

# THE EFFECT OF USING AUTHENTIC AUDIO AND VIDEO MATERIALS ON THE SPEAKING FLUENCY OF AUDITORY AND VISUAL IRANIAN LEARNERS

## O EFEITO DO USO DE MATERIAIS DE ÁUDIO E VÍDEO AUTÊNTICOS NA FLUÊNCIA DE FALA DE ALUNOS AUDITIVOS E VISUAIS IRANIANOS

**NASSIM MAHMOUDI**

MA in TEFL, Science and Research  
Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran,  
Iran  
[nassim\\_end@yahoo.com](mailto:nassim_end@yahoo.com)

**MAHSHAD TASNIMI**

Assistant Professor, English Translation  
Department, North Tehran Branch,  
Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran  
[mtasnimi@yahoo.com](mailto:mtasnimi@yahoo.com)

**Received:** 17 Feb 2023

**Accepted:** 10 Mar 2023

**Published:** 23 April 2023

**Corresponding author:**

[mtasnimi@yahoo.com](mailto:mtasnimi@yahoo.com)



**Abstract:** When we talk about learning a second language, we internationally think of conversing with speakers of other languages. This means that speaking is seen as the prime purpose of language learning. This study was undertaken to investigate the effect of authentic auditory and visual materials on speaking fluency of Iranian EFL learners with auditory and visual styles of learning. The quasi-experimental design consisted of 60 Iranian EFL language learners divided into two groups of visual style and auditory style. A questionnaire on perceptual learning styles and a speaking fluency test were used to collect the data. Students with visual style received authentic visual materials and students with auditory style received authentic audio materials. The obtained data was analyzed by employing paired and independent samples t-test. The results of the study indicated that both groups of students significantly progressed in speaking fluency suggesting the positive effect of authentic visual materials on students with visual preferences and the positive effect of authentic audio materials on

students with audio preferences. Moreover, both types of materials had equal effects on the participants of the study. The findings suggest that providing instruction that is congruent with students' learning styles and the use of authentic materials appear to improve speaking fluency.

**Keywords:** Perceptual learning styles. Visual style. Auditory style. Speaking fluency. Authentic materials.

**Resumo:** Quando falamos em aprender uma segunda língua, internacionalmente pensamos em conversar com falantes de outras línguas. Isso significa que falar é visto como o objetivo principal do aprendizado de idiomas. Este estudo foi realizado para investigar o efeito de materiais auditivos e visuais autênticos na fluência de fala de alunos iranianos de EFL com estilos de aprendizagem auditivos e visuais. O design quase-experimental consistiu em 60 aprendizes de línguas iranianas EFL divididos em dois grupos de estilo visual e estilo auditivo. Um questionário sobre estilos

perceptivos de aprendizagem e um teste de fluência de fala foram usados para coletar os dados. Alunos com estilo visual receberam materiais visuais autênticos e alunos com estilo auditivo receberam materiais de áudio autênticos. Os dados obtidos foram analisados por meio do teste t de amostras pareadas e independentes. Os resultados do estudo indicaram que ambos os grupos de alunos progrediram significativamente na fluência da fala, sugerindo o efeito positivo de materiais visuais autênticos em alunos com preferências visuais e o efeito positivo de materiais de áudio autênticos em alunos com preferências de áudio. Além disso, ambos os tipos de materiais tiveram efeitos iguais nos participantes do estudo. As descobertas sugerem que o fornecimento de instrução congruente com os estilos de aprendizagem dos alunos e o uso de materiais autênticos parecem melhorar a fluência da fala.

**Palavras-chave:** Estilos de aprendizagem perceptivos. Estilo visual. Estilo auditivo. Fluência de fala. Materiais autênticos.

## I. Introduction

Undoubtedly, speaking is considered as one of the major skills in both first language acquisition and second language learning. Accordingly, it has come to become the focus of a lot of recent investigations (e.g., Atas, 2015; Çagatay, 2015; Fung, & Li Min, 2016; Hammad Rafada, & Madini, 2017; Su Bergil, 2016). This skill is viewed as an essential component of L2 learning as the ability to engage in communication in L2 clearly contributes to the learners' accomplishment both in school and in life. Chaney (1998) notes that speaking serves as the vehicle used to build and share meaning through verbal and nonverbal symbols in various contexts. In practice, knowing a language is usually on a par with the ability to speak that language rather than having the capability to understand or read content in that language.

