, ensuring clarity and correctness in

communication. Rahnama (2016) describes accuracy as one of the two essential pillars of speaking ability, alongside fluency, noting that learners often struggle to balance the two dimensions. Hasnain and Halder (2024) emphasize that grammatical accuracy reflects the extent to which learners avoid errors in morphology and syntax, and they show that task-based instruction can enhance accuracy when learners are encouraged to focus on form during communicative practice. Lintunen, Mutta, and Peltonen (2020) highlight that accuracy is not only about error-free language but also about producing coherent and rhythmically appropriate speech, since grammatical mistakes often disrupt fluency. Wang, Abdullah, and Leong (2022) reinforce this perspective by identifying accuracy as a key indicator of oral proficiency in bibliometric analyses of speaking research, underscoring its importance in both assessment and pedagogy.

Taking together, research indicates that grammatical precision is a vital element of communicative ability. This accuracy is necessary to make sure that a student's communication is both grammatically correct and purposeful.

Aspects of Grammatical accuracy. Grammatical accuracy is a multidimensional construct that encompasses several aspects of language use, including morphology, syntax, and error-free production. Rahnama (2016) identifies accuracy as one of the two central pillars of speaking ability, noting that it involves producing grammatically correct sentences while balancing fluency. Hasnain and Halder (2024) emphasize that accuracy includes correct use of verb forms, tenses, and agreement, and they show that task-based instruction can improve these aspects when learners are encouraged to focus on form during communicative practice. Lintunen, Mutta, and Peltonen (2020) highlight that accuracy also relates to discourse-level appropriateness, since grammatical errors often disrupt rhythm, coherence, and interaction in oral communication. Wang, Abdullah, and Leong (2022) reinforce this perspective by identifying accuracy as a key dimension in bibliometric

analyses of speaking research, where it is consistently measured through error rates, syntactic correctness, and morphological precision. Combined research indicates that grammatical accuracy consists of multiple components. These include morphological precision, syntactic organization, and discourse suitability. These elements work together to improve the clarity and success of a learner's oral performance.

Morphological Correctness. Morphological correctness refers to learners' ability to use word forms accurately, including inflections, derivations, and affixes, and it is consistently highlighted as a crucial aspect of grammatical accuracy. McCutchen and Stull (2014) show that morphological awareness understanding how morphemes combine directly supports accuracy in writing, as learners who master inflections and derivations produce fewer grammatical errors. Ogawa (2025) emphasizes that morphological correctness in EFL essay writing is particularly evident in the proper use of verb endings, plural markers, and tense forms, which significantly improve productivity and coherence. A recent experimental study on targeted morphological instruction demonstrates that explicit teaching of affixes and morphological analysis enhances learners' ability to apply word forms correctly, thereby strengthening overall grammatical accuracy (Springer Authors, 2023).

In summary, these studies show that morphological correctness is more than just avoiding mistakes. Instead, it shows that a student has mastered how words are built. This mastery helps them communicate clearly and smoothly when both speaking and reading.

Syntactic Control. Syntactic control is widely defined as the ability to construct grammatically correct and structurally varied sentences, and it is consistently highlighted as a central aspect of grammatical accuracy. Thi and Nikolov (2023) show that targeted feedback; whether teacher-provided, automated, or combined significantly improves learners' syntactic complexity and accuracy, demonstrating that syntactic control can be strengthened through explicit guidance on sentence structures. Wondemagegne, Simegn, and Adugna (2023) reinforce this view by finding that syntactic control, measured through sentence variety and clause integration, strongly predicts the overall quality of EFL argumentative essays. Ogawa (2025) further emphasizes that syntactic correctness is essential for productivity in writing, as learners who manage sentence structures effectively produce more coherent and meaningful texts.

Combined evidence shows that syntactic control is not simply about error prevention. Instead, it enables students to produce sophisticated and logical communication. This makes it a key factor in achieving both correct grammar and effective speaking skills.

Discourse Appropriateness. Discourse appropriateness refers to learners' ability to use language that is not only grammatically correct but also contextually suitable, coherent, and socially acceptable in communication. Bobodzhanova and Mamleeva (2022) highlight that grammatical competence is a key instrument for oral discourse development, enabling learners to manage coherence and appropriateness in spoken interaction. Aynekulu and Ferede (2021) show that scaffolding grammar instruction improves oral proficiency by helping learners align their grammatical choices with communicative contexts, thereby enhancing discourse appropriateness. Quines (2023) reinforces this perspective by demonstrating that grammatical competence directly influences the appropriateness of oral communication, as learners with stronger control produce more coherent and contextually relevant discourse. Astorga Cabezas and Bahamondes Beltran (2021) add that “grammaring”

the active use of grammar in communication—supports discourse appropriateness by ensuring that learners’ speech is both accurate and pragmatically aligned with interactional norms.

These studies agree that effective communication happens when students combine grammatical accuracy with an understanding of the social context. This integration is essential for achieving overall proficiency in a foreign language.

Grammatical Accuracy in Communicative Contexts. Grammatical accuracy in communicative contexts emerges as a multidimensional construct shaped by pedagogy, perception, and purpose. Mamaziyoyeva (2025) shows that embedding grammar instruction into communicative tasks such as role plays and problem-solving activities strengthens learners’ ability to apply structures accurately, arguing that grammar is more durable when treated as a functional tool for meaning-making rather than abstract rules. Constantine, Getty, and Fraundorf (2022) complicate this view by demonstrating that judgments of grammaticality are influenced by speaker identity and intelligibility, with native-accented speech often perceived as more accurate even when quasi-grammatical. This highlights the social dimension of accuracy, where evaluation depends not only on linguistic form but also on listener perceptions. Adding another layer, research on lexicogrammatical variation in L2 writing (Journal of Second Language Writing, 2025) emphasizes that communicative purpose shapes grammatical choices, as writers adjust accuracy and complexity depending on genre and task demands.

Taken together, these studies suggest that grammatical accuracy is best understood as both linguistic and social: it improves when taught through interactive tasks, is judged differently depending on speaker identity, and shifts with communicative purpose. In communicative contexts, accuracy is therefore not absolute but context-sensitive, requiring a balance between structural correctness, social perception, and functional use.

Definition of Fluency

Fluency in oral proficiency is commonly defined as the smooth, coherent, and contextually appropriate flow of speech, and scholars emphasize its multidimensional nature. Peltonen (2024) describes fluency as the ease and naturalness of speech production, where learners can communicate without frequent pauses or breakdowns. Tavakoli, Campbell, and McCormack (2020) expand this definition by framing fluency as a multidimensional construct that includes speed of delivery, pausing patterns, and the ability to maintain coherence across extended discourse, making it one of the most reliable indicators of second language proficiency. Ong and Villegas (2020) add a pragmatic dimension, noting that fluency also involves appropriateness in discourse, as learners must adapt their speech to communicative contexts to achieve effectiveness.

In summary, these findings demonstrate that fluency is more than just error-free speech. It requires an integrated ability to speak with natural flow and structure that is appropriate for the listener. Thus, it guarantees clarity and effectiveness in oral performance.

Characteristics of Fluency. Fluency in oral proficiency is characterized by several interrelated features that ensure smooth and effective communication. Peltonen (2024) identifies fluency as the ease and naturalness of speech, marked by minimal hesitation and a steady rhythm. Tavakoli, Campbell, and McCormack (2020) emphasize its multidimensional nature, noting that fluency involves speed of delivery, appropriate pausing, and the ability to maintain coherence across extended discourse. Ong and Villegas (2020) add a pragmatic dimension, arguing that fluency also requires appropriateness in discourse, where speakers adapt their language to social and communicative contexts.

Taken together, these studies show that fluency is characterized by speed, pausing, rhythm, coherence, and contextual adaptability, all of which make speech clear, effective, and socially meaningful in EFL communication.

Fluency and Oral spontaneity.

Fluency and oral spontaneity in second language learning are best understood as gradual, multidimensional processes shaped by exposure, practice, and psycholinguistic mechanisms. Rojas (2023) demonstrates this through a unified fluency index for French learners, showing that articulation speed, hesitation rate, and pause frequency can be tracked longitudinally, with fluency developing steadily through consistent oral practice rather than isolated drills. Saito and Hanzawa (2018) reinforce the importance of input, finding that Japanese students improved fluency and lexicogrammar rapidly when given sustained opportunities for spontaneous speech, though pronunciation gains were slower, highlighting the uneven pace of oral development. Yu (2022) adds a psycholinguistic perspective, showing that frequent use of formulaic sequences enhances speed fluency and reduces pausing, enabling more spontaneous speech, but cautions that this advantage diminishes when learners process sequences word-by-word instead of holistically.

Together, these studies suggest that fluency and spontaneity emerge from a combination of structured exposure, repeated practice, and the proceduralization of language chunks, underscoring the need for pedagogical approaches that balance input, practice, and automaticity in oral communication.

The Interplay and Balance between Accuracy & Fluency

The relationship between accuracy and fluency in second language learning is increasingly seen as fluid and context-dependent rather than a fixed trade-off. Li and Sui (2025), working within a Complex Dynamic Systems Theory framework, show that learners may either sacrifice fluency for accuracy or achieve gains in both when tasks are scaffolded appropriately, underscoring the individual variability in how these dimensions interact. Cha Li and Zhang (2023) add that instructional design can tilt this balance, with online scaffolding environments often favoring accuracy improvements and self-efficacy, while

fluency requires more sustained opportunities for spontaneous speech. Revisiting Skehan's trade-off hypothesis, Hasnain and Halder (2024) argue that cognitive load does push learners to prioritize one dimension, but careful task sequencing can mitigate this effect, allowing accuracy to be consolidated before fluency is pushed forward. Wu and Michel (2024) highlight the pedagogical implications, noting that classrooms often privilege accuracy due to assessment systems, yet fluency is equally vital for communicative adequacy, calling for activities like timed speaking and improvisation to balance instruction.

Overall, these studies suggest that accuracy and fluency are not inherently opposed but can be developed in tandem when pedagogy, task design, and assessment practices are aligned to support both dimensions.

Definition of Communicative Activities

Communicative activities are generally defined as purposeful classroom tasks that prioritize meaningful interaction and authentic language use over mechanical practice. Galloway (1993) describes them as exercises designed to simulate real-life communication, shifting the focus from memorization to interaction through role plays, problem-solving, and information-gap tasks. Milal and Laily (2019) emphasize that communicative activities are rooted in the functional view of language, encouraging learners to negotiate meaning and use grammar in context rather than in isolation. More recently, Learn English (2024) highlights that communicative activities integrate multiple skills—speaking, listening, and sometimes writing—so that learners practice language in realistic scenarios, thereby balancing fluency with accuracy.

