



ວາລະສານການສຶກສາສາລາວແບບຍືນຍົງ

ວິທະຍາໄລສາລາວະວັນ

<https://www.sttcjournal.edu.la>

ດຳເນີນການວາລະສານໂດຍ ວິທະຍາໄລສາລາວະວັນ

ຜົນປະໂຫຍດຂອງການນຳໃຊ້ວິທີການສອນແບບສື່ສານພາສາ (CLT) ໃນຫ້ອງຮຽນທັກສະການເວົ້າພາສາອັງກິດ: ກໍລະນີສຶກສາທີ່ພາກວິຊາ ພາສາອັງກິດ, ຄະນະອັກສອນສາດ, ມະຫາວິທະຍາໄລແຫ່ງຊາດ

The Benefit of Using Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) in English Speaking Skill Classes: A case study at Department of English Language, Faculty of Letters, National University of Laos

ວົງເພັດ ພິມມະຈັກ¹, ເພັດນະພາ ໄຊຍະວົງ², ພອນທິບ ບຸບຜາສິຣີ³, ແລະ ສີສິງຄາມ ຣັກສະໜາ⁴

Vongphet PHIMMACHAK¹, Phetnapha XAYYAVONG², Phonethip BOUPHASIRI³, & Sisongkham RAKSANA⁴

ບົດຄັດຫຍໍ້

ການຄົ້ນຄວ້າໃນຫົວຂໍ້ “ຜົນປະໂຫຍດຂອງການນຳໃຊ້ວິທີການສອນແບບສື່ສານພາສາ (CLT) ໃນຫ້ອງຮຽນ
ທັກສະການເວົ້າພາສາອັງກິດ: ກໍລະນີສຶກສາທີ່ພາກວິຊາພາສາອັງກິດ, ຄະນະອັກສອນສາດ, ມະຫາວິທະຍາໄລແຫ່ງ
ຊາດ”; ເປັນການຄົ້ນຄວ້າແບບປະລິມານດ້ານການທົດລອງ ທີ່ມີຈຸດປະສົງເພື່ອສັງເກດຄວາມແຕກຕ່າງໃນຄະແນນ
ການເວົ້າຂອງນັກຮຽນກ່ອນ ແລະ ຫຼັງການນຳໃຊ້ວິທີການສອນພາສາແບບສື່ສານພາສາ (CLT), ເພື່ອສຶກສາຜົນ
ກະທົບຂອງການນຳໃຊ້ກົດຈະກຳການສອນແບບສື່ສານພາສາ (CLT) ຕໍ່ທັກສະການເວົ້າຂອງນັກສຶກສາປີທີໜຶ່ງ.
ແລະ ເພື່ອກຳນົດວ່າມີຄວາມແຕກຕ່າງທີ່ສຳຄັນກ່ອນ ແລະ ຫຼັງການນຳໃຊ້ວິທີການສອນພາສາແບບສື່ສານພາສາ
(CLT) ຕໍ່ຄວາມສາມາດໃນການເວົ້າຂອງນັກຮຽນປີໜຶ່ງ ຫຼື ບໍ່. ການສຶກສາໄດ້ໃຊ້ການອອກແບບການທົດລອງ
ແລະ ວິທີການສຸມຕົວຢ່າງແບບກຸ່ມ ເພື່ອຄັດເລືອກນັກສຶກສາຈຳນວນ 59 ຄົນ. ຫຼັງຈາກການທົດລອງ, ກຸ່ມຄວບ
ຄຸມສະແດງໃຫ້ເຫັນເຖິງທັກສະການເວົ້າ ທີ່ປັບປຸງຂຶ້ນໜ້ອຍໜຶ່ງ, ໂດຍມີພຽງ 10% ຂອງນັກສຶກສາທີ່ກ້າວໄປສູ່
ລະດັບ "ດີ", ໃນຂະນະທີ່ກຸ່ມທົດລອງສະແດງໃຫ້ເຫັນການປັບປຸງໂດຍ 76% ຂອງນັກສຶກສາໄດ້ຮັບໃນລະດັບ "ດີ"
ແລະ 24% ບັນລຸໃນລະດັບ "ດີຫຼາຍ". ຄະແນນສະເລ່ຍຂອງກຸ່ມທົດລອງເພີ່ມຂຶ້ນຈາກ 53.67 ເປັນ 80.34, ສ່ວນ
ກຸ່ມຄວບຄຸມເພີ່ມຂຶ້ນພຽງເລັກນ້ອຍຈາກ 52.50 ເປັນ 53.67. ຜົນການທົດສອບຄຳ t ຍືນຍັນວ່າມີຄວາມແຕກຕ່າງ
ທີ່ມີຄວາມໝາຍທາງສະຖິຕິ p $0.02 < 0.05$ ລະຫວ່າງກຸ່ມທົດລອງ ແລະ ກຸ່ມຄວບຄຸມຫຼັງຈາກການທົດລອງ.