Ur (1996) asserts that when it comes to language learning, speaking is considered as equal to having thorough knowledge in that language. This shows the pivotal role of speaking skill while learning an L2. The literature deals with the two major components of speaking, namely, fluency and accuracy. Engaging in the skill of speaking, the individual is expected to take account of both fluency and accuracy. Fluency is delineated as the capability to keep conversation going while speaking spontaneously, using all available linguistic resources (Gower, Philips & Walters, 2005) which is very important to keep the flow of communication going (Ejzenberg, 2000). Therefore, L2 instructors need to make use of appropriate ways aiming to help L2 learners improve their speaking proficiency. According to Richards, 2006, L2 learners acquire a language by engaging in interaction and negotiation. Encouraging EFL learners to have an active role in a large classes seems to be difficult. As a result, the teacher needs to use authentic materials in order to provide the opportunity for learners' participation in the class (Richards & Rodgers, 2002). In the view of Housen et al. (2005), fluency is concerned with a phonological phenomenon which is made up of three parts, namely, speed fluency, breakdown fluency and repair fluency. This stands in contrast

with complexity, evident in all levels of language structure and use (socio-pragmatic, syntactic, morphological, lexical, and phonological).

In non-professional contexts, fluency is considered equivalent to language proficiency and it doesn't relate to the aspects of oral language production. To put it another way, speaking fluently, an individual is normally described as someone who can speak easily with no problem. As pointed out by some scholars, it seems that the word fluency causes confusion even among L2 instructors as this word has been elaborated on with overlap in professional setting (Freed, 1995; Riggenbach, 1991; Schmidt, 1992; Schmitt-Gevers, 1993). Consequently, initially the term fluency needs to be clarified. Based on the definition given by ELT, the term fluency has been extensively used in the communicative L2 teaching. The review of literature shows that the term fluency is usually used in contrast with the term accuracy, with such a notion defined differently from the general proficiency and native-likeness. When it comes to communicative language teaching (CLT), there is a focus on the effective use of L2 within the target learners' language proficiency. Brumfit (1984) puts emphasis on the effective use of language at any level of proficiency. He defined effective use of language as the highest level of effective operation of the language system at different level of proficiency.

Ejzenberg (2000) and Riggenbach (1991) maintain that speech rate serves as an important predictor of fluency, estimated by the average number of syllables uttered per minute. Moreover, they have incorporated another factor, namely, the mean length of runs (MLR). Specifically, MLR is calculated through tallying the average number of syllables an individual articulates in utterances between pauses of 0.25 seconds and above. Phonation-time ratio is one more predictor of speech fluency put forth by Towell et al. (1996) and Lennon (1990). It is related to the percentage proportion of the time needed to articulate the speech sample. Besides, they have proposed other predictors of speech fluency including the following

- filled pause
- unfilled pauses
- dysfluencies.

According to Brown (2007), we all learn and organize information uniquely. As a matter of fact, the learner's variables impact the outcomes of learning. Larsen-Freeman (1991) enumerates these variables as follows:

- age
- socio-psychological factors
- creativity
- personality
- cognitive style
- hemisphere specialization,

- learning strategies
- learning styles
- other factors such as memory, gender

Nowadays, it is well known that each person possesses his/her characteristic way of learning, which plays an important role in his/her success or failure (Fewell, 2010; Zare&Noordin, 2011). It is likely that learning would be more successful for learners who can make use of multiple learning styles (Mulalic, Mohdshad& Ahmad, 2009; Reid, 1987). In the view of Reid (1987) and Too (2007), each of preferred learning style lends itself to a preferred method of instruction. That is, there is not a single approach favored by all learners (Riazi, 2007). As mentioned in the literature, learning styles play an important role in leaning so that they can be associated with the related models developed to this end. Many models including the Myers Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI), Hermann Brain Dominance Instrument (HBDI), etc are the ones used by researchers. Despite the fact that all the styles classify learning kinds differently, they have parallel goal and approach. As discussed by Reid (1995), learning styles are characterized by the following:

- Each person, learner and teacher alike, possesses a learning style as well as learning strengths and weaknesses;
- there are a variety of learning styles; with some of them being as opposites;
- Learning styles are value-neutral; we don't prefer one style over another by judging the former as absolutely better than the latter.
- Learners need to be encouraged to make utmost use of their learning styles in order to be more empowered in various learning circumstances;
- learners' approaches are related to their learning styles;
- L2 instructors must allow the learners to be aware of their learning strengths and weakness.