Across these studies, a common view emerges: communicative activities go beyond simple classroom tasks. They function as intentionally designed learning experiences that enable students to strengthen their language skills and gain confidence by participating in meaningful, interaction-focused communication.

Classification of Communicative Activities

The categorization of these activities is essential for understanding how specific tasks prioritize different linguistic outcomes. By selecting the right activity type, educators can create a structured environment where learners transition from controlled language practice to a stage where they must manage both grammatical precision and the pace of natural speech.

Roleplays.

Role plays are widely defined as communicative activities that simulate real-life situations, enabling learners to practice authentic interaction and develop oral proficiency. Khamouja, Benmhamed, and El Ghouati (2023) describe role-playing as a method that places learners in realistic contexts, allowing them to use language meaningfully while building confidence and speaking competence. Shravani (2024) emphasizes the experiential nature of role plays, noting that they immerse learners in dynamic scenarios where they actively negotiate meaning and engage in social interaction, making language learning more participatory and effective. Abdulazizova and Kuchkarova (2021) add that role plays provide opportunities to practice communication across varied social roles and contexts, thereby strengthening both linguistic accuracy and pragmatic adaptability.

Roleplays function as sophisticated context-driven tasks rather than mechanical drills, facilitating a simultaneous advancement in fluency, grammatical accuracy, and discourse appropriateness within communicative frameworks.

Debates.

Debates are defined as structured communicative activities that engage learners in argumentative discourse, requiring them to defend positions, challenge opposing views, and negotiate meaning in real time. Alasmari and Ahmed (2013) describe debates as interactive tasks that foster critical thinking and oral proficiency by encouraging learners to articulate ideas clearly and respond to counterarguments. Kaur (2015) emphasizes that debates simulate authentic communication by integrating persuasion, reasoning, and fluency, making them effective tools for practicing both accuracy and appropriateness in language use. Similarly, Darby (2020) highlights debates as experiential learning activities that promote confidence and collaborative skills, since learners must adapt their speech to social contexts while maintaining coherence and grammatical correctness.

Overall, these studies indicate that debates should be viewed as more than simple competitions. They function as instructional methods that integrate linguistic accuracy and smooth speech. Consequently, this approach enhances students' speaking skill in foreign language settings.

Oral Presentations.

Oral presentations are defined as structured communicative activities that require learners to prepare and deliver spoken discourse to an audience, thereby integrating accuracy, fluency, and discourse appropriateness in authentic contexts. Alwi (2017) emphasizes that oral presentations are purposeful tasks designed to develop learners' ability to organize ideas, use language accurately, and communicate effectively in front of peers, making them a vital tool for enhancing oral proficiency. Nguyen (2019) highlights their interactive dimension, noting that oral presentations foster confidence and fluency by encouraging learners to adapt their speech to audience needs and situational contexts. Similarly, Al-Sibai (2004) describes oral presentations as communicative strategies that

simulate real-life speaking situations, requiring learners to balance grammatical correctness with fluency and pragmatic appropriateness.

In summary, these studies indicate that oral presentations are more than just basic classroom tasks. They are authentic communication activities that improve a learner's language skills, self-confidence, and their ability to share information clearly in academic and professional environments.

Group Discussions.

Group discussions are interactive communicative activities where learners collaboratively exchange ideas, negotiate meaning, and practice language in authentic social contexts. Al-Sibai (2004) describes group discussions as structured opportunities for learners to develop oral fluency and confidence by engaging in peer-to-peer communication rather than teacher-centered instruction. Kaur (2015) emphasizes that group discussions simulate real-life communication by requiring learners to listen actively, respond appropriately, and maintain coherence, thereby fostering both fluency and discourse appropriateness. Similarly, Rao (2019) highlights that group discussions encourage critical thinking and collaborative learning, as learners must articulate their viewpoints clearly while respecting diverse perspectives.

Group discussions go beyond basic classroom conversation, serving as purposeful communicative activities that require the integration of grammatical accuracy, fluency, and pragmatic competence, making them essential for developing oral proficiency in EFL contexts.

The Role of Communicative Activities in Enhancing oral Proficiency

Communicative activities such as role plays, debates, oral presentations, and group discussions play a pivotal role in enhancing oral proficiency by integrating accuracy, fluency, and discourse appropriateness in interactive contexts. Mokhtara and Zaabat (2019) show that

role plays improve learners' speaking competence by simulating real-life situations, thereby fostering confidence and reducing hesitation. Alasmari and Ahmed (2013) highlight debates as effective tools for sharpening critical thinking and oral fluency, since learners must defend positions and respond to counterarguments with clarity and grammatical control. Oral presentations, as demonstrated by Nguyen (2019) and Al-Sibai (2004), strengthen learners' ability to organize ideas, adapt speech to audience needs, and balance accuracy with fluency, making them essential for academic and professional communication. González Reséndez (2024) adds that group discussions promote collaborative learning and negotiation of meaning, encouraging learners to listen actively, respond appropriately, and maintain coherence.

Overall, the research suggests that communicative activities play a crucial role in language learning by giving learners opportunities to practice in realistic and meaningful situations. This type of practice not only improves their language skills but also boosts their confidence and helps them use the language more effectively in everyday life, which makes these activities vital for developing oral proficiency in EFL classrooms.

Conclusion

This chapter has established that the development of oral proficiency in EFL contexts is fundamentally rooted in the synergy between communicative intent and linguistic precision. By moving away from traditional pedagogical constraints toward a Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) framework, the learning process shifts from passive reception to active production. This transition highlights the necessity of the CAF framework, which provides a balanced lens through which both grammatical accuracy and oral fluency can be developed simultaneously.

The integration of task-based activities; specifically role-plays, debates, and group discussions functions as the primary vehicle for this development. These activities do not

merely offer practice but serve as essential communicative environments where learners must negotiate meaning, internalize grammatical structures, and refine their speech rate in real-time. In conclusion, by prioritizing a balanced approach to the components of oral proficiency, educators can better equip students to navigate the complexities of spontaneous, real-world communication with both confidence and correctness.

Chapter Three:

Research

Methodology

Introduction

This chapter outlines the methodology adopted to address the research questions and test the hypotheses. It presents the overall research design, describes the population and sampling procedures, and explains the rationale behind participant selection. The chapter also provides a detailed account of the two data collection tools; the students' questionnaire and the teachers' questionnaire; highlighting their structure, purpose, and relevance to the study.

Research Design

In this study, a quantitative approach design was chosen to systematically capture and analyze learners' and teachers' perceptions of communicative activities. This approach is particularly suitable because it allows for the quantifiable comparison of attitudes and experiences, providing a clear picture of trends across the study population. While a qualitative approach could offer rich narrative insights, the quantitative method was selected to facilitate broader generalization and statistical analysis.

Population & Sampling

In terms of sampling, this study focused on a group of 32 EFL learners drawn from a larger population of 90 first-year LMD students from Chadli Bendjedid University Department of English through the academic year 2025/2026. These students were selected purposively, as preliminary observations revealed that they frequently encounter difficulties in oral communication, making them appropriate participants for the study. These students were selected purposively, as preliminary observations revealed that they frequently encounter difficulties in oral communication, making them appropriate participants for the study. Additionally, 13 EFL teachers out of an available group of 15 from Chadli Bendjedid

University were included to provide a well-rounded view of teaching practices and perceptions. This sampling strategy ensures that the data reflects both the learner and instructor perspectives, highlighting the specific challenges and insights within this educational setting.

Description of EFL Students Questionnaire

With the students' questionnaire, the focus shifts to the learners' own perspectives on how communicative activities shape their oral proficiency. Structured in four sections, each containing three to four targeted questions, this questionnaire invites students to share their views on how these tasks influence their confidence, grammatical accuracy, and fluency.

Section One: Impact of Communicative Activities

The first section of the students' questionnaire investigates the psychological and motivational impact of communicative activities on oral performance. Through items addressing confidence, anxiety reduction, motivation, and vocabulary learning, it seeks to determine whether tasks such as debates, role-plays, and group discussions foster a supportive environment that encourages learners to speak more freely. This section also examines whether peer interaction is perceived as a more effective means of acquiring new vocabulary compared to traditional lecture-based instruction. By focusing on affective factors; confidence, anxiety, and motivation alongside lexical development, the section provides insight into how communicative activities influence learners' readiness to participate and their overall perception of oral proficiency development.

Section Two: Communicative Tasks and Grammatical Accuracy

The second section of the questionnaire focuses on the relationship between communicative activities and grammatical accuracy. It examines the extent to which learners pay attention to correct grammar while engaged in oral tasks, the challenges they face in

recalling rules under the pressure of spontaneous communication, and the role of teacher feedback in reinforcing accuracy. Additionally, it explores whether pair work enables learners to notice and self-correct their mistakes. The aim of this section is to assess how communicative tasks influence the accuracy dimension of oral proficiency, highlighting whether fluency-oriented interaction compromises grammatical correctness or, conversely, provides opportunities for learners to internalize rules through practice and feedback. By analyzing these responses, the study gains insight into learners' perceptions of the balance between spontaneous communication and grammatical precision in classroom contexts.

Section Three: Communicative Tasks and Fluency

The third section of the questionnaire is devoted to examining the role of communicative activities in fostering fluency. It addresses learners' perceptions of whether such tasks enable them to speak more smoothly, reduce hesitation, and focus on conveying meaning rather than concentrating on individual words. It also explores whether regular classroom interaction contributes to increased speaking speed and whether information-gap activities facilitate quicker lexical retrieval. The aim of this section is to evaluate how communicative practices support the fluency dimension of oral proficiency, emphasizing spontaneity, continuity of speech, and efficiency in word choice. By analyzing these responses, the study seeks to determine the extent to which communicative activities enhance learners' ability to produce language more fluidly and confidently in real-time interaction.

Section Four: Perceptions of Communicative Activities

The final section of the questionnaire provides a holistic view of learners' perceptions regarding communicative activities. It asks students to evaluate the overall effectiveness of such tasks in improving oral proficiency, to express their preference between communicative

approaches and traditional grammar-translation methods, and to identify the most significant benefit they associate with oral communicative practice whether fluency, accuracy, confidence, vocabulary growth, or preparation for real-world communication. The aim of this section is to capture learners' general attitudes and priorities, offering insight into how they value communicative language teaching as a pedagogical approach. By analyzing these responses, the study can determine not only the perceived strengths of communicative activities but also the aspects of oral proficiency that learners consider most essential to their development.

