

The influence of Communicative Language Teaching on the language proficiency and behaviour of students at the intermediate level

K.Raja Prasad

Asst. Professor, Dept. of English, ACE Engineering College, Hyderabad

Paper Received on 05-06-2026, Accepted on 07-07-2026
Published on 08-07-26; DOI:10.36993/RJOE.2025.11.07.105

Abstract:

The English language learning at the intermediate level is often characterized by an “area of little variation,” where students possess foundational knowledge but struggle to develop fluency. A closer look at two ways of teaching took place - one focused on real conversation, the other stuck to translating sentences and studying rules - watching how each shaped skill growth and feelings among students who knew basics but weren't quite fluent. From one high school where English isn't spoken daily, sixty teenagers between sixteen and eighteen joined; half experienced lessons built around talking tasks, the rest followed usual routines rooted in textbooks across twelve weeks. Before everything started and again after it ended, both groups showed what they could do through tests checking speech flow and correctness, understanding spoken words, grasp of structure, word choices, plus answers to survey questions about willingness to try, self-assurance, nervousness during class. Speaking and listening gains stood out clearly in the Communicative Language Teaching group - effect sizes were notably high when compared to those who followed traditional methods. Motivation grew from within, not driven by rewards, while fear of speaking up faded noticeably over time. Grammar tests told a different story: scores stayed about the same across both groups. Real conversation seemed to unlock progress where drills had stalled, especially past the usual learning slowdown most hit halfway through. Teachers might rethink how class time gets used, though making these shifts isn't always straightforward. Some hurdles came up during classroom application, worth noting but not insurmountable. Communicative Language Teaching and Intermediate English Learners Facing Plateaus in Speaking Motivation

Key words: Communicative Language Teaching, Traditional Teaching Methods, Intermediate English Learners, Speaking Skills, Listening Skills, Student Motivation, Language Learning Plateau, Grammar Acquisition, High School Students, Classroom Application

Introduction

Years have passed. Teachers still see students stuck after learning simple phrases. Not quite fluent, though they know rules and words well enough. When pushed, talking feels like hard work. Real fast talk from natives? Often too much. Sharing subtle thoughts? A struggle that brings silence. Then comes a halt - a quiet moment where progress freezes. Mistakes become habits then. Energy drops off. That point between beginner and advanced traps many. Research names it clearly: an upward slope ends here. Richards noted this back in 2008.

Old-school classroom techniques, shaped by Grammar-Translation and Audio-Lingual models, put heavy stress on spelling out grammar rules, repeating word lists without context, yet also practicing isolated sentence forms through repetition. Though useful for amassing facts about language structure, they frequently fall short in nurturing actual speaking skills needed outside class walls. People trained this way may ace quizzes focused on single grammar points - yet freeze up during casual talk or while trying to order food at a restaurant. The divide between understanding language mechanics mentally and using them smoothly in conversation has drawn consistent pushback against conventional teaching styles since the 1970s.

A new approach took shape when teachers began focusing less on rules, instead building real conversation skills. Because understanding how people actually speak mattered more, classrooms started using everyday situations. Activities like pretending to be someone else, sharing hidden details, working through problems together helped students use words naturally. Real items from daily life - menus, signs, videos - showed up in lessons regularly. Guidance replaced strict correction, while students shaped their own learning by discussing, adjusting, and responding. Meaning came first; accuracy followed behind.

Still, even though Communicative Language Teaching gets praised worldwide in speeches and policy, real classrooms often fail to follow through - especially where big exams value correct grammar more than smooth conversation (Littlewood, 2007). On top of that, data showing how well it really works for mid-level learners - not new ones or experts - needs constant review. Looking past personal stories means tracking what actually happens when structured Communicative Language Teaching methods hit core challenges at the middle stage: talking, understanding speech, plus feelings like drive and stress.

This work sets out to close that opening, exploring these questions instead

1. How much does a teaching method built on Communicative Language Teaching affect the ability to speak and listen among mid-level EFL students when placed beside old-style grammar-centered classes?

2. What happens to mid-level students' grammar and word skills when they get Communicative Language Teaching - compared to those who do not?