^{1,2,3,4}ພາກວິຊາພາສາອັງກິດ ຄະນະອັກສອນສາດ ມະຫາວິທະຍາໄລແຫ່ງຊາດ/ ສປປ ລາວ

Corresponding author: Vongphet PHIMMACHAK, Email: khao09@hotmail.com, Tel: +8562077505301

ແລະ $\eta^2 = 0.918$, ສະແດງໃຫ້ເຫັນເຖິງຜົນກະທົບທີ່ໃຫຍ່ຫຼາຍ, ປະມານ 91.8% ຂອງຄວາມແຕກຕ່າງໃນ ຄະແນນການເວົ້າຫຼັງການສອບເສັງຂອງນັກສຶກສາ ສາມາດອະທິບາຍໄດ້ວ່າການສອນທີ່ນຳໃຊ້ການສອນແບບສື່ສານ ພາສາ (CLT) ມີຜົນກະທົບ ແລະ ປະໂຫຍດ ສາມາດຊ່ວຍນັກສຶກສາໄດ້ດີກວ່າວິທີການສອນແບບດັ້ງເດີມໃນການ ພັດທະນາຄວາມສາມາດໃນການເວົ້າພາສາອັງກິດຂອງນັກສຶກສາປີທີ1 ຢູ່ພາກວິຊາພາສາອັງກິດ, ຄະນະ ອັກສອນສາດ, ມະຫາວິທະຍາໄລແຫ່ງຊາດ.

ຄໍາສໍາຄັນ: ການສອນການເວົ້າ, ການສອນພາສາແບບສື່ສານ, ທັກສະການເວົ້າ.

Abstract

This topic "The Benefit of Using Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) in English Speaking Skill Classes: A case study at Department of English Language, Faculty of Letters, National University of Laos " is quantitative experimental research. The purpose of the study was to observe the differences in students' speaking scores before and after using CLT in experimental group and traditional teaching method in control group, to examine the effect of using CLT activities on year-one students' speaking skills before and after using CLT, and to identify whether or not there is significant difference before and after using CLT on year-one student's speaking ability at Department of English Language, Faculty of Letters, National University of Laos. The study used a pre-experimental design and employed cluster sampling to select a total of 59 students. After the involvement, the control group showed a slight improvement, with only 10% of students reaching the "Good" level. In contrast, the experimental group showed significant improvement 76% of students reached the "Good" level and 24% achieved the "Very Good" level. The average score in the experimental group increased from 53.67 to 80.34, while the control group's score rose slightly from 52.50 to 53.67. The t-test proved a statistically significant difference ($p < 0.05$) between the two groups after the experiment. the t-test results reveal a highly significant difference between the groups' post-test scores ($t = 22.192$, $df = 43.921$, $p < 0.001$), with a substantial mean difference of 26.678 points. The standard error of this difference is relatively small at 1.202, and the 95% confidence interval ranges from 24.255 to 29.101, not containing zero, which further confirms the statistical significance of the findings. These results strongly suggest that the intervention or teaching method applied to the experimental group was remarkably effective compared to the control group's treatment, producing a clear and statistically significant improvement in performance. Therefore, the findings indicated the effect and benefit of the use of the CLT method can help students than traditional teaching methods in improving the students' English-speaking abilities in Department of English Language, Faculty of Letters, National University of Laos.