Description of Teachers' Questionnaire

This instrument is designed to capture educators' perspectives on the same themes explored with learners namely, the impact of communicative activities on oral proficiency, including dimensions of confidence, grammatical accuracy, and fluency. The teachers' questionnaire is structured into four sections, each containing a focused set of questions typically ranging from three to five items aimed at eliciting detailed reflections on instructional practices and perceptions.

Section One: Impact of Communicative Activities

This section investigates how frequently teachers integrate communicative activities into their syllabus and the extent to which these tasks enhance student engagement and foster a supportive classroom environment. It also examines teachers' evaluation of pair work as a means of promoting negotiation of meaning among learners. The aim here is to capture the pedagogical perspective on the motivational and social benefits of communicative tasks, highlighting how instructors perceive their role in shaping classroom dynamics and encouraging active participation.

Section Two: Communicative Tasks and Grammatical Accuracy

The second section focuses on teachers' observations of grammatical accuracy during communicative tasks. It explores whether accuracy tends to decline when students are deeply engaged, how teachers balance the dual demands of accuracy and fluency, and whether learners eventually internalize grammar rules through repeated communicative use. Additionally, it asks teachers to identify which types of activities yield the highest levels of accuracy. The aim is to assess how educators perceive the tension between fluency and accuracy, and to understand the strategies they employ to maintain linguistic precision while fostering communicative competence.

Section Three: Communicative Tasks and Fluency

This section examines teachers' perspectives on fluency development through communicative activities. It addresses whether instructors observe measurable increases in speech rate, the extent to which tasks help students overcome the mental translation barrier, and the criteria teachers use to assess fluency in high-stakes tasks. It also considers whether prioritizing fluency is believed to lead to stronger overall oral proficiency. The aim is to evaluate how teachers conceptualize fluency growth, the indicators they rely on for assessment, and their views on the long-term benefits of emphasizing fluency in classroom practice.

Section Four: Perceptions of Communicative Activities

The final section gathers teachers' general attitudes toward communicative-based lessons, their identification of the biggest challenges in implementing such tasks, and their judgment on whether communicative activities provide a better balance between accuracy and fluency compared to traditional methods. The aim is to capture the broader pedagogical perceptions of CLT, including both its advantages and its practical limitations. By analyzing

these responses, the study gains insight into the professional consensus on the effectiveness of communicative activities and the obstacles that may hinder their successful application.

Conclusion

In conclusion, this chapter has defined the methodology used in our study, focusing exclusively on the quantitative methods employed. We have detailed the construction and distribution of two questionnaires, one for students and one for teachers designed to gather numerical data on their perspectives. By employing this quantitative framework, we have established a clear and structured foundation for analyzing the responses numerically. This sets the stage for the next chapter, where we will delve into the quantitative findings and their implications.

Chapter Four:

Analysis of the

Findings

Introduction

This chapter presents the analysis and interpretation of fieldwork data, focusing on how communicative activities such as oral presentations, debates, and role-plays shape EFL learners' grammatical accuracy and fluency. It draws on two main sources: students' questionnaires, which reveal their confidence, motivation, and perceptions of communicative tasks, and teachers' questionnaires, which provide professional insights into classroom practices, student engagement, and the balance between accuracy and fluency. By comparing these perspectives, the chapter offers a comprehensive view of how real-life tasks and peer interaction contribute to the development of oral proficiency in EFL contexts.

Analyses of Students' Questionnaire

This questionnaire is submitted to 32 EFL students from Chadli Bendjdid University, Department of English, to explore their perceptions toward communicative activities.

Section One: Impact of Communicative Activities

Q1. Do you feel more confident speaking English after participating in group discussions?

Table 1: *Students' Level of Confidence in Speaking English After Group Discussion*

Response	Frequency	Percentage%
Strongly agree	14	43,7%
Agree	10	31,3%
Neutral	5	15,6%
Disagree	3	9,4%
Strongly disagree	0	0,0%

In analyzing the results for table 1, we see that a significant portion of students hold a positive view of communicative activities. Nearly(44%) of the respondents strongly agree that these activities improve their oral proficiency, while another (31%) agree. This means about three-quarters of the students (75%) express a favorable opinion overall. Approximately (16%) of students remain neutral, indicating some level of uncertainty or mixed feelings. Meanwhile, only about (9%) disagree, and no students strongly disagree. In summary, the data reveals a clear trend: the majority of students view communicative activities as beneficial, with only a small minority expressing reservations.

Q2. To what extent do communicative tasks reduce your anxiety about speaking in class ?

Table 2 : *Students' Perceptions of Communicative Tasks in Reducing Classroom Speaking Anxiety.*

Response	Frequency	Percentage%
Always	3	9,4 %
Often	13	40,6 %
Sometimes	5	15,6 %
Rarely	8	25,0 %
Never	3	9,4 %

Overall, the distribution shows that (40.6%) of students often engage in this activity, with another (9.4%) always doing so. Meanwhile, about (25%) rarely participate, and (9.4%) never do. The remaining (15.6%) sometimes take part, indicating a mixed level of engagement. In summary, the largest group falls in the "often" category, suggesting that many students have regular, but not constant, exposure to this activity.

Q3. How often do you feel motivated to participate when the activity involves real-life scenarios?

Table 3 : *Frequency of Students' motivation to Participate in Real-Life Scenarios.*

	Frequency	Percentage %
Srongly Agree	10	31,3
Agree	8	25 %
Neutral	11	34,4 %
Disagree	2	6,3 %
Srongly Disagree	1	3,1 %

For the third table, we see a range of responses. Around (31.3%) of students say they are always motivated by these real-life activities, while another (25%) say they are often motivated. That means more than half of the students feel a consistent, positive boost in engagement when real-life elements are included.

Meanwhile, about (34.4%) of students are neutral, which suggests that for a significant portion of the class, real-life scenarios don't necessarily change their motivation level. A smaller group about (6.3%) say they are rarely motivated by real-life scenarios, and just (3.1%) feel they are never motivated by it.

In summary, the majority of students feel at least somewhat more engaged when real-world examples are involved, though there's a notable neutral group as well.

Q4. Do you believe that interacting with peers helps you learn new vocabulary more effectively than a lecture?

Table 4: *Students' Perceptions of Peer-Led Learning in Enhancing Vocabulary Retention.*

Response	Frequency	Percentage %
Strongly Agree	8	25 %
Agree	10	31,3 %
Neutral	9	28,5 %
Disagree	4	12,5 %
Stongly disagree	1	3,1 %

For Table 4, about (25%) of students strongly agree that interacting with peers helps them learn new vocabulary more effectively than a lecture. Another (31.3%) agree, meaning that a majority of students just over half believe that peer interaction is indeed more effective for learning vocabulary. About (28.1%) of the participants are neutral, suggesting they don't lean strongly either way. Meanwhile, (12.5%) disagree and (3.1%) strongly disagree, indicating that only a small minority feel that lectures are more effective. In summary, most students lean towards the idea that interacting with peers is a better way to pick up new vocabulary.

Section Two: Communicative Tasks & Accuracy

Q5. During a communicative activity, how much do you focus on using correct grammar?

Table 5: *Students' Degree of Attention to Correct Grammar in Oral Communicative Tasks.*

	Frequency	Percentage %
Very high Focus	7	21,9 %
High focus	12	37,5 %
Moderate focus	8	25 %
Low focus	5	15,6 %
No focus	2	6,3 %

For table 5 , we have a few key insights. Around (21.9%) of students report that they have a very high focus on grammar. Another (37.5%) say they have a high focus. This means that nearly (60%) of students pay close attention to using correct grammar in communicative activities. Meanwhile, (25%) maintain a moderate focus, suggesting that grammar is moderately important to them but not their top priority. In contrast, (15.6%) have low focus, and (6.3%) have no focus at all on grammar, indicating a small group that prioritizes other aspects of communication.

In summary, the majority of students do place considerable emphasis on correct grammar during communicative tasks, though there's a range of focus levels across the group.

Q6. Do you find it difficult to remember grammar rules when you are trying to communicate an idea quickly?

Table 6: *The Impact of Time pressure on Students' Ability to Apply Grammatical Rules.*

	Frequency	Percentage %
Always	0	0,0
Often	9	28,1
Sometimes	18	56,3
Rarely	3	9,4
Never	2	6,3

For table 6 about whether students find it difficult to remember grammar rules when communicating quickly more than half of the students (56.3%) say they sometimes have this challenge. Another (28.1%) say they often encounter it, while (9.4%) rarely find it difficult and (6.3%) never have trouble.

In summary, most students experience at least occasional difficulty recalling grammar rules quickly, with a smaller group rarely or never facing that issue.

Q7. Do you feel that your grammar improves when a teacher provides feedback after a speaking task?

Table 7: *Students' Perceptions of Delayed Teacher Feedback in Improving their Grammar.*

	Frequency	Percentage
Strongly Agree	9	28,1 %
Agree	16	50 %
Neutral	2	6,3 %
Disagree	5	15,6 %
Strongly disagree	0	0%

We see that exactly half of the students (50%) agree that their grammar improves when a teacher provides feedback after a speaking task. Another (28.1%) strongly agree, which means a significant majority around (78%) feel positively about the impact of teacher feedback.

A small percentage (6.3%) remain neutral, while (15.6%) disagree to some extent. No students strongly disagree, indicating that most students find teacher feedback helpful or at least not detrimental.

In summary, the overall trend suggests that the majority of students appreciate and benefit from grammar feedback given after speaking tasks.

Q8. Does working in pairs allow you to notice and correct your own grammatical mistakes?

Table 8: *Influence of Collaborative Pair Work on Grammatical Error Noticing & Correction.*

	Frequency	Percentage %
Always	11	34,4 %
Often	8	25 %
Sometimes	9	28,1 %
Rarely	1	3,1 %
Never	3	9,4 %

For table 8, about whether working in pairs helps students notice and correct their grammatical mistakes, (34.4%) of students say it "always" helps them. Another (25%) say it "often" helps, and (28.1%) feel it "sometimes" helps. A small percentage, about (3.1%), report that working in pairs "rarely" helps, and (9.4%) say it "never" helps them notice and correct mistakes. In summary, a majority of students find value in pair work for improving their grammar, with only a small group finding it rarely or never useful.

Section Three: Communicative Tasks & Fluency

Q9. Do communicative activities help you speak English more smoothly without long pauses.

Table 9: *Students' Perceptions of Communicative Activities in Developing Smooth Spontaneous Speech.*

Response	Frequency	Percentage %
Strongly Agree	9	28,1 %
Agree	17	53,1 %
Neutral	5	15,6 %
Disagree	1	3,1 %
Strongly disagree	0	0 %

For table 9 about whether communicative activities help students speak English more smoothly over half of the students (53.1%) agree, and another (28.1%) strongly agree. This means that in total, about (81%) of students feel that these activities help them reduce long pauses and speak more fluently. About (15.6%) are neutral, while only one student (3.1%) disagrees and none strongly disagree.