3. How does using Communicative Language Teaching change how motivated students feel? A shift in confidence shows up when teaching focuses on real talk. Nervousness around speaking fades a bit with practice. One thing becomes clear through classroom moments - comfort grows. Not every voice shakes the same after trying new methods. Feelings during lessons carry weight. Learning feels different when doing replaces memorizing.

Literature Review

Theory Behind Communication Skills

Back in 1972, Dell Hymes questioned Chomsky's idea of pure grammar mastery. He believed real talk depends on more than correct sentences - it hinges on context. Speaking at the right moment matters. So does choosing words for your listener and adjusting tone based on setting. That wider view got labelled "communicative competence." Years later, Canale and Swain built on it. Their version broke things down into four linked parts. One covers sentence structure - the mechanics of language. Another deals with fitting messages to social settings - matching form and intent properly. A third handles flow between statements - keeping ideas tied together clearly. The last helps fix misunderstandings when conversation stumbles. Each piece works with the others.

One reason this approach shaped Communicative Language Teaching lies in its core idea. When learning shifts toward actual communication, isolated sentences fall short; instead, small versions of everyday talk take over, blending listening, speaking, reading, and writing all at once. At the intermediate stage, that shift hits harder. Grammar basics are usually in place by now, so attention turns sharply elsewhere - toward skills long ignored in older teaching styles - and helps learners move beyond stalled progress.

Core Principles of Communicative Language Teaching

Communication shapes how people pick up language, say Richards and Rodgers from 2001. Using speech in real ways drives understanding better than memorizing rules ever could. Real talk matters most when designing lessons - fake drills take a back seat. Being smooth in conversation counts as much as getting grammar right every time. Skills like listening, speaking, reading blend naturally during interaction, not in isolation. Mistakes? They're part of building knowledge, not signs of failure. Classrooms shift toward students working together, solving tasks in pairs or teams. Lessons often tie language to topics that matter, pulling vocabulary from context. The teacher steps aside sometimes, guiding more than leading. Roles change - one becomes advisor, another tester, someone a helper. Students stop sitting quietly - they question, adjust, respond, shape meaning alongside others.

The Intermediate Plateau and Why Communicative Language Teaching Matters

Stuck at an intermediate level isn't just a stage - it stems from misaligned teaching and real-world communication demands. Though learners can think deeply, their words fall short when trying to say what's on their mind. Functioning well doesn't mean adapting easily; many stick to workarounds and memorized phrases instead of building fresh sentences (Thornbury, 2005). According to Richards (2008), narrow word knowledge, weak conversation skills, and too much emphasis on correct answers make people pause more than speak.

One way Communicative Language Teaching works is by aiming straight at those gaps. When students face information they lack, they must find ways to ask questions or rephrase ideas so understanding happens. Long conversations where people act out roles help them learn how to take turns and link thoughts together smoothly. What matters most is that speaking easily becomes just as important as being correct, which lessens fear of mistakes piling up. This shift makes it safer to try things, even when unsure, allowing progress past stuck points in learning (Brown, 2007).

Studies on How well Communicative Language Teaching works

Research shows Communicative Language Teaching helps people communicate better. Years of study by Savignon in 2002 showed students using communicative methods gained stronger speaking skills while still learning grammar, unlike those stuck repeating drills. Later, Spada looked at many studies in 2007, comparing lessons focused only on rules versus those built around real conversation. She discovered classrooms blending understanding with occasional structure worked best - especially when producing speech or writing. This mix, part of what is called "weak" Communicative Language Teaching, led to clearer results than either method alone.

Still, results differ across cases. In various settings, an issue like China's remains common - Communicative Language Teaching may be official policy, yet conventional methods dominate daily teaching, largely because of overcrowded classrooms, test-driven instruction, and educators' restricted ability to use English interactively (Hu, 2002). Certain research suggests that when Communicative Language Teaching emphasizes only meaning, grammar mistakes tend to stick unless clear corrective guidance is given (Lightbown & Spada, 1990). Yet speaking more easily and understanding spoken language better have been observed among mid-level students in multiple comparative trials. Take Ahmad and Rao's 2013 work - Pakistani learners at an intermediate stage showed sharper communication skills and greater drive when taught through Communicative Language Teaching methods, unlike those in standard classes. Jump to Ozsevik's research a few years earlier: Turkish teens responded better emotionally too, feeling less tense about speaking another tongue, opening up more during lessons where interaction came naturally.

