EFFECTS OF LANGUAGE USE THROUGH AN INTEGRATED SKILLS INTERVENTION ON ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS' SPEAKING SKILLS: A FOCUS ON VOCABULARY AND GRAMMAR

Dereje Gebisa Tulu, Hailu Gutema
Department of Foreign Language and Literature, Wollega University, Ethiopia
Department of Foreign Language and Literature, Addis Ababa University, Ethiopia
E-mail: derejegeb@wollegauniversity.edu.et

Abstract

This study examines the effects of language use through a thorough skills intervention on students' general level of speaking skills, focusing on vocabulary and grammar. A quasi-experimental investigation was conducted to fulfill the research objective. The total number of participants was selected by systematic random sampling and divided into control and experimental groups. During the 2022 academic year, 92 *Shambu* High School of 10th grade students participated in the study. Tests with oral questions were given before and after the intervention and the results were evaluated using SPSS. Independent samples t-test results showed that there was no significant difference between the pretest scores of the two groups on the oral presentation samples, either in general speaking ability or in the use of grammar and vocabulary. However, the general spoken language abilities of the two groups and their consumption of vocabulary and grammatical elements differed significantly in the post-test. According to the paired sample t-test, the experimental group improved their basic speaking skills more than the control group. Therefore, it can be argued that teaching English through an integrated skills intervention had a better impact on students' speaking abilities than a more conventional method of teaching speaking skills. The study found that integrated skill strategies should be used in EFL lecture sessions to help students develop their interpersonal skills.

Keywords: *grammar; integrated skills; language use; speaking; vocabulary*

1. Introduction

The integrated skills approach to education is built on the social constructivist hypothesis, which asserts that engaging in constructive criticism and conversation with others can improve teaching and learning (Vygotsky, 1978). An integrated skills approach to education is generally seen as a strategy for working together on basic skills in order to achieve desired outcomes and develop one's own knowledge and talents as well as the knowledge and talents of others (Sarantakos, 2012). In addition, it gives them the chance to practice their language

while supporting the development of their critical thinking, problem solving, communication and adaptation skills as well as their commitment to lifelong learning.

The integrated skill style of teaching has been used in language training since the 1970s, when communicative language teaching became popular. It is considered an extension of CLT because it encourages student involvement and is student-centered, just like CLT. An integrated skills approach to teaching language lessons was then used in the classrooms by instructors who used the four basic skills of speaking, reading, listening and writing (Widdowson, 1978).

Linguist, Oxford (2001), emphasizes the importance of integrated skills in foreign/second language teaching and learning. He explains that the way integrated skills are used in interaction acts both as an opportunity to use the target language and as a source of clear feedback (output). In other words, interaction creates a favorable environment by facilitating language acquisition and the growth of students' language skills. According to Richards and Rodgers (2001), an integrated skills intervention is essential to foreign/second language teaching.

2. Literature Review

Interpersonal competence is a key language ability that is important for both academic success and everyday social life. Students will not be successful in their studies, which will have an impact on their life outside of school, if they do not use adequate language skills when speaking and completing the various tasks on their projects. According to Seow (2002), interpersonal competence is necessary for students to succeed in school and in life. Consequently, interpersonal competence is an important component of the English for English curriculum (Zahida, 2007). As other researchers have stated, interpersonal competence is a difficult task that makes it impossible to create a clear and well-understood ideal organization. According to Raimes (1983), they are complex and difficult to learn because they require the development of current concepts, the use of diverse ideas, the transmission of appropriate and comprehensible messages, the use of appropriate fluency, the transfer of audience information, and the organization of information.

Being able to use language well, which can be taught through training or education, provides a number of educational benefits, such as promoting cooperative learning and providing students with a variety of learning methods (Byrne, 1988). Thus, students can also apply meaningful sentences or sentences and terminology that they have learned, understand the control of linguistics, opportunities to receive and interact through new words and sentence patterns (Raimes, 1983). It is very important to discuss these details with both English teachers and students to make speaking lessons fun and relevant.

Using an isolated skills approach to language use, according to Selinker (1986), students cannot think about different ideas in their work. This is because it prevents active learning, peer reward and help. Despite attempts to use an integrated approach to speaking skills in EFL lessons, teachers have not been able to properly implement the integrated foundations of learning skills such as independence, interaction and responsibility. As a result, students rely only on their own abilities to complete tasks (Selinker, 1986).