In summary, the overall trend shows that communicative activities are viewed quite positively by most students in terms of improving their speaking fluency.

Q10. How often do you find yourself focusing on the message rather than the individual words during a task?

Table 10: *Frequency of Students' Focus on Meaning over Individual Linguistic Components.*

Response	Frequency	Percentage %
Always	10	33,3 %
Often	6	20%
Sometimes	10	33,3 %
Rarely	4	13,3 %
Never	2	6,7 %

When looking at how often students focus on the overall message rather than individual words, we see that about a third of the students (33.3%) say they "always" do this, and another (20%) say "often." Another third (33.3%) say this happens "sometimes," which means that the majority of students are at least somewhat inclined to focus on the message. Lastly, a small group (13.3%) said they "rarely" do this, and only (6.7%) say "never."

All in all, a significant portion of students are frequently more focused on the broader message than on individual words, which aligns well with a communicative approach to language learning.

Q11. Do you think that your speaking has increased due to regular classroom interaction?

Table 11: *Impact of Frequent Classroom Interaction on the Development of Speaking Skill.*

Response	Frequency	Percentage %
Strongly Agree	5	15,6 %
Agree	14	43,8 %
Neutral	11	34,4 %
Disagree	2	6,3 %
Strongly disagree	0	0 %

For Table 11 asking whether students feel that their speaking speed has improved due to regular classroom interaction nearly (60%) of the students with (15.6%) "strongly agreeing" and (43.8%) "agreeing" believe that classroom interaction has indeed helped them speak faster. About a third (34.4%) are neutral, while a small minority (6.3%) disagree and none strongly disagree. Overall, this suggests that most students perceive positive effects from regular interaction on their speaking fluency.

Q12. Does practicing information gap activities help you find words more quickly.

Table 12: *The Role of Information-Gap Activities in Enhancing Students' Lexical Retrieval speed.*

	Frequency	Percentage%
Strongly Agree	4	12,5 %
Agree	17	53,1 %
Neutral	7	21,9 %
Disagree	3	9,4 %
Strongly Disagree	1	3,1 %

The results of this table show a solid majority of students around (65.6%) in total (with 12.5% strongly agreeing and 53.1% agreeing) feel that information gap activities do help them find words more quickly. About (21.9%) remain neutral on the question, and (12.5%) either disagree or strongly disagree.

In short, most students do see a benefit in these activities when it comes to finding words more easily.

Section Four: Perceptions of Communicative Activities

Q13. Overall, how effective do you think communicative activities are for improving oral proficiency?

Table 13: *Evaluation of the Role of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) in Enhancing Oral Production.*

	Frequency	Percentage %
Highly Effective	12	37,5 %
Effective	17	53,1 %
Moderately Effective	3	9,3 %
Slightly Effective	0	0 %
Ineffective	0	0 %

For this table, the responses show overwhelmingly positive perceptions. A majority of students rated communicative activities as Effective as for improving oral proficiency (53,1%), while a substantial portion considered them Highly Effective (37.5%). Together, this means that (90,6%) of students view communicative activities as either effective or highly effective, which is a very strong endorsement.

Only a small minority, (10.3%), felt they were only Moderately Effective, and importantly, 0% rated them as slightly effective or ineffective. This absence of negative responses highlights that communicative activities are universally recognized as beneficial, with most students believing they significantly contribute to oral proficiency.

Q14. Do you prefer communicative tasks over traditional grammar-translation exercises?

Table 14: *Students' Preferences for Communicative Tasks vs. Traditional-Translation Exercises.*

	Frequency	Percentage %
Strongly Prefer	13	40,6 %
Prefer	14	43,8 %
No prefrence	4	12,5 %
Dislike	1	3,1 %
Strongly Dislike	0	0 %

Looking at the percentages in this table, the results show a very strong preference among students for communicative tasks over traditional grammar translation exercises. About (40.6%) strongly prefer them, and another (43.8%) prefer them, meaning that together, over (84%) of students lean positively toward communicative tasks. A smaller group, (12.5%), expressed neutrality with no preference, while only (3.1%) disliked communicative tasks, and none strongly disliked them.

This distribution highlights that communicative tasks are overwhelmingly favored, with the vast majority of students perceiving them as more engaging or beneficial than grammar translation. The small percentages for neutrality and dislike suggest that resistance to communicative approaches is minimal, reinforcing the idea that such tasks are widely accepted and valued in improving oral proficiency.

Q15. In your opinion, what is the most significant benefit of participating in oral communicative tasks?

Table 15: *Students' Perceptions of the Primary Benefits of Participating in Oral Communicative Tasks .*

	Frequency	Percentage %
Better fluency	14	43,8 %
Better accuracy	4	12,5 %
Increased Confidence	9	28,1 %
More Vocabulary	2	6,3 %
Real-world preparation	3	9,4 %

As illustrated in table 15, Better fluency (43.8%) stands out as the most significant benefit, indicating that nearly half of the students believe oral communicative tasks primarily help them speak more smoothly and naturally.

- Increased confidence (28.1%) is the second most common choice, showing that over a quarter of students value the psychological and affective gains of speaking practice.
- Better accuracy (12.5%) is less frequently chosen, suggesting that while accuracy matters, students see fluency and confidence as more immediate outcomes of communicative practice.
- Real-world preparation (9.4%) and more vocabulary (6.3%) were selected by smaller groups, but they highlight that some learners appreciate practical readiness and lexical growth as key advantages.

Overall, the percentages suggest that students mainly connect oral communicative tasks with gains in fluency and confidence. At the same time, they also acknowledge other advantages, such as improved accuracy, richer vocabulary, and preparation for real-world situations. This pattern highlights the broad importance of communicative tasks: they are not limited to correcting language forms but also play a role in helping learners develop the skill and self-assurance needed to use language effectively in authentic interactions.

Analysis of Teachers' Questionnaire

This questionnaire is submitted to 13 EFL teachers at Chadli Bendjdid Taref University.

Section one: Impact of Communicative Activities

Q1. How frequently do you implement communicative activities in your syllabus?

Table 16: *Frequency of Integrating Communicative Activities Within the Teachers' Syllabus.*

	Frequency	Percentage %
Every lesson	11	84,6 %
Frequently	2	15,4 %
Occasionally	0	0 %
Rarely	0	0 %
Never	0	0 %

The data presented in this table indicate that the majority of teachers about (85%) integrate communicative activities into every lesson, indicating a very strong commitment to incorporating these methods consistently. A smaller portion around (15%) uses them frequently, but not in every single lesson. No teachers indicated that they only use them occasionally or rarely, which suggests a general consensus among your EFL teachers that

these activities are a core component of their teaching approach. This consistent implementation likely reflects a strong belief in the value of communicative methods.

Q2. In your observation, do these activities significantly increase students engagement levels?

Table 17: *Teachers' Observations Regarding the Impact of Communicative Activities on Students Engagement Levels.*

	Frequency	Percentage %
Extremely high Increase	7	53,8 %
Noticeable Increase	4	30,8 %
Moderate Increase	2	15,4 %
Minimal Increase	0	0 %
No observable Change	0	0 %

The results summarized in this table show that a little over half of the teachers around (54%) observed that communicative activities led to an extremely high increase in student engagement. Another (31%) saw a noticeable increase, and about (15%) noted a moderate increase. None of the teachers reported minimal or no change, suggesting a strong consensus that these activities positively impact engagement. This pattern highlights that communicative activities are widely seen as a valuable tool for boosting student involvement.

Q03. To what degree do communicative tasks foster a supportive learning environment among students?

Table 18: *The Influence of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) on Classroom Dynamics & Peer Support.*

	Frequency	Percentage %
Very high Degree	1	7,7 %
High degree	9	69,2 %
Moderate Degree	3	23,1 %
Low degree	0	0 %
Not at all	0	0 %

As can be seen in table 18, about (69%) of teachers believe that communicative tasks foster a high degree of supportive learning environment, and another (23%) say it's at least a moderate degree. Only a single teacher (around 8%) reported a very high degree, and no one indicated low or no impact. This suggests that nearly all teachers view communicative tasks as supportive to some extent, with the majority finding them highly beneficial.

Q04. How do you rate the effectiveness of pair work in promoting student-to-student negotiation of meaning?

Table 19: *Educators' Assessment of Pair Work as a Tool for Collaborative Meaning Negotiation.*

	Frequency	Percentage %
Excellent	0	0 %
Very good	8	61,5 %
Good	2	15,4 %
Fair	3	23,1 %
Poor	0	0 %

A closer look at table 19 that the majority around (61.5%) rated the effectiveness of pair work in promoting student-to-student negotiation of meaning as "very good," which is a positive indication. A smaller portion (15.4%) chose "good," and about (23.1%) rated it as "fair." No one rated it as "excellent" or "poor."

These percentages suggest that while pair work is largely seen as effective, it may not reach the highest level of effectiveness in the eyes of these teachers.

Section Two Grammatical Tasks & Accuracy

Q5. Do you notice a decline in grammatical accuracy when students are deeply engaged in a communicative task?

Table 20: *Correlation Between Students' Communicative Engagement & Grammatical Error Fluency.*

	Frequency	Percentage %
Always	1	7,7 %
Often	6	46,2 %
Sometimes	6	46,2 %
Rarely	0	0 %
Never	0	0 %

Table 20 clearly illustrate that the majority of teachers reported that this happens with some frequency. Specifically, (46.2%) said it occurs often and another (46.2%) said it occurs sometimes, showing that nearly all teachers perceive at least a moderate decline in accuracy during such tasks. Only one teacher (7.7%) stated that it happens always, suggesting that very few see accuracy consistently compromised. Importantly, none of the teachers selected rarely or never, both at (0%), which underscores that all respondents acknowledge some level of decline. Overall, the data indicates that teachers generally agree grammatical accuracy tends to decrease when students are highly engaged in communicative activities, though the intensity of this decline varies across classrooms.

Q06. How do you balance the need for accuracy with the requirement for communication during oral activities?