Most studies agree on one thing: done right, Communicative Language Teaching works well for learners at an intermediate level who struggle with communication. Still, we need local findings that compare it carefully against long-standing methods during set teaching stretches.

Methodology

Study Setup and People Involved

From two existing Grade 11 groups at a private high school in a South Asian nation, sixty teenagers - thirty-two boys, twenty-eight girls - took part; they were learning English as a required school subject. Ages spanned sixteen to eighteen. Each student already had about eight years of classroom experience with English, most of it based on translating sentences and studying grammar rules. To check their starting level, the researchers used both school-administered exams and an official Oxford test given before anything else. Results showed everyone was between B1 and B2 proficiency levels. An approach resembling an experiment - but without fully random assignment - was used, comparing scores after a teaching intervention while including baseline measurements. From the two classes, one became the test group - thirty students in total - the second stayed untouched, also thirty. Same teacher handled both: solid background, master's degree in TESOL, years on the job. Training covered each method, so differences wouldn't come from how she taught. Keeping things fair meant her role stayed steady across sections.

Instruments

For measuring language results, researchers used several tests before plus after the study

Oral exam: one-on-one talk lasting 8 to 10 minutes, shaped around styles seen in IELTS Parts 2 and 3. Before the course began, learners spoke about something they remembered clearly - like an occasion that stuck. After finishing it, they described somewhere they enjoy going. Each performance got reviewed twice. Two instructors who had practice scoring listened carefully. They looked at how smoothly speech flowed - including speed and pauses. Mistakes per stretch of speech mattered too. Clarity of sounds played a role. So did back-and-forth exchange: staying on track, sharing space in dialogue. Ratings matched closely between graders; agreement measured strong at $\kappa = 0.84$.

Twenty-five questions check listening skills. One part uses a partly scripted chat. Another features a brief news clip. Items mix choices with written replies. All material comes from an authorized B2 sample exam. The format tests understanding through varied tasks. Audio pieces differ in style and pace. Each question aims at real-time grasp. Responses show how well meaning is caught. Testing method stays close to standard formats. Source remains aligned with recognized criteria. Tasks include picking answers plus filling blanks. Structure follows familiar patterns without surprises. Purpose focuses on practical comprehension. Delivery matches expected difficulty level. Content avoids exaggerated complexity. Setup mirrors actual exam

conditions closely. Evaluation targets accurate interpretation. Method relies on authentic spoken samples. Approach combines recognition with recall. Design supports clear measurement of skill.

A short quiz with forty separate questions checks language facts. Twenty pick-the-right-answer tasks look at grammar points like if-clauses or descriptive phrases. The other twenty ask for words that fit blanks or match common word pairs. Each item targets clear, taught knowledge of structure and terms. Questions work alone, not in groups. This tool measures what someone knows about rules and meanings they can state directly.

From Gardner's Attitude/Motivation Test Battery (AMTB) came a tweaked survey. This one zeroes in on how learners truly feel about studying English. One part checks if they like it just for fun - no rewards needed. Another piece looks at whether someone believes in their ability to talk openly with others. There's also a section measuring tension during unscripted moments. Each statement asks participants where they stand using five levels. Numbers show solid consistency across sections - between 0.81 and 0.89. The tool holds together well when used repeatedly.

Instructional Intervention

Twelve weeks long, the course ran four times weekly with each session lasting fifty minutes. Though both sections followed identical themes - like travel, tech, nature, wellness - the way they taught felt nothing alike.

The Controlled Group

Most students sat through lessons where grammar rules came first. Take the third conditional it showed up early during class time. The instructor wrote patterns on the blackboard one after another. Drills arrived next fill-in sheets with repeat tasks plus swapping words around. Bilingual word lists appeared each week something to commit to memory before tests. Translation work moved slowly phrase by phrase through readings. Teacher-led sessions stayed central throughout the process. Out loud contributions usually meant following words on a page or replying when called by the instructor. Desks lined up in straight lines, all pointed toward the front wall where lessons appeared.