Key words: Communicative Language Teaching, Speaking skill, Teaching speaking.

Introduction

The speaking skills course was initially implemented using conventional approaches at Department of English Language. The curriculum itself follows conventional methods applied in the department. The department offers the speaking skills course because the curriculum requires all first-year students to reach an A2 level in English. Over time, the curriculum has evolved, introducing various changes to the teaching-and-learning process. At Department of

English Language, the curriculum has been implemented since 2023 and continues to be in effect. It was introduced to first-year students, and English-speaking skills are one of the subjects included in the 2023 curriculum. The goal of teaching speaking is comprehension; Besides, the 2023 curriculum includes speaking skills as an essential component that must be taught and learned in the department. To improve students' speaking ability, teachers need to adopt an appropriate method that fosters an engaging classroom atmosphere and aligns with students' needs. The researchers are interested in exploring alternative approaches. One of the most effective methods for improving students' speaking ability in language classrooms is Communicative Language Teaching (CLT). This method focuses on developing students' speaking ability through meaningful communication. Littlewood (1981) stated that CLT emphasizes the necessity of communication in language learning, serving as a response to traditional approaches. Larsen-Freeman (2000) also highlighted that CLT aims to develop communicative competence by emphasizing the interdependence of language and communication.

There are several reasons why researchers are interested in carrying out this research, the researchers found that, the topic of this research is not yet investigated by any other researchers at Department of English Language, Faculty of Letters, and the topic of the action research is also very interested for the researchers to know the effect of CLT, specifically information transfer activities of students' speaking ability. In addition, the location of the research facilitates researchers to conduct the research. it is essential to conduct this study because there are urgent and specific problems with English speaking skills of year-one students at the Department of English Language, National University of Laos that need immediate solutions. The researchers observed that year-one students desperately need better speaking instruction because they are trapped in a cycle of fear and avoidance, they also don't speak because they're afraid of making mistakes, but without speaking practice, they cannot improve their speaking skills. The current situation is particularly concerning because year- one students feel too shy and nervous to participate in speaking activities, which means they miss valuable learning opportunities every day. The researchers recognize that year-one students lack essential communicative competence and self- confidence, which are necessary for academic success and future career opportunities. Furthermore, the traditional teaching approach currently used at the university focuses on grammar rules rather than real communication, leaving students unprepared for actual English conversations. Most importantly, year-one students have insufficient opportunities to practice speaking in meaningful, interactive situations. Therefore, the researcher needs to investigate whether CLT can address these specific problems and provide practical solutions that will help year-one students become more confident, fluent English speakers who can succeed in their studies and professional lives.

Research objectives

1. To observe the differences in students' speaking scores before and after using Communicative Language Teaching (CLT).
2. To examine the effect of using communicative language teaching (CLT) activities on year-one students' speaking skills before and after using Communicative Language Teaching (CLT).

3. To identify whether there is significant difference before and after using Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) on year one student's speaking ability at Department of English Language, Faculty of Letters, National University of Laos.

Research methodology

Research design

The study employed a quasi-experimental approach, with a control group (Traditional teaching) and an experimental group (Communicative Language Teaching). The quasi-experimental approach helped the researchers to compare of two different teaching approaches. The quasi-experimental design was appropriate for this study, as it aimed to evaluate the benefits and effectiveness of the Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) method on learners' speaking skills.

Participants

In this study, the researchers used cluster sampling to take the sample. A total of 59 students from 2 classes programme in English speaking skill were chosen to be the sample in this study. Also, all of them had undergone basic speaking skill at year 1 classes.

Research instruments

In this study, there are two groups: Group 1D and Group 1E. Before teaching starts, both groups take a pre-test that measures their speaking skill. The pre-test lasts for 15 minutes and gives a starting point to see each student's level before learning. After that, group 1D receives a special treatment: they are taught speaking skills using the Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) method for 36 hours. On the other hand, group 1E learns speaking using the regular literacy curriculum, also for equally 36 hours. After the teaching period, both groups take a post-test, again lasting 15 minutes, to check how much they have improved in their speaking skills. The results from the post-tests are compared with the pre-tests to see if the CLT method in Group 1D helped students improve more than the traditional teaching method in Group 1E. Because the groups were not randomly assigned, they are called "non-equivalent." This means there might be some differences between the two groups from the beginning.