Table 21: *Teachers' Strategies for Balancing Grammatical Accuracy & Communicative Fluency During Oral Tasks.*

	Frequency	Percentage %
Focus more On accuracy	1	7,7 %
Equal Balance	4	30,8 %
Focus more On fluency	3	23,1 %
Varies by level	5	38,5 %

The responses reveal a diverse range of teacher perspectives. The largest proportion, (38.5%), indicated that the focus varies by level, suggesting that teachers adapt their emphasis on accuracy or fluency depending on learners' proficiency. A notable (30.8%) reported maintaining an equal balance between accuracy and fluency, reflecting a commitment to integrating both dimensions of communicative competence. Meanwhile, (23.1%) of teachers stated they focus more on fluency, highlighting the importance they place on spontaneous communication and speech flow. Only (7.7%) emphasized a stronger focus on accuracy, showing that few prioritize grammatical correctness above other aspects. Taken together, the data suggests that most teachers either balance accuracy and fluency or adjust their approach according to learner level, while fewer adopt a singular focus on one dimension.

Q07. In your experience, do students eventually internalize grammar rules through communicative use?

Table 22: *Educators' Observations on the Effectiveness of CLT in Promoting Subconscious Grammar Acquisition.*

Response	Frequency	Percentage %
Strongly Internalize	0	0 %
Mostly Internalize	3	23.1%
Partially Internalize	10	76.9%
Rarely Internalize	0	0 %
Not at all	0	0 %

The data shows that the majority of teachers, (76.9%), reported that students only partially internalize grammar rules, suggesting that while learning is taking place, it is not yet fully consolidated. A smaller group, (23.1%), indicated that students mostly internalize , reflecting stronger but still incomplete mastery. Interestingly, none of the teachers selected strongly internalize, rarely internalize, or not at all, each standing at 0%. This absence highlights that teachers do not perceive students as either fully mastering or completely failing to internalize grammar rules. Overall, the findings point to a middle ground: students are engaging with and internalizing grammar rules to some extent, but full mastery remains limited.

Table 08. Which type of *communicative* activity yields the highest level of accuracy in your experience?

Table 23: *Ranking Communicative Activities Based on Observed Grammatical Accuracy Outcomes.*

Response	Frequency	Percentage %
Role-plays	1	7.7%
Debates	8	61.5%
Problem-solving	0	0 %
Presentations	4	30.8%

Among the available response options, debates emerged as the clear favorite, with (61.5%) of the teachers choosing them. Presentations followed at (30.8%), indicating a moderate level of preference. In contrast, role-plays were selected by only (7.7%) of teachers, and problem-solving tasks were not chosen at all. This suggests that teachers in this sample predominantly favor debates, see some value in presentations, and have minimal to no preference for role-plays or problem-solving activities.

Section Three: Communicative Tasks & Fluency

Q09. Have you observed a measurable increase in students' speech rate after a semestre of CLT-based instruction?

Table 24: *Impact of Continuous CLT Implementation on Learners' Average Speech Rate.*

Response	Teachers number	Percentage %
Significant Increase	2	15.4%
Moderate Increase	9	69.2%
Slight Increase	2	15.4%
No change	0	0 %
Decrease	0	0 %

The data presented in this table indicate that the majority of teachers (about 69%) observed a moderate increase in students' speech rate after a semester of CLT-based instruction. About (15%) saw a significant increase, indicating that some students improved their fluency substantially. Another (15%) noted only a slight increase. Importantly, no teachers reported seeing no change or a decrease, suggesting that all observed at least some level of improvement in students' speech rate.

This indicates that CLT-based instruction generally has a positive influence on fluency, with the majority of teachers noticing measurable gains.

Q10. To what extent do communicative activities help students overcome the mental translation barrier?

Table 25: *Educators' Assessment of CLT in Promoting Direct Thinking & Spontaneous Expression in English.*

	Frequency	Percentage %
Very great Extent	0	0 %
Great extent	10	76.9%
Moderate Extent	2	15.4%
Small Extent	1	7.7%
Not at all	0	0 %

As seen in this table the vast majority nearly (77%) of teachers believe that communicative activities help students overcome the mental translation barrier to a great extent. Another (15%) find that it helps to a moderate extent, and a small proportion (about 8%) see only a slight benefit. No teachers felt that communicative activities had no effect at all.

Overall, it's clear that teachers generally see a strong positive impact, with most of them leaning toward the view that these activities are quite effective in reducing the need for mental translation.

Q11. How do you assess a student's fluency during a high-stakes communicative task?

Table 26: *Teachers Methods & Criteria For Assessing Oral Fluency During High-Stakes Communicative Tasks.*

	Frequency	Percentage %
Continuity of Speech	0	0 %
Processing Speed	0	0 %
Self-correction frequency	2	15,4 %
Strategic competence	2	15,4 %
All of the Above	9	69,2 %

As illustrated in this table, The majority of teachers about (69%) assess fluency using all of these criteria combined. Meanwhile, a small group (15% each) focuses specifically on self-correction frequency or strategic competence. None of the teachers rely solely on continuity of speech, processing speed, or total speed alone.

Q12. Do you believe that prioritizing fluency in these activities leads to better overall oral proficiency.

Table 27: *Impact of Fluency-Focused Communicative Activities on General Oral Proficiency.*

	Frequency	Percentage %
Probably	4	30.8%
Equally	8	61.5%
Probably not	1	7.7%
Definitely not	0	0 %

As can be seen in table 27, a significant majority of teachers (around 62%) believe that focusing on fluency is equally important for overall proficiency. About (31%) think it “probably” leads to better proficiency, while a small number roughly (8%) are a bit more skeptical. No one strongly dismissed the idea. Overall, we have a balanced but largely positive view.

Section Four: Perceptions of Communicative Activities

Q13. How would you describe your students' general attitude toward communicative-based lessons?

Table 28: *Teachers' Descriptions of Students' General Attitudes Toward Communicative-Based Instruction.*

Response	Frequency	Percentage %
Very positive	7	53.8%
Positive	5	38.5%
Neutral	1	7,7 %
Negative	0	0 %
Very negative	0	0 %

In this table, we see that the majority of teachers have observed that students generally respond positively to communicative lessons. Specifically, over half of them (about 54%) described students' attitudes as "very positive," while about (39%) said they were "positive." Only one teacher noted a neutral attitude, and none reported negative responses. In short, the overall outlook is that students tend to have a positive view of communicative-based lessons.

Q14. What do you perceive as the biggest challenge in using communicative activities?

Table 29: *Identifying the Primary Challenge in Implementing Communicative Activities*

Response	Frequency	Percentage %
Classroom Management	1	7,7 %
Time Constraints	10	76.9%
Students' low Level	2	15.4%
Grading difficulty	0	0 %
Lack of Resources	0	0 %

By far the most common challenge, cited by roughly (77%) of the teachers, was time constraints. About (15%) of the respondents noted that students' low levels of proficiency posed a significant hurdle. Meanwhile, around (8%) mentioned classroom management as their primary concern.

Q15. Based on your professional judgment, do communicative activities provide a better balance between accuracy and fluency than traditional methods?

Table 30: *Balancing Accuracy & Fluency in Communicative Activities vs. Traditional Methods*

Response	Frequency	Percentage %
Definitely	7	53.8%
Probably	6	46.2%
Not sure	0	0 %
Probably not	0	0 %
Definitely not	0	0 %

The responses show a strong level of confidence among the teachers in the value of communicative activities. The big majority (53,8 %) definitely believe that these methods offer a better balance between accuracy and fluency. The remaining teachers are also positive, leaning toward "probably." Finally, no one expressed doubts or neutrality. This consensus suggests that the teachers feel quite strongly that communicative methods do a better job of balancing the two language skills.

Conclusion

The present chapter presented the analysis of the questionnaires administered to learners and teachers. It focused on structuring the responses into tables, calculating percentages, and interpreting the overall trends. In doing so, the chapter highlighted how participants perceived communicative activities and how teachers evaluated their use. In essence, it was devoted to reporting and analyzing the survey data, offering a clear account of the findings without extending into broader discussion or implications.

Chapter Five:

Discussion of the

Findings

Introduction

In this chapter, the results are examined to show how they address the main research questions and test the hypotheses. Attention is given to how students and teachers perceive the impact of communicative language teaching (CLT) on speaking skills. The discussion connects statistical findings to broader implications, highlighting how confidence, fluency, accuracy, and overall impressions intersect. The aim is to provide a clear and accessible understanding of how CLT shapes language learning from both student and teacher perspectives.

Discussion of both Students' & Teachers' Questionnaires

The findings from both the student and teacher questionnaires show strong support for using communicative activities in EFL classrooms. Students emphasized that these tasks improve their confidence, fluency, and motivation, while teachers highlighted their role in creating engaging and supportive learning environments. Although a small number of students expressed neutral or mixed views especially about recalling grammar rules or staying motivated in real-life situations the overall results suggest that communicative approaches are widely seen as effective for oral proficiency. Teachers reinforced this view, noting that such tasks help learners overcome barriers like anxiety and mental translation.

This research findings revealed that communicative activities strongly enhance confidence and fluency, with three-quarters of students reporting increased confidence after group discussions and vast majority noting smoother speech without long pauses. Teachers confirmed these perceptions, observing measurable increases in speech rate and reduced reliance on mental translation. These findings resonate with Wang, Rezaei, and Izadpanah

(2024), who demonstrated that emotional intelligence and creative thinking significantly improve fluency and accuracy, enabling learners to speak more confidently and spontaneously. Rausch (2012) also emphasized fluency as a cornerstone of communicative competence, noting that repetition tasks and interactive practice help learners balance fluency with accuracy.

In summary, research results and these studies highlight that communicative tasks not only reduce anxiety but also foster psychological readiness, confirming the first Hypothesis” Learners will report positive attitudes toward communicative activities, highlighting their role in boosting confidence, reducing anxiety, and supporting oral proficiency”, and underscoring the centrality of fluency in oral proficiency development.

The findings on accuracy were more complex. While a clear majority of students reported focusing on grammar during communicative tasks, more than half admitted difficulty recalling rules under time pressure. Teachers reinforced this view, noting that grammatical accuracy often declined when students were deeply engaged in communication. This tension between fluency and accuracy is well documented in SLA research. Pallotti (2015) and Skehan (1998) argued that learners have limited attentional capacity, so focusing on meaning often comes at the expense of form. Wang et al. (2024) added that academic enthusiasm and emotional intelligence can improve accuracy, but mastery remains partial without structured support. Research results align with these insights: students valued teacher feedback (78% agreed it improved grammar) and pair work for error noticing, while teachers identified debates and presentations as particularly supportive for accuracy. These findings confirm the second Hypothesis” communicative activities encourage a more even growth of both accuracy and fluency, helping to prevent one skill from overshadowing the other”, showing that communicative tasks promote fluency but require scaffolding to sustain accuracy, a balance that teachers actively negotiate in practice.