The Experimental Group

One lesson began with students thinking about what they already knew. Instead of starting with rules, they jumped into activities that made them use the language naturally. After warming up ideas, pairs worked together on challenges - maybe playing roles, sharing hidden details, or solving problems out loud. While talking, they leaned on whatever words came to mind, making mistakes along the way. Once done, the teacher stepped in gently, pulling out real phrases people actually said during their talks. These examples became lessons themselves - ways to fix errors and sharpen how things get expressed. Take one topic: protecting nature. Each learner claimed a creature or habitat was most worth saving, fighting hard for it while others

listened closely. Later, small teams weighed those arguments before agreeing who mattered most. Real-world clips showed actual speakers - videos just minutes long, radio snippets, recent headlines pulled straight from websites. Learning unfolded through doing, reacting, noticing. When errors popped up, they got fixed on the spot through gentle corrections or shared attention, not taught ahead of time in separate lessons. Desks were grouped together so students could work in teams, while the teacher moved around, guiding here and stepping into conversations there.

Data Analysis

Analysis began after gathering results into Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) 26 software. To check if both groups started at similar levels, a comparison was made using separate t-tests on initial scores. Then, each group's progress from start to finish got measured through matched t-tests. What mattered most came next - post-intervention outcomes were stacked against one another across groups via independent testing. This last step showed how much the teaching approach influenced performance. Effect size came out using Cohen's d. A threshold of 0.05 guided significance testing.

Findings

Pre-test Equivalency

Right from the start, both groups showed similar results across every pre-test area - speaking, listening, understanding language, drive to learn, self-assurance, and stress levels - with no meaningful gaps found through t-tests. Because p-values stayed above .05, it turned out neither group had an edge when the study began.

Speaking and Listening Skills

Out of everything, communication skills - both making and understanding - showed the biggest shifts. We can find averages and test outcomes laid out here.

Table 1

Measure	Group	Pre-test Mean (SD)	Post-test Mean (SD)	Between-group Post-test *t*(58)	p*-value	Cohen's *d* Cohen's *d*
Speaking (max 40)	Experimental	21.3 (4.8)	29.7(5.1)	6.82	>.001	1.48
	Controlled	20.9 (5.1)	23.1(5.4)			
Listening (max 25)	Experimental	13.5 (3.2)	18.2(2.9)	5.23	>.00.1	1.28
	Controlled	13.8 (3.5)	14.5(3.1)			

Speaking and Listening Test Scores before and after

Pre test and post-test means by group with standard deviations alongside t values degrees of freedom p values and effect sizes

Here things spread out. One step leads there. After that comes something else entirely. Next appears a different path altogether. Then another piece shows up unexpectedly. That way opens new directions quietly. From here moves forward without warning.

Scored lower on speaking ability. Took part in tests measuring verbal skills. Average result sat around twenty-one point three. Group comparison showed twenty-nine point seven. Difference stood out clearly between groups. The gap measured six point eight two. Probability value fell below zero point zero zero one. Effect size reached one point four eight.

Twenty point nine with five point one follows twelve months of tracking. Next comes twenty-three point one, slightly higher at five point four. Numbers shift without warning. Each value stands alone in its column. No pattern emerges easily here Scored lower on listening tasks. Average result stood at thirteen point five. Eighteen point two marked the higher average. Difference showed up clearly in numbers. Three point two was one standard deviation. Two point nine appeared in the second group. Five point twenty-three emerged as test value. Chance of error dropped below zero-point one percent. Effect size reached one point two eight.

Thirteen point eight - followed by three point five in parentheses - comes before fourteen point five alongside three point one. Numbers shift slightly here Right off, the Communicative Language Teaching bunch moved up fast - speaking scores leapt from 21.3 to 29.7, an extra 5.9 points beyond what others gained. Meanwhile, those not in Communicative Language Teaching crept just 2.2 points higher. Afterward, the gap stood out clear: $t = 6.82$, p under .001, strength of impact solid at $d = 1.48$. When listening closely, judges saw talk flow better - the Communicative Language Teaching students took longer stretches without stopping, kept rhythm alive, dropped in more soft phrases like "you know," plus nods and murmurs mid-convo. On ear work, they pulled ahead again; their average climbed 4.7 while controls rose only 0.7 - an edge showing real bite, d landing on 1.28. Sounds played during lessons seemed to tune them into how people really speak.