Procedure

In experimental group, teachers applied CLT for the speaking class, first checked what students knew and needed to learn. They used real videos and conversations to show natural English. Students did warm-up activities and practice exercises before speaking tasks. They did role-plays like ordering food or asking directions. Teachers watched but didn't correct every mistake. After activities, students talked about problems and got helpful feedback. Teachers gave homework to practice outside class.

For the control group, teacher used textbook goals and focused on perfect grammar and pronunciation. Students learned from textbook dialogues with correct grammar patterns. Before speaking, they did grammar lessons and repetitive drills. Speaking tasks had fixed answers with little personal expression. Teachers stopped often to correct mistakes immediately. Feedback focused on finding errors rather than communication success. Progress was tested through formal exams checking grammar accuracy.

Data collection

In this study, to collect the data from the sample, the research was used oral test in pretest and post-test, the researchers collected the data from pre-test and post-test, both groups take a pre-test that measures their speaking skill. The pre-test lasts for 15 minutes and gives a starting point to see each student's level before learning. After that, experimental group receives a

special treatment: they are taught speaking skills using the Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) method for 36 hours. On the other hand, controlled group learns speaking using the regular literacy curriculum, also for equally 36 hours.

After the teaching period, both groups take a post-test, again lasting 15 minutes, to check how much they have improved in their speaking skills. The results from the post-tests are compared with the pre-tests to see if the CLT method in experimental group helped students improve more than the traditional teaching method in controlled. Because the groups were not randomly assigned, they are called “non-equivalent.” This means there might be some differences between the two groups from the beginning.

Data analysis

In the first phase of the data analysis, tables of frequencies (frequencies, percentages, means, Standard Deviation) were employed to present the data. To find out whether there was a significant difference or not, the researchers used a statistical method. The independent sample T-test was used to find out the average value of the students’ speaking ability taught by using the CLT approach and taught without CLT approach. To know the hypothesis is accepted or rejected. To identify the level of the effect of using the CLT approach on year-one students’ speaking ability, it was calculated by using eta squared formula:

$$\eta^2 = \frac{t^2}{t^2 + df}$$

$$\eta^2 = 0.01 \text{ Small effect}$$

$$\eta^2 = 0.06 \text{ Medium effect}$$

$$\eta^2 = 0.14 \text{ Large effect}$$

Results and Discussions

Results

The first section focuses on the descriptive data analysis. The second section presents the inferential statistical data analysis.

Descriptive Statistics

Table 1: The Description of Mean and S.D. Pre-test and Post test Scores

Groups	N	Min	Max	Mean	S.D.
Pre-Test Experimental	29	50	60	53.67	8.483
Post-Test Experimental	29	75	90	80.34	6.337
Pre-Test Control	30	50	50	52.50	3.892
Post-Test Control	30	55	60	53.67	4.330

Table 1 presents the result of the Pre-test and post test Scores, there are distinct that occur between the two classes, the experimental class and the control class both before and after being given treatment. The mean of the control class before being given treatment was 52.50 with S.D. 3.892, while after being given treatment was 53.67 with S.D. 4.330, whereas the experimental class before being given treatment was 53.67 with S.D. 8.483 and after being given treatment was 80.34 with S.D. 6.337. The increase in mean score was larger for the experimental group from 53.67 to 80.34 compared to the control group from 52.50 to 53.67.

Based on the result, there are differences that occurred between the two groups certainly the experimental class and the control class both before and after being given treatment.