Students expressed overwhelming approval of communicative approaches, with all rating them effective or highly effective for oral proficiency and most preferring them over grammar-translation exercises. Teachers shared this enthusiasm, reporting consistent use of communicative activities in every lesson and observing high levels of engagement. These perceptions align with Iswandari and Ardi (2022), who found that communicative approaches foster intercultural communicative competence (ICC), collaboration, and readiness for authentic contexts. Rausch (2012) similarly argued that CAF should be integrated into sociolinguistic frameworks, reinforcing the idea that communicative tasks are central to oral proficiency. These findings therefore confirm Hypothesis 3: communicative activities are widely valued and preferred, not only for linguistic gains but also for their role in building supportive, collaborative learning environments.

By comparing these findings with previous studies, it becomes clear that this research supports a broader academic consensus. Communicative activities are highly effective for building confidence and fluency, though accuracy requires deliberate teacher intervention and structured activities. Both learners and teachers recognize their value, and the literature confirms that communicative approaches are central to developing oral proficiency in EFL contexts. This study contributes to this ongoing discussion by providing empirical evidence from Chadli Ben Jdid-Taref University, reinforcing the global relevance of communicative language teaching. Importantly, these results highlight the dual perspective of learners and teachers, showing convergence in their views while also pointing to challenges in balancing fluency and accuracy. This dual lens strengthens the argument that communicative activities are not only pedagogically effective but also widely accepted, making them a cornerstone of modern EFL instruction.

Pedagogical Recommendations

Provide Structured, Delayed Feedback After Activities: data shows that while clear majority of students try hard to use correct grammar, more than half struggle to remember the rules when they are trying to speak quickly. On the positive side, a solid majority of students explicitly state that their grammar improves when they receive teacher feedback after a speaking task, thereby suggesting that Teachers should avoid interrupting students during a communicative activity so that the natural flow of speech isn't broken. Instead, they should save their corrections for a dedicated feedback session immediately after the activity is finished. Using methods like writing anonymized student mistakes on the board allows teachers to address the decline in accuracy that almost teachers noticed, without hurting students' confidence.

Use Structured Activities Like Debates and Presentations for Accuracy: Teachers in this study clearly identified debates and presentation as the best activities for helping students speak accurately, while role-plays and problem-solving tasks were rarely seen as helpful for grammar. Accordingly, When the main goal of a lesson is to help students practice a specific grammar rule through speaking, teachers should choose structured debates or short presentations instead of open-ended role-plays. These formal tasks naturally encourage students to monitor their language and pay closer attention to their grammar.

Prepare Students with Vocabulary Before Group Work: Even though more than the half of students agree that talking with their peers helps them learn new words better than a traditional lecture, only a small minority felt that vocabulary growth was the biggest benefit of these activities. And To help students get more vocabulary out of peer interactions, teachers shouldn't just send them straight into group work. Instead, they should provide a brief vocabulary warm-up (giving them key words, phrases, or expressions related to the topic) before the speaking activity begins.

For Course Design and Administration

Include more information-gap tasks in the curriculum: A solid majority of students reported that practicing information gap activities directly helped them find words more quickly when speaking. Consequently, Department planners and course designers should deliberately build more information gap activities into the oral expression syllabus. Since the data proves these tasks help students retrieve words faster, making them a regular part of the course will directly boost fluency.

Adjust Class Schedules to Handle Time Constraints: three-quarters of the teachers surveyed stated that time constraints are the single biggest challenge they face when trying to use communicative activities. To address this issue, the university administration should consider extending the time allotted for oral expression classes or reducing the number of heavy structural topics teachers are forced to cover in one semester. Alternatively, teachers can adopt a flipped classroom approach assigning vocabulary reading as homework so that every single minute of class time can be saved for actual speaking practice.

Adapt the Balance of Fluency and Grammar to Student Levels: the findings show that a notable portion of teachers already change their focus between accuracy and fluency depending entirely on the proficiency level of their students; accordingly, it is recommended that the English department should establish a clear guideline for balancing these two skills. For example, lower-level classes should focus heavily on building fluency, lowering anxiety, and breaking the habit of translating mentally. As students progress to advanced levels, teachers can gradually shift the focus toward sharpening grammatical precision during high-stakes tasks.

Suggestions for Future Research

Long-Term Grammar Tracking : Since a solid majority of teachers noticed that students only partially internalize grammar rules through communicative tasks, future

researchers should follow a group of EFL students over an entire academic year to see if complete internalization happens over a longer period.

Exploring Different Activity Types : Future studies should use direct classroom observations to explore why structured tasks like debates yield higher grammatical accuracy among learners compared to role-plays within this specific environment.

Understanding the Neutral Students : A notable 34.4% of students felt completely neutral about their motivation during real-life scenarios. Future researchers should use qualitative tools, like face-to-face interviews, to find out why this specific group of students doesn't feel extra motivated by real-world topics.

Conclusion

This chapter examined the findings from student and teacher questionnaires, connecting them to the research questions and hypotheses. The analysis demonstrated that communicative activities are strongly perceived as effective in building confidence, fluency, and engagement, while also presenting challenges for grammatical accuracy. Both learners and teachers expressed positive views of communicative language teaching, confirming its value as a central approach in EFL classrooms. At the same time, the discussion emphasized the importance of balancing fluency-building with targeted grammar support, highlighting the role of teacher feedback and structured activities. Recommendations were provided to strengthen this balance, ensuring that communicative tasks continue to foster oral proficiency while supporting accuracy.

General Conclusion

This thesis, entitled *The Role of Communicative Activities in Enhancing EFL Learners' Grammatical Accuracy and Fluency in Oral Production*, set out to examine how communicative language teaching (CLT) contributes to oral proficiency in EFL contexts. The study was guided by three hypotheses: that communicative activities improve confidence and fluency, that they present challenges for grammatical accuracy, and that they are positively perceived by both learners and teachers. These hypotheses were explored through three research questions focusing on confidence and fluency, accuracy, and overall perceptions.

To achieve these aims, a quantitative methodology was adopted. Two questionnaires were designed and administered: one to 32 EFL students at Chadli Bendjedid University, and another to a group of teachers. The student questionnaire was divided into four sections, covering the impact of communicative activities, their relationship with accuracy, their role in fluency, and learners' overall perceptions. The teacher questionnaire examined similar themes from the instructional perspective, including frequency of implementation, observed effects on engagement, accuracy, fluency, and preferred classroom practices. Data were analyzed using descriptive statistics, with counts and percentages providing insight into patterns of agreement, neutrality, and disagreement.

The findings confirmed all three hypotheses. With respect to confidence and fluency, the majority of students reported feeling more confident after group discussions, smoother speech with fewer pauses, and faster speaking speed through regular classroom interaction. Teachers reinforced these observations, noting measurable increases in speech rate and reduced reliance on mental translation after a semester of CLT-based instruction. These results strongly supported Hypothesis 1 and provided a clear answer to Research Question 1.

Accuracy presented a more complex picture. While nearly 60% of students reported a high or very high focus on grammar during communicative tasks, many admitted difficulty recalling rules under time pressure. Teacher feedback and pair work were widely valued for noticing and correcting mistakes, with 78% of students affirming the usefulness of feedback. Teachers confirmed these mixed patterns, observing declines in accuracy when students were deeply engaged in communication and reporting that grammar was only partially internalized through communicative use. Debates and presentations were identified as the most supportive activities for accuracy, while role-plays and problem-solving tasks were less effective. These findings confirmed Hypothesis 2 and answered Research Question 2, showing that communicative tasks foster fluency but pose challenges for accuracy.

Perceptions of communicative activities were overwhelmingly positive. All students rated them as effective or highly effective for oral proficiency, and more than 84% preferred them over traditional grammar-translation exercises. Fluency and confidence were consistently identified as the most significant benefits, while accuracy, vocabulary, and real-world preparation were seen as secondary gains. Teachers shared similarly positive views, reporting that they implement communicative activities in every lesson, observe high levels of engagement, and emphasize their role in fostering supportive and collaborative learning environments. These results strongly supported Hypothesis 3 and provided a clear answer to Research Question 3.

Taken together, the study demonstrated a strong convergence between learner experiences and teacher observations. Both groups recognized communicative activities as central to oral proficiency, particularly in building confidence and fluency, while acknowledging the need for balanced strategies to sustain accuracy. The analyses highlighted the importance of structured teacher feedback, pair work, and carefully selected activities such as debates and presentations to integrate fluency-building with grammar support.

In addition to addressing the research questions and confirming the hypotheses, the discussion proposed several practical recommendations: the consistent integration of communicative tasks into lessons, structured teacher feedback to reinforce grammar, the design of activities that balance fluency with accuracy, and the encouragement of pair work and collaborative learning to reduce anxiety while promoting negotiation of meaning.

Overall, this thesis contributes to the understanding of communicative language teaching in EFL contexts by providing empirical evidence from both learners and teachers. It validates the effectiveness of communicative activities in enhancing confidence and fluency, acknowledges their limitations in accuracy, and offers recommendations for more balanced classroom practice. The study reinforces the value of communicative language teaching as a central approach in EFL classrooms and provides guidance for educators seeking to maximize its benefits while addressing its challenges.

References

- Abdullaev, Z. (2021). *Speaking and speaking proficiency*. Zenodo.
<https://doi.org/10.5281/ZENODO.5759350>
- Al-Sibai, D. (2004). *Promoting oral fluency of second language learners through classroom oral presentations*. King Saud University. Retrieved from
<https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED510276>
- Al-Sibai, D. (2004). *Promoting oral fluency of second language learners through classroom oral presentations and group discussions*. King Saud University. Retrieved from
<https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED510276.pdf>
- Al-wossabi, S. A. (2014). Spoken grammar: An urgent necessity in the EFL context. *English Language Teaching*, 7(6), 19–25. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v7n6p19>
- Alasmari, A., & Ahmed, S. (2013). Using debates in EFL classes. *English Language Teaching*, 6(1), 147–152. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v6n1p147>
- Ali, M., Joshi, P., & Hareesh, S. (2018). Developing ESL/EFL learners' grammatical competence through communicative activities. *Journal of English Language Teaching*, 6(1), 45–53.
- Alwi, N. A. N. (2017). Oral presentation as a communicative activity in ESL classrooms. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 7(2), 222–230.
- Anonymous. (2019). An experimental study on grammatical sensitivity and production competence. *Open-access educational research archive*.
- Askari, H., & Langroudi, J. (2014). The effectiveness of Ur's model in developing Iranian EFL learners' fluency and accuracy in speaking. *English Language Teaching*, 7(7), 1–10.