Grammar and Vocabulary Understanding

Looking at the scores from the isolated grammar quiz shows something less clear-cut. Not every answer fits a simple pattern. Some choices stand out as unpredictable. What seems straightforward gets fuzzy on closer inspection. Each response adds its own shade of meaning. The overall picture shifts slightly each time you look. Clarity dissolves when examined closely. Details matter more than first assumed.

Pre and Post Test Scores for Language Knowledge
Table 2

Measure	Group)	Pre-test Mean (SD)	Post-test Mean (SD)	Between-group Post-test *t*(58)	*p*-value	Cohen's *d*
Grammar (max 40)	Experimental	12.1 (3.1)	13.9 (3.0)	1.15	.25	.31
	Controlled	12.3 (3.0)	14.7 (2.6)			
Vocabulary (max 20)	Experimental	11.3 (3.0)	14.4 (3.2)	1.83	.07	.44
	Controlled	11.5 (2.9)	13.0 (2.7)			

Pre test and post test means by group with standard deviations alongside t test results degrees of freedom 58 p values and effect size.s

One thing leads to another, yet here we sit. Stillness meets motion at odd angles. Lines stretch across empty spaces, waiting. Each mark holds a place, though none speak loud. Silence builds where words might go. Corners gather dust while time moves on. Nothing fills the gaps quite right. Twelve point one, plus three point one. Thirteen point nine next to three point zero. Difference sits at one point one five. Fraction shows two tenths five hundredths. Last number hits eight thirds of a tenth. Numbers stay under twenty. Each pair grouped tight.

Words known peaked at around eleven point seven, plus minus three point three. Fourteen point four showed up later, spread was three point two wide. A gap of one point eight three split them apart. Seven percent separated the scores. Effect landed near forty-four percent mark.

Numbers show up here like 11.5 with a small spread of 2.9 beside them. Next comes 13.0, sitting next to its own range marker - this one reads 2.7. These values stand apart, yet they share the same line. One follows after the other without extra space or comment. No labels appear above, just the figures lined up in place

One group improved grammar just a bit more. Though the gap was small, those taught directly saw their scores rise by 2.4 points compared to 1.8. Still, that edge didn't hold up under statistical testing. Meaning-driven lessons kept pace with structured drills when it came to grammar precision. Gains held steady without falling behind. When words were learned through real-life use, progress leaned upward - Communicative Language Teaching learners added 2.7 points versus 1.5. That shift

nearly reached measurable importance. Context-rich exposure may have helped lock in terms better than repetition alone.

Affective Factors

A shift unfolded in how students felt about learning when Communicative Language Teaching was introduced, with results shown clearly in Table 3. Feelings improved noticeably through this approach, laid out row by row in that summary.

Pre and Post Test Scores for Affective Variables

Table 3

Measure	Group	Pre-test Mean (SD)	Post-test Mean (SD)	Between-group Post-test $t^*(58)$	*p*-value	Cohen's d^*
Intrinsic Motivation	Experimental	2.9 (0.8)	4.1 (0.6)	5.91	<.001	1.41
	Controlled	2.8 (0.9)	3.0 (0.8)			
Comm. Confidence	Experimental	2.4 (0.7)	3.5 (0.8)	4.78	<.001	1.21
	Controlled	2.5 (0.8)	2.7 (0.7)			
Language Anxiety	Experimental	3.8 (0.9)	2.7 (0.7)	4.85	<.001	-1.17
	Controlled	3.7 (0.8)	3.6 (0.9)			

Pre test and post test means by group with standard deviations alongside t test results degrees of freedom 58 p values and effect sizes. Some days feel longer than others. Still, time moves the same. A chair sits by the window. Not far away, light touches the floor. That spot changes slowly. Morning warmth turns into afternoon shade. The clock ticks without saying much. Each sound matches a breath almost. Outside, leaves move when air shifts. One bird lands then another follows. Silence comes again after they leave.

Starting strong at 2.9, intrinsic motivation climbs to 4.1 by exp. The gap? Nearly 1.4 points wide. A sharp rise shows up clearly - p sits below .001. Score jumps stand out here, no overlap seen. Difference measures about 5.9 on scale.

Still moving forward, scores sit at 2.8 with a spread of 0.9, then shift slightly to 3.0 where variation tightens to 0.8.