In the early 1978s, interest in this method of teaching was sparked by Widdowson's work, which argued that teaching students with integrated skills increased their learning compared to teaching students with isolated talents. Language specialists began to investigate

the effectiveness of an integrated approach to teaching in the context of oral communication after considering its positive effects in other subjects. Skehan (1996), a pioneer in this field, found that students produced greater oral communication skills when using their integrated skills than when they used their isolated talents.

Teachers have long provided students with integrated skills to perform specific tasks. Engaging students in integrated skills learning helps them achieve good knowledge outcomes, develop a sense of interest, improve general skills such as communication and project management, and reduce long periods of silence (Oxford, 2001). With effective management, an integrated approach to skills l

3. Research Method

3.1 Design

A quasi-experimental study was used to determine whether teaching speaking skills through an integrated skills intervention improves students' speaking skills or not. This type of experiment was done because it greatly reduced the unimportant elements. It allows, for example, the organization of language courses with intact teachers and a group of students who fulfill the same duties, as a result of which students are not randomly divided into controlled and experimental groups. The applicants for the experiment were 92 students of the 10th grade of the academic year 2022 at *Shambu* High School.

3.2 Data Collection Tool – Speaking Test

To achieve its goals, the study used quantitative data, mainly test results, pre- and post-oral speaking tests were made available. A certain circumstance arose and 45 minutes were set aside for discussion. The required language skills were as follows: As the researchers describe, the primary test of speaking skills is a continuum, from the least spontaneous and most monitored to the most spontaneous, unmonitored and demanding (Brown, 2010). These include (1) imitative speaking tests include assessment of perception and production. This is as-acceptable pronunciation and understanding. (2) Intensive speaking tests are concerned with testing the understanding of a narrow range of grammatical, semantic or phonological relations. This type of test includes: intelligible pronunciation, natural and correct intonation, minimal hesitation when speaking, correct L2 to TL translations of words, phrases or sentences, completion of a dialogue focusing on speech acts and grammar. (3) Responsive speaking tests assess conversations with limited comprehension where short and simple questions are required to be asked and answered. (4) Interactive speaking tests: speaking longer sentences and more complex than the sensitive speaking test, short conversations, role plays and discussions. (5) Extensive oral tests include oral presentations, presentations and translations of longer texts written in L2 into TL (English) are included here.

The required test scores in the pre-test and post-test speaking tests were well outside of 100%. Both the general and specific instructions given in the headings and subsections clearly explained what would be taken into account when evaluating their tests. A pre-intervention test was used as an aid and to ensure comparability of group scores. A post-test was used to determine if there were any changes after the intervention. Two 10th grade English language teachers who were instructed in the scoring criteria and whose ratings had confirmed interrater reliability reviewed and scored the tests (0.710).

3.3 Marking Scale

The evaluations were evaluated using an analytical scoring approach, as the aim of the study was to see not only overall speaking skills, but also the characteristics of speaking skills from vocabulary and grammar, which focus on the content, organization or structures, acceptability, meaning and address of the message. He was inspired by a test of English for educational purposes (Brown, 2010). Constructing labeling principles less arbitrary and specific, unifying and escaping, zero measures are part of adaptation. In other words, numbers are used instead of words such as some, low and often, and zero marks are given for grammar and vocabulary.

3.4 Training Material

There are different sections in the material. The first part presents the manual, the teaching promise form and the assigned phase of the training. The second part talks about supporting speaking skills with different skills. These allow participants to familiarize themselves with the strategy before using it. To support the speaking exercises in the textbook, speaking skills tasks, which mainly included oral presentations, were created and used during the experiment, for both control and experimental groups. The activities were mostly based on the Year 10 English textbook, as they allow students to practice speaking skills in depth. The focus of the exercises was oral presentations in the classroom. While the experimental group mastered the tasks using a strategy that encourages the use of spoken language with integrated abilities, the control group was taught with a traditional approach that encourages speaking independently, i.e. without the use of integrated skills.

3.5 Procedures

When the teaching materials for the pre-post testing and recording scales were first developed, counselors and peers reviewed them. Second, an ethical review was conducted once the subjects were selected. Third, when the pretest was administered, the Shapiro-Wilk test was used to determine whether the pre- and posttests were normally distributed (0.56, 0.092, 0.295, and 0.405 > 0.05). The posttest was then administered, scored, and its results compared with the results during the pretest.

4. Results and Discussion

4.1 Results

Independent samples t-tests were conducted for both overall speaking skills and their individual parts to test the previously stated hypotheses. A paired samples t-test was also calculated to determine how treatment affected speaking skills.