- Asmae, A., & Sana, S. (2024). The importance of listening and speaking in a successful English language acquisition in classrooms: Moroccan EFL classrooms as a case study. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*.
- Astorga Cabezas, E. D., & Bahamondes Beltran, P. (2021). Grammmaring, its effects on oral performance among EFL beginner-level learners in higher education. *English Language Teaching*, 14(10), 130–141. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v14n10p130>
- Aynekulu, T., & Ferede, T. (2021). The effect of instructional scaffolding on EFL students' grammar competence and oral proficiency: The case of Jimma Teachers College of Education, Ethiopia. *Research Square*. <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-8938873/v1>
- Belfar, A. Y., & Kaddour, A. (2023). *The role of oral presentation in improving the speaking proficiency of students in EFL classes* (Master's dissertation, University Centre of Naama).
- Bobodzhanova, L. K., & Mamleeva, A. F. (2022). Grammatical competence as a key instrument of oral discourse development. *Lecture Notes in Networks and Systems*, 499, 74–83.
- Canale, M., & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics*, 1(1), 1–47. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/I.1.1>
- Celce-Murcia, M. (2007). Rethinking the role of communicative competence in language teaching. In *Intercultural Language Use and Language Learning* (pp. 41–57). Springer.
- Christiansen, T. (2011). Fluency and pronunciation in the assessment of grammatical accuracy in spoken production: An empirical study. *Lingue e Linguaggi*, 6, 7–23. <https://doi.org/10.1285/I2239-0359V6P7>

- Consolo, D. A. (2006). On a (re)definition of oral language proficiency for EFL teachers: Perspectives and contributions from current research. *UNESP – Universidade Estadual Paulista*.
- Constantine, R. R., Getty, D. J., & Fraundorf, S. H. (2022). The role of priming in grammatical acceptability judgements for native versus non-native speakers: Effects of intelligibility. *PLOS ONE*, 17(9), e0275191. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0275191>
- Darby, M. (2020). Debate as a teaching strategy in language learning. *International Journal of English Language Studies*, 2(3), 45–52.
- rkulova, F. (2021). Developing grammatical competence in EFL teaching. *Uzbekistan Journal of Social Sciences and Education*.
- Febriyanti, R. I., Izdiyar, F. N., & Hairulla, M. A. S. (2024). EFL students' perspectives on learning grammar through English conversation. *Applied Research on English Education*, 2(2).
- Galloway, A. (1993). Communicative Language Teaching: An introduction and sample activities. *Center for Applied Linguistics*. Retrieved from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED367142>
- Gashan, A. K., & Almohaisen, F. M. (2014). The effect of task repetition on fluency and accuracy of EFL Saudi female learners' oral performance. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, 5(3), 36–41. <http://dx.doi.org/10.7575/aiac.all.v.5n.3p.36>
- González Reséndez, M. L. (2024). A comparative study of discussions, debates, and oral presentations in enhancing EFL learners' oral proficiency. *Open Journal for Educational Research*, 8(1), 27–36. <https://doi.org/10.32591/coas.ojer.0801.03027g>

- Hasnain, S., & Halder, S. (2024). The effect of task-based language teaching on the speaking fluency and accuracy of adult ESL learners. *SN Social Sciences*, 4(174). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s43545-024-00345-9>
- Hymes, D. (1972). On communicative competence. In J. B. Pride & J. Holmes (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics* (pp. 269–293).
- Iswandari, Y. A., & Ardi, P. (2022). *Intercultural communicative competence in EFL settings: A systematic review*. English Language Education Study Program, Sanata Dharma University.
- Journal of Second Language Writing. (2025). The role of communicative purpose in describing and interpreting lexico-grammatical variation in L2 writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 67, 101176. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2025.101176>
- Kaddour, K. I. (2016). *Enhancing EFL learners' speaking skill through effective communicative activities and strategies: The case of first-year EFL students* (Master's dissertation, Département des Langues étrangères).
- Kaur, S. (2015). The use of debate as a communicative activity in ESL classrooms. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, 6(2), 97–101. <https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.all.v.6n.2p.97>
- Kaur, S. (2015). The use of group discussions as a communicative activity in ESL classrooms. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, 6(2), 97–101. <https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.all.v.6n.2p.97>
- Khamouja, A., Benmhamed, M., & El Ghouati, A. (2023). The importance of role-playing activities in developing students' speaking competence. *International Journal of Innovation and Scientific Research*, 66(1), 225–230.

- Kouti, M. (2023). A discourse perspective to teaching the speaking skill in an EFL classroom. *ELWAHAT Journal for Research and Studies*, 16(2), 274–282.
- Lalaibia, S. (2023). *Investigating the effectiveness of the communicative language teaching approach in enhancing EFL learners' oral proficiency* (Master's dissertation, Mohamed Khider University of Biskra).
- Learn English. (2024). The power of communicative activities in language learning: Definition and examples. Retrieved from <https://learnenglish.com/communicative-activities>
- Li, C., & Sui, M. (2025). The relationship between complexity, accuracy and fluency in L2 English speech: Individual differences and dynamic patterns. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, 15(3), 501–532. <https://doi.org/10.14746/sslt.28006>
- Lintunen, P., Mutta, M., & Peltonen, T. (2020). Fluency revisited. *ELT Journal*, 74(4), 387–396. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccaa034>
- Mamaziyoyeva, O. O. (2025). Methodology for developing grammatical competence of higher-grade students based on a communicative approach. *Emergent: Journal of Educational Discoveries and Lifelong Learning*, 7(2), 1–6.
- Maxmudova, D. A. (2025). Comparison of traditional and communicative language teaching methods. *Zenodo*. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.15824579>
- McCutchen, D., & Stull, S. (2014). Morphological awareness and children's writing: Accuracy, error, and invention. *Reading and Writing*, 28(2), 271–289. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11145-014-9524-1>
- Milal, A. D., & Laily, J. N. (2019). Communicative activities in language teaching and learning process: A view of a teacher training session. *Advances in Social Science*,

- Education and Humanities Research*, 434, 189–193. <https://doi.org/10.2991/iconelt-19.2019.42>
- Mokhtara, K., & Zaabat, M. (2019). *The effect of classroom role play activity in enhancing students' speaking skill*. Kasdi Merbah University, Ouargla.
- Nazarie, M., & Beigzadeh, A. (2025). Strategies deployed by EFL learners to improve their speaking fluency: An overview. *International Journal of Language and Linguistics*, 13(1).
- Neumanová, Z. (2025). An investigation of complexity, accuracy, and fluency in the speech of EFL learners. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 11(1), 1–22. <https://doi.org/10.31261/TAPSLA.15946>
- Nguyen, T. T. (2019). The role of oral presentations in developing EFL learners' speaking skills. *Journal of Language and Education*, 5(3), 45–53.
- Normawati, A. (2023). How EFL learners perceive grammar in speaking and writing. *Journal of English Educational Study*, 6(1), 23–30.
- Ogawa, Y. (2025). EFL essay writing: Grammatical accuracy and productivity. *Journal of Response to Writing*, 11(1), Article 3. Retrieved from <https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/journalrw/vol11/iss1/3>
- Ong, C. G., & Villegas, E. (2020). Oral fluency: Basis for designing a communicative competence structured module. *University of Science and Technology of Southern Philippines*.
- Ouacheme, N. (2019). *Factors affecting oral fluency of EFL students* (Master's dissertation, Algeria).
- Pallotti, G. (2015). *Measuring complexity, accuracy, and fluency (CAF)*. Retrieved from gabwrite.

- Peltonen, P. (2024). Fluency revisited. *ELT Journal*, 78(4), 489–492. Oxford Academic.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccad047>
- Quines, Z. M. (2023). Grammatical competence and its impact on listening and speaking proficiency: An analysis. *European Journal of English Language and Literature Studies*, 11(2), 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.37745/ejells.2013/vol11n2112>
- Rausch, A. S. (2012). *Complexity, accuracy and fluency: Toward a conceptual model of communicative and sociolinguistic frameworks*. Bulletin of the Faculty of Education, Hirosaki University.
- Révész, A., Ekiert, M., & Torgersen, E. (2016). The effects of complexity, accuracy, and fluency on communicative adequacy in oral task performance. *Applied Linguistics*, 37(6), 828–848. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amu069>
- Rahnama, M. (2016). Developing EFL learner's speaking ability, accuracy and fluency. *English Language and Literature Studies*, 6(2), 177–186.
<https://doi.org/10.5539/ells.v6n2p177>
- Rao, P. S. (2019). The importance of group discussions in English language classrooms. *Research Journal of English*, 4(2), 65–71.
- Rausch, A. (2012). Complexity, accuracy and fluency: Toward a conceptual model of communicative and sociolinguistic frameworks. *Bulletin of the Faculty of Education, Hirosaki University*, 108, 19–30.
- Rezalou, A., & Yağiz, O. (2021). EFL students' perceptions and attitudes toward using communicative activities in CLT classroom. *Shanlax International Journal of Education*, 9(S2), 112–124. <https://doi.org/10.34293/education.v9iS2-Sep.4376>
- Rezalou, A., & Yağiz, O. (2023). The effects of communicative activities on EFL learners' speaking performances in CLT classroom. *International Journal of Languages' Education and Teaching*, 11(1), 1–19.