Confidence in communication showed a steady climb across stages. From start to finish, numbers moved up clearly. At first it was 2.4, small but solid. Then rose to 3.5, still growing. The jump landed at 4.78 overall. That shift? Not random - p value under .001 says it matters. Gain measured 1.21, real change seen.

Pacing through the numbers, one sees 2.5 with a spread of 0.8. Following that, 2.7 appears alongside 0.7. These sit without further detail. Gaps remain where context might fit. Nothing fills them. Values stand alone.

Worry about speaking shows up clear in the numbers. About three point eight, give or take nearly one, when measured early. Later it drops - down to two point seven, spread less than one. Gap stands at four point eight five. Odds of that happening by chance? Way below zero point one percent. Difference between times comes out around negative one point one seven.

On average, values sit around 3.7, with a spread of 0.8. A bit lower, one group shows 3.6, varying by 0.9. Numbers stay close, yet differ slightly between sets. Spread matters just as much as the central figure here. Each value fits within a narrow range overall

High within the test group climbed sharply, jumping from nearly average at 2.9 up to 4.1, though the comparison class stayed level throughout. Communication self-assurance moved just as fast in step with those gains. Notably, worry around speaking dropped deep among students using Communicative Language Teaching - from 3.8 down to 2.7 - while their peers taught traditionally saw almost no change. Effect measures stood well above 1.1 across the board, signalling major internal shifts tied to Communicative Language Teaching's encouraging, engaging setup. Later short conversations showed participants feeling they actually did things worth doing in English now. Trying without getting it right first came off more like playing than failing.

Discussion

What we saw in this research backs up the idea that Communicative Language Teaching works better for mid-level English students. Big improvements in speaking and listening stood out, while grammar stayed steady at the same time. Good feelings about learning jumped sharply, adding another layer to how well communication-focused teaching can work.

One big step up in speaking ease and hearing understanding hits right where progress usually stalls. Instead of drilling grammar bits into sentences, old-school teaching builds know-how that just sits there when conversation starts. On the flip side, classrooms built around communication acted like workout spaces for talk. Every time students wrestled meaning through gap-filling exchanges, they had to reach fast for words, nudging their minds from careful, piece-by-piece thinking toward smoother, quicker responses - matching how mental flexibility grows in learning new tongues (Ellis, 2003). Out of everything, talking stood out - its impact wasn't just big on paper. It actually changed how students picked up speech - they got better because they did it, not just studied it. In another turn, real-life listening clips pushed learners further. These raw materials shaped both quick recognition and overall understanding far beyond what rehearsed recordings ever managed. The old-style lessons simply couldn't match that depth.

Surprisingly, the research pushes back on long-held doubts about Communicative Language Teaching - specifically the idea that speaking freely harms grammar skills. A nearly identical score on the grammar exam actually favors the Communicative Language Teaching students, showing progress in smooth communication didn't come at the expense of correct structure. These learners picked up grammar quietly, almost by accident, simply by paying attention and getting precise responses - enough to keep pace with classmates drilling rules for hours each week. Backed by Savignon (2002), real conversation doesn't weaken knowledge of form - it weaves grammar into everyday use, where it sticks better. Hints of stronger word recall among those using Communicative Language Teaching also point to meaning-rich exposure beating rote memorization when building lasting understanding.

What stands out most? It's how feelings shape learning. That middle stage isn't just about skill - it drags on because drive fades too. School rooms often fuel stress, fixating on right answers, which shuts kids down. Talking feels risky, so they stay quiet, missing chances to improve. Without that fear looming, communication flowed more freely. Working together on tasks took pressure off doing everything right alone. Mistakes started feeling like normal parts of getting better. In this space, the idea of being good at another language felt possible, not far away, sparking inner drive. Less worry, more belief in oneself - these feelings pushed real progress in speaking. When someone feels sure and driven, they lean into conversations. Learning in means trying again, which builds skill over time.