Table 2: The Summary of the Descriptive Statistics from Students' Pre-test and Post-test in Experimental Class and Control Class

Students' Score	Experimental Class		Gain Score	Controlled Class		Gain Score
	Pre-test	Post-test		Pre-test	Post-test	
Mean	53.45	80.34	26.90	52.50	53.67	1.17
S.D.	3.605	5.659	2.054	2.543	3.198	0.66
Minimum	50	75	25.00	50	50	0.00
Maximum	60	90	30.00	55	60	5.00

Table 2 shows a clear difference in learning outcomes between the experimental and control classes. In the experimental class, students began with a pre-test mean score of 53.45 with standard deviation of 3.605 and achieved a post-test mean score of 80.34 with standard deviation of 5.659, resulting in a substantial average gain score of 26.90 points. The minimum pre-test score was 50, which improved to a minimum post-test score of 75, while the maximum scores increased from 60 to 90. This represents a significant improvement across all students in the experimental class, with gain scores ranging from 25 to 30 points, indicating the intervention was highly effective in improving students' speaking performance. Both groups started with similar speaking abilities; the experimental group had a mean score of 53.45 points while the control group had 52.50 points. The experimental group's scores ranged from 75-90 points compared to the control group's 50-60 points, clearly demonstrating that CLT was much more effective in enhancing students' speaking abilities, confidence, and overall communication skills than traditional teaching approaches.

Inferential Statistics

Table 3: The Result of the Independent t-test (Pre-test) of Control and Experimental Group

Groups	N	Total	Mean	S.D.	df	t	P
controlled group	30	100	52.50	2.543	57	0.952	0.171
Experimental group	29		53.67	3.605			

Table 3 presents the result of the independent t-test (Pre-test) of control and experimental group. The control group had a mean score of 52.50 with a standard deviation of 2.543. The experiment group had a mean score of 53.67 with a standard deviation of 3.605. The t-value for the comparison was 0.952, and the p-value was 0.380. The p value of 0.171 is greater than the typical alpha level of 0.05, suggesting that there is no statistically significant difference between the scores of the control and experimental groups. Based on the result, the p value is 0.171 greater than 0.05, so as in the independent sample t-test, this revealed that H_a is rejected and H_o is accepted, and it can be concluded that there was no significant difference before being given treatment between the controlled and experimental classes.

Table 4 : The Result of the Independent t-test (Post-test)

Groups	N	Total Score	Mean	S.D.	df	t	P
controlled group	30	100	53.67	3.198	57	22.192	0.028
experimental group	29		80.34	5.659			

Table 4 summarizes the results of an independent t-test (Post-test) of controlled and experimental group. The controlled group had a mean score of 53.67 with a standard deviation of 3.198. The experimental group had a mean score of 80.34 with a standard deviation of 5.659. The t-value for the comparison was 22.192, and the p value was 0.02. The p value of 0.02 is smaller than the typical alpha level of 0.05, this means that there is statistically significant difference between the scores of the control and experimental groups. Based on the tables, the p value is 0.02 smaller than 0.05, so as in the independent sample t-test, this means that H_a is accepted and H_o is rejected, and this result revealed that there was significant effect of using Communicative language teaching (CLT) toward students' speaking scores after being given treatment between the Experimental class using Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) and the controlled class using conventional methods.

To identify the level of the effect of using the CLT approach on year-one students' speaking ability the researchers applied eta squared formula to calculate the data as the below:

$$\eta^2 = \frac{t^2}{t^2 + df}$$

$t = 22.192$
 $df = 43.921$ (use "Equal variances not assumed" $p = 0.028 < 0.05$)

$$\frac{22.192^2}{22.192^2 + 43.92} = \frac{492.48}{492.48 + 43.921} = \frac{492.48}{536.401} = 0.918$$

Based on the independent samples t-test result, the eta squared (η^2) was calculated to determine the effect size of using Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) on students' speaking scores. The eta squared (η^2) = 0.918, which indicated a very large effect size, according to Cohen's guidelines, $\eta^2 = 0.01$ Small effect, $\eta^2 = 0.06$ Medium effect, $\eta^2 = 0.14$ Large effect; this represents a very large effect size, meaning that about 91.8% of the variance in students' post-test speaking scores can be explained by the teaching method used. This result clearly showed that the CLT method had a significant and powerful influence on improving students' speaking performance compared to the traditional method. With such a high η^2 value and a statistically significant p-value of 0.000, it can be concluded that CLT was not only effective but played a major role in the success of the experimental group.