	Control			Experimental			D/f	t-value	p-value	Sign	
Test	N	X	S.D	N	X	S.D					
Pre	46	8.33	2.668	47	8.83	2.493	90	-1.597	.121	Not Sign	
Post	46	10.33	2.895	47	12.83	2.902	90	-0.619	.039	Sign	

Table 1. Independent T-Test of Oral Speaking Performance

Although there was a mean change of 0.50 between the groups in the pretest, the table shows that there is no statistical difference between them (p, 0.121 > 0.05) due to the t-test.

This shows that before mediation; the speaking skills of the groups were more or less comparable. The t-test results revealed a significant change between the control and experimental groups (p, 0.039, 0.05) and the post-test mean difference between the groups is 2.50 as shown in the table. This means that integrated skills treatment for speaking skills has an overall more positive effect on students' speaking skills than conventional strategies for teaching speaking skills.

	Pre			Post			D/f	t-value	P-value
Group	N	X	S.D	N	X	S.D			
Control	46	8.32	2.667	8.82	8.82	2.95	45	-5.21	0.093
Experimental	46	11.50	2.42	13.71	13.71	2.72	45	-5.94	0.002

Table 2. Paired T-Test of Speaking Performance

Although the mean scores indicate that the experimental group improved by 3.32 points on the posttest, which is better than the pretest, the statistics in the table indicate the opposite. As a result, the experimental group showed a significant difference (T=(46)=4.894, p = 0.000, p <0.05). However, the mean score after the control group increased by only 0.50. This shows that there was no difference in the pre- and t-scores of the control group (t=-5.341, p=0.093, p>0.05).

Speaking Components		Control			Experimental			D/f	t-value	p-value
	Test	N	X	S.D	N	X	S.D			
Content	Before	23	2.06	0.63	23	3.05	0.73	90	-3.473	0.33
	After	23	2.02	0.69	23	6.7	0.77	90	-3.443	0.034
Organization	Before	23	3.61	1.32	23	3.86	2.45	90	-0.909	0.43
	After	23	3.54	1.42	23	7.49	2.55	90	0.597	0.038
Acceptable	Before	23	2.03	0.45	23	3.09	0.39	90	-2.576	0.28
	After	23	2.25	0.41	23	7.28	0.49	90	-0.502	0.000
Meaningful	Before	23	1.62	0.43	23	2.99	0.56	90	-2.262	0.36
	After	23	1.72	0.34	23	6.89	0.57	90	-0.684	0.033
Address message	Before	23	1.81	0.51	23	2.83	0.61	90	0.22	0.42
	After	23	1.92	0.37	23	5.94	0.55	90	-2.031	0.024

Table 3. Independent Tests on Samples for Speaking Elements

The table shows that before therapy there was no statistically significant difference between the scores of the groups in any of the speaking components (p>0.05). The control and experimental groups were on the same page in terms of content (p = 0.33 > 0.05), organization (p, 0.43 > 0.05), acceptance (p, 0.28 > 0.05), meaningfulness (p, 0.36 > 0.05) and address message (p, 0.42 > 0.05). The experimental and control groups differed significantly in all speech-related metrics after the interventions (p = 0.034, 0.038, 0.000, 0.033 and 0.024 > 0.05). Thus, it can be concluded that learning to speak through integrated skills instruction has a stronger impact on the development of language elements such as vocabulary and grammar in accordance with acceptable, meaningful, message-oriented oral communication than traditional speaking skills instruction.

Speaking Components		Pre			Post			D/f	t-value	p-value
	Group	N	X	S.D	N	X	S.D			
Content	Control	23	2.69	0.83	23	3.05	0.78	22	-2.30	0.24
	Experimental	23	3.05	0.73	23	6.6	0.77	22	-3.41	0.003
Organization	Control	23	3.6	2.25	23	4.69	2.64	22	-5.21	0.33
	Experimental	23	3.80	2.45	23	7.49	2.55	22	-3.25	0.005
Acceptable	Control	23	2.96	0.52	23	3.23	0.45	22	-2.46	0.33
	Experimental	23	3.09	0.39	23	7.28	0.49	22	-1.00	0.044
Meaningful	Control	23	2.82	0.66	23	2.99	0.67	22	-1.45	0.27
	Experimental	23	2.99	0.56	23	6.87	0.58	22	-0.81	0.058
Address message	Control	23	2.85	0.48	23	2.83	0.52	22	0.59	0.76
	Experimental	23	2.83	0.60	23	5.94	0.55	22	-3.44	0.038