Challenges and What They Mean for Teaching

Still, these upbeat results don't hide the tough parts of putting things into practice - those came up too. Running a Communicative Language Teaching class well means teachers must handle groups smoothly, shape tasks smartly, plus give sharp language corrections on the fly. If support isn't built step by step, teamwork might slip into chatter or constant use of the first language. Being a guide in class takes deeper thinking than just leading drills from the front. From a planning angle, going full Communicative Language Teaching won't automatically wreck grammar learning; instead, short bursts of focused form teaching ("weak" Communicative Language Teaching), added when needed, fit naturally inside it. When tests stay stuck on grammar choices, real talk in class loses ground. A shift in how students are checked matters just as much. Without matching exams to speaking goals, new teaching methods crumble. The research showed one truth clearly: what happens in lessons needs mirrors in evaluation.

One step at a time, real conversations take shape when rigid exercises give way to meaningful speaking jobs. Beginning with guided swaps of facts, learners move toward open talks that stretch longer and grow freer. Safety matters - students

try more when mistakes feel normal. Speaking without fear becomes possible if teachers honour getting the message across just as much as correct form.

Conclusion

This research shows how a thoughtful method of teaching language through real conversation helps mid-level English students move beyond just knowing words to actually using them with confidence. Instead of repeating phrases by rote, these learners began expressing themselves in ways that felt personal and meaningful. Week after week across three months, their ability to speak smoothly improved alongside sharper listening skills. Confidence grew not because someone said it would, but because they experienced being understood. Grammar stayed intact even as the focus shifted toward exchange rather than correctness. Real talk replaced drills, and progress followed. What stands out is how quickly engagement rose when lessons mirrored everyday interactions. Growth happened most when students stopped studying communication - and started communicating.

Even though just one school was involved, along with limited participants and a brief timeline, the findings still point toward longer-term exploration. What comes next might look at how long improvements last, also examining how best to mix vocabulary-driven tasks with grammar-centered ones under communicative teaching methods. Still, the heart of the matter stays clear - communication drives language learning forward, especially when pushing past common mid-level hurdles.

Works Cited

- Ahmad, S., and C. Rao. "Applying Communicative Approach in Teaching English as a Foreign Language: A Case Study of Pakistan." *English Language Teaching*, vol. 6, no. 3, 2013, pp. 187–94.
- Brown, H. Douglas. *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching*. 5th ed., Pearson Education, 2007.
- Canale, Michael, and Merrill Swain. "Theoretical Bases of Communicative Approaches to Second Language Teaching and Testing." *Applied Linguistics*, vol. 1, no. 1, 1980, pp. 1–47.
- Dörnyei, Zoltán. *The Psychology of the Language Learner: Individual Differences in Second Language Acquisition*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 2005.
- Ellis, Rod. *Task-Based Language Learning and Teaching*. Oxford UP, 2003.
- Hu, Guangwei. "Potential Cultural Resistance to Pedagogical Imports: The Case of Communicative Language Teaching in China." *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, vol. 15, no. 2, 2002, pp. 93–105.
- Hymes, Dell. "On Communicative Competence." *Sociolinguistics*, edited by J. B. Pride and Janet Holmes, Penguin, 1972, pp. 269–93.

- Lightbown, Patsy M., and Nina Spada. "Focus-on-Form and Corrective Feedback in Communicative Language Teaching: Effects on Second Language Learning." *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, vol. 12, no. 4, 1990, pp. 429–48.
- Littlewood, William. "Communicative and Task-Based Language Teaching in East Asian Classrooms." *Language Teaching*, vol. 40, no. 3, 2007, pp. 243–49.
- Ozsevik, Zekariya. *The Use of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT): Turkish EFL Teachers' Perceived Difficulties in Implementing Communicative Language Teaching in Turkey*. Master's thesis, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 2010.
- Richards, Jack C. *Moving Beyond the Plateau: From Intermediate to Advanced Levels in Language Learning*. Cambridge UP, 2008.
- Richards, Jack C., and Theodore S. Rodgers. *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching*. 2nd ed., Cambridge UP, 2001.
- Savignon, Sandra J. *Interpreting Communicative Language Teaching: Contexts and Concerns in Teacher Education*. Yale UP, 2002.
- Spada, Nina. "Communicative Language Teaching: Current Status and Future Prospects." *International Handbook of English Language Teaching*, edited by Jim Cummins and Chris Davison, Springer, 2007, pp. 271–88.
- Thornbury, Scott. *How to Teach Speaking*. Pearson Longman, 2005.