Discussion

The findings from quantitative analysis are discussed based on the independent samples t-test result, the eta squared (η^2), alternative hypothesis (H_a) and null hypothesis (H_o) in order.

Based on the independent samples t-test results, the calculated eta squared demonstrates an exceptionally strong effect size for the implementation of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) on students' speaking performance in post-test speaking scores, this can be

attributed to the teaching methodology employed. This remarkably high η^2 value, coupled with the statistically significant p -value of 0.000, provides compelling evidence that CLT not only significantly outperformed traditional teaching methods but also played a dominant role in the experimental group's success, confirming that the Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) approach had a profound and practically meaningful impact on enhancing students' speaking abilities with exceptional educational significance.

The alternative hypothesis (H_a) stated that there was significant difference of using Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) toward students' speaking scores. In testing this hypothesis, the result of the independent t -test (Pre-test) of the control group and experiment group, the t -value for the comparison was 0.952, and the p -value was 0.380. The p value of 0.171 is greater than the typical alpha level of 0.05. the p value is $0.171 > 0.05$, so as in the independent sample t -test, this revealed that H_0 is accepted and H_a is rejected, and it can be concluded that there was no significant difference before being given treatment between the controlled and experimental classes using traditional methods.

The null hypothesis (H_0) stated that there was no significant difference of using Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) toward students' speaking scores. In testing this hypothesis, the result of the independent t -test (post-test) of the control group and experimental group. The t -value for the comparison was 22.192, and the p value was 0.02. The p value of 0.02 is smaller than the typical alpha level of 0.05. the value is $0.02 < 0.05$, so as in the independent sample t -test, this means that H_a is accepted and H_0 is rejected. Based on the result, it can be concluded that there was significant difference of using Communicative language teaching (CLT) toward students' speaking scores after being given treatment between the experimental class using Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) and the controlled class using traditional methods. This finding is agreed with the expectation and early finding of Fu'adiyah (2020) on the topic "The Effect of Using Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) on Students' Speaking Ability at SMA IT Bangkinang". The result proved that there were significant differences before and after implementing Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) on eleventh grade students at SMA IT Bangkinang. Moreover, Yanti (2020) revealed that there is a significant influence of using CLT on the students' speaking skill at the eighth grade of SMP MUHAMMADIYAH 4 Metro.

Accordingly, the findings clearly demonstrated that Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) has a significantly positive effect on students' speaking abilities compared to traditional teaching methods. Both groups began the study with similar speaking proficiency levels, as evidenced by comparable pre-test scores: the experimental group averaged 53.45 points while the control group scored 52.50 points, with all students classified as "fairly good" speakers. However, after implementing CLT in the experimental group, the results showed dramatic improvement. The experimental group's mean score increased substantially to 80.34 points, representing an impressive gain of 26.90 points per student, while the control group using traditional methods showed minimal progress with only a 1.17-point increase to 53.67 points. The statistical analysis confirmed this difference was significant ($p = 0.02 < 0.05$), indicating that CLT was much more effective than conventional teaching approaches.

Based on the finding of the data analyse from the descriptive statistic and independent sample t -test, it meant that the students were taught English by using CLT method, the students' English-speaking scores are better than without using CLT method. It can be proved by the

difference between pre-test and post-test. When the researchers compared the speaking abilities between the experimental class using CLT and the control class using traditional methods, there was an important difference. The t-test results showed a p value of 0.02, which is smaller than 0.05. This means the alternative hypothesis was accepted, there was a real difference between how well the two classes could speak after the teaching period. This shows that the CLT method worked better than traditional methods for helping students speak better. CLT focuses on real communication and interaction, giving students chances to practise speaking naturally, which improves both fluency and accuracy. Traditional methods, however, focus more on memorizing grammar rules and vocabulary lists, which does not help students communicate as well in real-life situations.