Table 4. Paired Samples T-Test for Speaking Skills Components

The results of the paired sample t-test in the table show that the experimental groups improved significantly in all areas, 0.05, organization (t= -3.25, p = 0.005, p < 0.05), acceptability (t= -1, 00, p = 0.04, p<0.05), meaningfulness (t= - 0.81, p = 0.05) and address message (t= -2.33, p = 0.0029, p = 0 .05). On the contrary, the control groups showed no improvement in the area of content (t= -2.30, p = 0.13 >0.05), organization (t= 5.21, p = 0.22>0.05), acceptability (t =2.46, p = 0.22>0.05) meaningfulness (t= 1.45, p = 0.16>0.05) and address message (t= -3.44, p = 0.038, p< 0.05). This may be the result of teaching by the teacher. There was no instruction that included integrated skills.

4.2 Discussion

The main objective of this experimental training was to find out how integrated skills training in speaking skills improved students' ability to give oral presentations. Independent samples pre-test revealed no significant differences between control and experimental groups in either general language use or spoken components. Independent samples post-test results showed that there were important changes between the experimental and control groups in terms of both general speaking and its sub-performances. This suggests that learning to speak through the integration of other skills is preferable to learning to speak through the traditional method. The finding thus disproves the computational theory. Al-Faoury's (2012) report, which found that speaking with integrated abilities had a large overall impact, is consistent with this conclusion.

According to the paired sample t-test results, the experimental groups dramatically improved their overall language performance. After the intervention, it can be concluded that the overall effectiveness of the students in using the language. After the intervention, it can be stated that the speaking skills of the students improved overall due to better vocabulary and grammar. This supports the findings of Alnooh (2015) who found that speaking using complex skills affects students' speaking components in EFL speaking classes because the control group failed to improve vocabulary and grammar. These results show that in EFL speaking lessons, language skills affect students' language use, especially vocabulary and grammar.

5. Conclusion

Independent samples t-test results showed that the improvement of students' speaking skills in the pre-test was not significantly different between the experimental and control groups. In contrast, the experimental and control groups differed significantly in the posttest in improving students' speaking skills, specifically their vocabulary and grammar. So the null hypothesis is accepted. A paired sample t-test also revealed statistically significant changes in students' speaking abilities in the experimental groups after the intervention, especially in terms of vocabulary and grammar. It would be useful to use speaking skills through integrated skills in EFL lessons when focusing on vocabulary and grammar, although it generally has a greater impact on students' speaking activities.

Acknowledgements

References

Alnooh, A. (2015). *Investigating the Impact of using an integrated approach to the teaching of writing skills Aamongst secondary students of english as a foreign language in saudi arabia.* Master Thesis. Kingston, England: University of Hull.

Al-Faoury, O.H. (2012). *The effect of an integrative skills program on developing jordanian University Students' Achievement in English and Selected Multiple Intelligences.* (Unpublished PhD Dissertation). Jordan: University of Jordan.

Brown, D. & Abeywickrama, P. (2010). *Language assessment: principles and classroom practices.* New York: Pearson Education.

Byrne, D. (1988). Integrating skills in k. johnson and k. morrow (eds.) *The English* Teacher, *26,1-23.*

Oxford, R. (2001). *Integrated skills in the ESL/EFL Classroom.* ERIC Digest.

Raimes, A. (1983). *Techniques in teaching writing*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Richards, J.C. and T. S . Rogers. (2001). *Approaches and methods in language teaching (2nd Edition).* Cambridge: CUP.

Sarantakos, S. (2012). *Social research macmillan international higher education*. New York: Macmillan.

Selinker, L. & Tonvin, R. S. (1986). An empirical look at the Integration and separation of skills in ELT. *ELT Journal, 40(3), 227-235.*

Skehan, P. (1996). A framework for the implementation of integrated skills-based instruction. *Applied Linguistics, 17(1), 38-62.*

Seow, A. (2002). *Methodology in language teaching*. *An anthology of current practice,* 315-320. Cambridge: Cambridge Press.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1987). *Thought and language*. Cambridge MA: MIT Press.

Widdowson, H.G.(1978). *Teaching language as communication*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Zahida, R. (2007). *Characteristics of skilled vs. unskilled language learners in english*: *An empirical study on advanced l2 learners' perceptions*, phd thesis. Cairo: Cairo University.