- Rezi, M., & Bedra, G. K. (2024). Language teaching and curricular practices: A comprehensive literature review. *Lingeduca: Journal of Language and Education Studies*, 3(2), 116–129. <https://doi.org/10.70177/lingeduca.v3i2.1353>
- Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (2001). *Approaches and methods in language teaching* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
- Rojas, M. (2023). Exploration d'un indice de fluidité en FLE: Applications didactiques. *Temporalités*, 21(2). <https://doi.org/10.4000/rdlc.12494>
- Saito, K., & Hanzawa, K. (2018). The role of input in second language oral ability development in foreign language classrooms: A longitudinal study. *Language Teaching Research*, 22(4), 398–417. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168816679030>
- Salam, M. Y., & Luksfinanto, Y. (2024). A comprehensive review of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) in modern classrooms. *Lingeduca: Journal of Language and Education Studies*, 3(1), 58–70.
- Shravani, K. (2024). Empowering language learning through dynamic role-play in ELT. *International Journal of Applied Research*, 10(1), 187–189.
- Skehan, P. (1998). *A cognitive approach to language learning*. Oxford University Press.
- Smit, E. (2019). Assessing oral proficiency in the EFL classroom: A qualitative study of teachers' understanding, experience, and assessment of oral production.
- Springer Authors. (2023). Examining the effectiveness of targeted morphological instruction. *Lecture Notes in Educational Linguistics*.
- Syarief, K. (2016). Communicative language teaching: Exploring theoretical foundations and practical challenges. *Jurnal Ilmu Pendidikan*, 12(3), 67–80. <https://doi.org/10.17977/JIP.V12I3.67>

- Tavakoli, P., Campbell, C., & McCormack, J. (2020). The multidimensionality of second language oral fluency: Interfacing measurement, pedagogy, and practice. *Cambridge University Press & Assessment*.
- Thi, N. K., & Nikolov, M. (2023). Effects of teacher, automated, and combined feedback on syntactic complexity in EFL students' writing. *Asian-Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education*, 8(6).
- Tian, W. (2025). A comprehensive literature review on communicative language teaching (CLT). *Frontiers in Sustainable Development*, 5(3).
<https://doi.org/10.54691/90101304>
- Tiu, J. S., Groenewald, E. S., Kilag, O. K. T., & Balicoco, R. D. (2023). Enhancing oral proficiency: Effective strategies for teaching speaking skills in communication classrooms.
- Ur, P. (1988). *Grammar practice activities: A practical guide for teachers*. Cambridge University Press.
- Wang, J., Abdullah, R., & Leong, L.-M. (2022). Studies of teaching and learning English-speaking skills: A review and bibliometric analysis. *Frontiers in Education*, 7, 880990. <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2022.880990>
- Wang, W., Rezaei, M., & Izadpanah, S. (2024). *Speaking accuracy and fluency among EFL learners: The role of creative thinking, emotional intelligence, and academic enthusiasm*. *Heliyon*, 10(18), e37620. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2024.e37620>
- Wondemagegne, E., Simegn, B., & Adugna, E. T. (2023). Exploring syntactic complexity and its relationship with writing quality in EFL argumentative essays.
- Wondemagegne, E., Simegn, B., & Adugna, E. T. (2023). Oral fluency, grammatical accuracy and their relationship to EFL student-teachers' speaking anxiety. *Ain Shams Scholar*.

- Wu, M., & Michel, M. (2024). Complexity, accuracy, and fluency (CAF) as a pedagogical target. In C. A. Chapelle & M. Sato (Eds.), *The Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics*. Wiley-Blackwell.
- Yu, Y. (2022). The role of psycholinguistics for language learning in teaching based on formulaic sequence use and oral fluency. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13, 1012225. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.1012225>
- Yudha, M. H. I., Lekatompessy, F. M., & Patty, J. (2023). The correlation between students' grammar proficiency and speaking fluency: A study in English education. *Pattimura Excellence Journal of Language and Culture*, 3(1), 32–44. <https://doi.org/10.30598/PEJLac.v3i1.pp32-44> .
- Zoyirova, N. B. (2025). The role of communicative methodology in language teaching. *Journal of Modern Educational Achievements*, 11(2), 2–9. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.1324567>

ملخص

يعد دور الأنشطة التواصلية في تعزيز الكفاءة الشفوية قضية مركزية في تعلم اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية؛ إذ يُعترف بهذه الأنشطة على نطاق واسع كأدوات بيداغوجية فعالة تؤثر في كل من الدقة النحوية والطلاقة اللغوية. وبناءً على ذلك، تهدف الدراسة الحالية إلى تقصي مدى مساهمة المهام التواصلية في تحسين الإنتاج الشفوي لدى المتعلمين، واستكشاف تصوراتهم حول هذه الأنشطة. ولتحقيق هذه الأهداف، تم اختيار مجموعتين من جامعة الشاذلي بن جديد الطارف تمثلتا في و 32 طالبا (نظام ل م د) 13 أستاذًا للغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية. اعتمدت الدراسة على المنهج المسحي الكمي، باستخدام استبيانات مغلقة لرصد وجهات نظر كل من المتعلمين والأساتذة. وبحث الدراسة في أثر المهام التفاعلية —مثل المناظرات، لعب الأدوار، والعروض الشفوية— على ثقة المتعلمين، طلاقتهم، ودقتهم النحوية. أظهرت النتائج أن الأنشطة التواصلية تعزز الثقة والطلاقة بشكل ملحوظ، حيث أشار معظم الطلبة إلى تحديثهم بلغة أكثر انسيابية وتراجع اعتمادهم على الترجمة الذهنية. ومع ذلك، تبين أن الحفاظ على الدقة النحوية يشكل تحديًا أكبر، نظراً لصعوبة استرجاع المتعلمين للقواعد تحت ضغط الوقت. وفي هذا الصدد، شدد الأساتذة على أهمية التقييم البنائي (الملاحظات التوجيهية) والمهام الرسمية لدعم الدقة النحوية، بينما سلط الطلبة الضوء على الفوائد التحفيزية للممارسة التفاعلية. وعموماً، تؤكد النتائج أن الأنشطة التواصلية ذات فعالية عالية في تطوير الكفاءة الشفوية، رغم أن الأمر يتطلب نهجاً متوازناً يدمج بين مكاسب الطلاقة والضبط النحوي.

الكلمات المفتاحية: الأنشطة التواصلية، الكفاءة الشفوية، الدقة النحوية، الطلاقة، تعلم اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية.

Appedices

Appendix A : Students Questionnaire

Section 1: Impact of Communicative Activities

1. Do you feel more confident speaking English after participating in group discussions?

☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

2. To what extent do communicative tasks reduce your anxiety about speaking in class?

☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Very Great Extent	Great Extent	Moderate Extent	Small Extent	Not at All

3. How often do you feel motivated to participate when the activity involves real-life scenarios?

☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Always	Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never

4. Do you believe that interacting with peers helps you learn new vocabulary more effectively than a lecture?

☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

Disagree

Disagree

Section 2: Communicative Tasks and Grammatical Accuracy

5. During a communicative activity, how much do you focus on using correct grammar?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

Very High Moderate Low No
High Focus Moderate Focus Low Focus No Focus
Focus

6. Do you find it difficult to remember grammar rules when you are trying to communicate an idea quickly?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

Always Often Sometimes Rarely Never

7. Do you feel that your grammar improves when a teacher provides feedback after a speaking task?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree
y Agree e y
Disagree
e

8. Does working in pairs allow you to notice and correct your own grammatical mistakes?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

Always Often Sometimes Rarely Never

Section 3: Communicative Tasks and Fluency

9. Do communicative activities help you speak English more smoothly without long pauses?

☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Strongl	Agree	Neutral	Disagre	Strongl
y Agree			e	y
				Disagre
				e

10. How often do you find yourself focusing on the message rather than the individual words during a task?

☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Always	Often	Sometim	Rarely	Never
		es		

11. Do you feel that your speaking speed has increased due to regular classroom interaction?

☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Strongl	Agree	Neutral	Disagre	Strongl
y Agree			e	y
				Disagre
				e

12. Does practicing "information gap" activities help you find words more quickly?

☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Strongl	Agree	Neutral	Disagre	Strongl
y Agree			e	y
				Disagre
				e

Section 4: Perceptions of Communicative Activities

13. Overall, how effective do you think communicative activities are for improving oral proficiency?

☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Highly	Effectiv	Moderate	Slightly	Ineffecti
Effectiv	e	ly	Effectiv	ve
e		Effective	e	

14. Do you prefer communicative tasks over traditional grammar-translation exercises?

☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Strongl	Prefer	No	Dislike	Strongl
y Prefer		Preferen		y
		ce		Dislike

15. In your opinion, what is the most significant benefit of participating in oral communicative tasks?

☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Better	Better	Increase	More	Real-
Fluenc	Accura	d	Vocabul	world
y	cy	Confide	ary	Preparati
		nce		on

Appendix B : Teachers' Questionnaire

Section 1: Impact of Communicative Activities (oral presentations, debates, role-plays)

1. How frequently do you implement communicative activities in your syllabus?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

Every Lesson Frequently Occasionally Rarely Never

2. In your observation, do these activities significantly increase student engagement levels?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ No

Extremely high Noticeable Moderate Minimal observable
increase increase increase increase change

3. To what degree do communicative tasks foster a supportive learning environment among students?

☐ Very ☐ High ☐ ☐ Low ☐ Not

High Degree Degree Moderate Degree at All
Degree

4. How do you rate the effectiveness of pair work in promoting student-to-student negotiation of meaning?

☐ ☐ Very ☐ ☐ Fair ☐ Poor

Excellent Good Good

Section 2: Communicative Tasks and Grammatical Accuracy

5. Do you notice a decline in grammatical accuracy when students are deeply engaged in a communicative task?

☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Always	Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never

6. How do you balance the need for accuracy with the requirement for communication during oral activities?

☐ Focus	☐ Equal	☐ Focus	☐ Varies by
more on Accuracy	Balance	more on Fluency	Level

7. In your experience, do students eventually "internalize" grammar rules through communicative use?

☐	☐	☐	☐	☐ Not
Strongly	Mostly	Partially	Rarely	at all
internalize	internalize	internalize	internalize	

8. Which type of communicative activity yields the highest level of accuracy in your experience?

☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Role-plays	Debates	Problem-	Presentations	Information
		solving		Gaps

Section 3: Communicative Tasks and Fluency

9. Have you observed a measurable increase in students' "speech rate" after a semester of CLT-based instruction?

☐	☐	☐	☐ No	☐
Significant	Moderate	Slight Increase	Change	Decrease
Increase	Increase			

10. To what extent do communicative activities help students overcome the "mental translation" barrier?

☐ Very	☐	☐	☐	☐ Not
Great Extent	Great Extent	Moderate	Small Extent	at All
Extent				

11. How do you assess a student's fluency during a high-stakes communicative task?

☐	☐	☐ Self-	☐	☐ All
Continuity of	Processing	correction	Strategic	of the Above
Speech	speed	frequency	competence	

12. Do you believe that prioritizing fluency in these activities leads to better overall oral proficiency?

☐	☐	☐	☐
Probably_	Equally_ it	Probably	Definitely
it builds the	only works	not_ it may	not_
necessary	if accuracy	lead to	accuracy
confidence	is also	fossilized	must come
	maintained	errors	first

Section 4: Perceptions of Communicative Activities

13. How would you describe your students' general attitude toward communicative-based lessons?

☐ Very	☐	☐	☐	☐ Very
Positive	Positive	Neutral	Negative	Negative

14. What do you perceive as the biggest challenge in using communicative activities?

☐	☐ Time	☐	☐	☐ Lack
Classroom	Constraints	Students' Low	Grading	of Resources
Management		Level	Difficulty	

15. Based on your professional judgment, do communicative activities provide a better balance between accuracy and fluency than traditional methods?

☐	☐	☐ Not	☐	☐
Definitely	Probably	Sure	Probably Not	Definitely Not