The literature has identified various dimensions of learning styles. For example, Reid (1987) categorized learning styles into four perceptual learning modalities and two social ones by drawing on the results of a study. They are as follows:

- Visual learning: this style involves learners' tendency for reading through the eyes
- Auditory learning: This style involve the learners' tendency for learning through the ear (listening to lectures);
- Kinesthetic learning: This style has to do with the learners' tendency to learn more successfully through the movement (physical responses);

- Tactile learning: This style means that students can learn better through touch (as in building models);
- Individual learning: Such a style is concerned with learning more effectively by working alone; and
- Group learning: this style involves learning more effectively through cooperation.

Recently, the application of authentic materials in the instruction of English language in L2 classes has come to become the focus of teachers' attention. Furthermore, as Kilickaya (2004) asserts, the use of authentic materials in the classroom would cause English language teaching to be more effective, resulting in the improvement of students' learning process. ELT literature is replete with references to authentic materials. Currently, some discussions and debates are going on as to whether authentic materials must be incorporated in language classes as well as how they should be employed or best exploited. Obviously, the proponents of the application of authentic material share one idea: there are benefits learners get from being exposed to the language in authentic materials. As a matter of fact, a lot of linguists recommend using authentic materials in instruction due to their positive effect on students. In the view of Carter and Nunan (2001), authentic materials are considered as certain type of "texts" not earmarked for "teaching" purposes. Given the foregoing discussion, this study is aimed at investigating the impact of the employment of authentic audio and video resources on Iranian auditory and visual learners' speaking fluency.

The review of literature reveals different definitions of authentic materials. However, a shared element in all of these definitions is 'being exposed to real language as well as its use in its own community. In the same vein, Rogers (1988) characterizes authentic materials as those materials being 'appropriate' and of high 'quality' in terms of goals, objectives, students' needs and interest as well as 'natural' with respect to real life and meaningful communication. Harmer (1991) describes authentic texts as materials designed for native speakers. That is, the texts are real and they are written not for L2 learners, but for the speakers of the language. Jordan considers an authentic text as the one not composed for language instruction purposes (cited in Matsuda, 1997).

Wallace (1992) says that authentic texts have been described as real-life texts, not composed for pedagogic purposes. Consequently, authentic texts are intended for native speakers, consisting of "real" language. Peacock (1997) expands this by saying that authentic texts are materials produced to serve some social purpose in the language community. He compares them to non-authentic texts specifically written for language learning purposes. The notion of authenticity is very important to CLT, with the students exposed to the similar language as a native. Breen (1985) categorizes authenticity into the following four types:

- Authenticity of the texts which can be employed as input data for learners

;

- Authenticity of the students' own understanding of such texts;
- Authenticity of tasks which are helpful to language learning;
- Authenticity of the real social context of the classroom language

Rost (2005) asserts that authenticity is considered as a term used by researchers questionably. In the same veins, Kilickaya (2004) notes that authenticity is the topic of deep discussion by many scholars. Given the important role of speaking in learning a foreign language, the purpose of the present study was to investigate the effect of authentic auditory and visual materials on speaking fluency of Iranian EFL learners with auditory and visual learning styles. Therefore, this study aimed at answering the following research questions:

**Q1:** Does using authentic video materials have any significant effect on the speaking fluency of Iranian intermediate visual learners?

**Q2:** Does using authentic audio materials have any significant effect on the speaking fluency of Iranian intermediate auditory learners?

**Q3:** Is there any statistically significant difference between the fluency of auditory and visual learners as a result of using authentic materials?