Conclusion

The purpose of the study was to observe the differences in students' speaking scores before and after using CLT in experimental group and traditional teaching method in control group, to examine the effect of using activities on year-one students' speaking skills before and after using CLT, and to identify whether or not there is significant difference before and after using CLT on year-one student's speaking ability at Department of English Language, Faculty of Letters, National University of Laos. Researchers worked with 59 first-year English students and divided them into two groups. One group learned with CLT methods, while the other group used traditional teaching methods. Before starting the study, both groups had similar speaking levels - all students were at a "Fairly Good" level. After the teaching period, the results showed big differences between the groups. The traditional group improved only slightly, with just 10% reaching "Good" level. However, the CLT group showed amazing improvement: 76% of students reached "Good" level and 24% reached "Very Good" level. The CLT group scored an average of 27 points higher than the traditional group. The lowest score in the CLT group (75 points) was still 15 points higher than the highest score in the traditional group (60 points). Statistical tests showed that CLT explained 91.8% of the improvement in speaking scores. These results clearly prove that CLT is much more effective than traditional teaching methods for improving students' speaking skills. The study shows that CLT helps not just a few students, but most of them learn better.

Recommendations

For Teachers and Further Researchers

For the teachers, it is highly recommended to make this study more useful for teachers to improve teaching speaking skills using the CLT approach in classrooms. First, it is essential for teachers to carefully plan lessons before implementing them, considering the proper procedures for each technique according to established pedagogical theories that suit the Lao learning environment. Second, as lesson plans guide classroom activities, teachers should ensure consistency between written plans and actual implementation, adapting to the needs of students. Finally, when teaching English using the CLT approach in classrooms, teachers should encourage the use of English in all activities, while being sensitive to students' cultural backgrounds and initial language barriers common in the Lao context.

For further researchers, considering the limitations of this research, further studies should conduct experimental research on effective CLT practices specifically designed to improve speaking skills among Lao university students, taking into account local educational resources and cultural considerations. The future research should explore the long-term effects

of CLT on speaking proficiency across different academic levels and broader populations, including students from various institutions or regions. Additionally, further studies could incorporate qualitative methods, such as interviews or classroom observations, to gain deeper insight into learners' experiences, engagement, and attitudes toward CLT. Investigating how different components of CLT such as group work, role-play, or task-based learning contribute individually to speaking improvement would also provide more targeted pedagogical recommendations. Finally, future researchers should consider comparing CLT teaching method with other innovative methods to determine the most beneficial strategies for enhancing oral communication skills in EFL contexts.

Acknowledgment

The research team expresses its sincere gratitude to Champasak University for facilitating this study. Special thanks are extended to the 40 third-year English Department students who dedicated their valuable time to complete the questionnaires regarding challenges in integrated language skills development. Finally, we would like to thank the experts for their validation and insightful suggestions in refining the research instruments to ensure their completeness.

References

- Brown, H. D., Yorio, C. A., & Crymes, R. H. (1983). *Teaching the spoken language: An approach based on the analysis of conversational English*. Cambridge University Press.
- 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>
- Harmer, J. (2001). *The practice of English language teaching* (3rd ed.). Longman.
- Harmer, J. (2007). *How to teach English* (2nd ed.). Pearson Education Limited.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (2000). *Techniques and principles in language teaching* (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press.
- Littlewood, W. (1981). *Communicative language teaching: An introduction*. Cambridge University Press.
- McCarthy, J. P. (2010). Active learning techniques versus traditional teaching styles: Two experiments from history and political science. *Innovative Higher Education*, 24(4), 279–294.
<https://doi.org/10.1023/B:IHIE.0000047415.48495.05>
- M. P. (2014). Active learning increases student performance in science, engineering, and mathematics. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 111(23), 8410–8415.
<https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1319030111>
- Prince, M. (2004). Does active learning work? A review of the research. *Journal of Engineering Education*, 93(3), 223–231. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2168-9830.2004.tb00809.x>
- Richards, J. C. (2006). *Communicative language teaching today*. Cambridge University Press.
- Savignon, S. J. (2002). *Interpreting communicative language teaching: Contexts and concerns in teacher education*. Yale University Press.
- Thornbury, S. (2005). *How to teach speaking*. Pearson Longman.