## **2. Method**

### **2.1 Participants**

The participants of the present study were around 120 Iranian female EFL learners studying at the intermediate level of proficiency in one of the language institutes in Tehran. Initially, the participants were given a learning style questionnaire to find out the learners who were most auditorily or visually oriented. To this end, the researcher was able to identify 30 auditorily and 30 visually oriented learners. The selected participants were then placed into two groups consisting of a total number of 60 participants with one of the groups having 30 auditorily and another one having 30 visually oriented learners. These learners sat for a PET the scores of which were used to assure that both groups were homogeneous in terms of overall language proficiency. The learners were also homogenized in terms of speaking fluency by running a speaking interview before the main study.

### **2.2 Materials and Instruments**

The following instruments and materials were used in the present study:

### 2.2.1 Perceptual Learning Style Preference (PLSP)

In order to identify participants' learning style preferences, the Perceptual Learning Style Preference (Appendix A) Survey was administered to the participants. This questionnaire was developed by Reid in 1984. As Reid (1984) asserts, people learn in different ways. For example, some people learn primarily with their eyes (visual learners) or with their ears (auditory learners); some people prefer to learn by experience and/or by "hands-on" tasks (kinesthetic or tactile learners); some people learn better when they work alone, while others prefer to learn in groups. This questionnaire is designed to help the learners identify the way(s) they learn best and the way(s) they prefer to learn. This instrument consists of 30 randomly ordered statements. The participants responded based on a five point Likert-scale, ranging from "Strongly agree" (1 point), "Agree" (2 points), "Undecided" (3 points), "Disagree" (4 points) to "Strongly disagree" (5 points). The survey consists of randomly arranged sets of 5 statements on each of the six learning style preferences to be measured: visual (questions: 6,10,12,24,29); auditory (questions: 1,7,9,17,20); kinesthetic (questions: 2,8,15,19,26); tactile (questions: 11,14,16, 22, 25); group learning (questions: 3,4,5,21,23); and individual learning (questions: 13, 18, 27, 28, 30). The scores range from 30 to 150.

### 2.2.2 Preliminary English Test (PET)

A sample of Preliminary English Test (PET) was adopted from Preliminary English Test 5 of Cambridge ESOL Examinations published by Cambridge University Press (2008) in order to determine the learners' proficiency level in general and their speaking fluency in particular. This was done to select a homogenous sample of participants. Three papers of PET were used in this research as described in Table 1.

Table 1

*Different sections of PET*

Paper 1	1 hour	Reading and writing	5 Parts	35 Marks for Reading and 25 Marks for writing
Paper 2	35 minutes	Listening	4 Parts	25 Marks
Paper 3	10-12minutes	Speaking	4 parts	15 Marks
Total score:100				

#### ***Paper1: Reading (1 hour)***

In PET, paper number 1 is dedicated to evaluating reading and writing. The reading part which consists of 35 questions is presented in 5 parts. Part one consists of five multiple choice

questions (five points) , part two presents five matching questions (five points) , part three, included 10 true/false questions (10 points) , part 4 entails five multiple questions (five points) , and part five is a cloze test which includes 10 multiple choice gaps (10 points). The reading section has a total score of 35. The writing section has 5 fill in the blank questions which are scored objectively and two writing tasks. In the first task the learners are required to write a 35 to 40 word paragraph and it has 5 marks. In the second task the test-takers are required to write a 100 paragraph and it has 15 marks.

### ***Paper 2: Listening (30 minutes)***

This paper consists of four parts; part one has seven multiple choice questions(seven points), part two includes six multiple choice questions(six points), part three has six fill in the gap questions(six points) and part four consists of five yes/no questions(five points).the listening part therefore have 24 points overall.

### ***Paper 3: Speaking (10-12 minutes)***

The speaking section of PET consists of four parts. In the first part, the examiner introduces him / herself and asks the participants' name and personal information and asks them to spell their names. In part two, the examiner gives the participants a picture and asks them to talk about it together. In part three, each participant is given the chance to speak alone, the examiner provides the participant with a colored photograph taken from the mentioned book and asks the learner to talk about it. In part four, the examiner asks the participants to talk more about the photograph in part 3; for instance they are asked to state their opinion or to talk about something that had happened to them.

## **2.2.3 Fluency Measurement Scale**

In the current study speaking fluency was measured in line with Marashi and Dolatdoost (2016). As Marashi and Dolatdoost maintained the factors they used to measure speaking fluency had already been used in different studies on speaking fluency (e.g. Breiner-Sanders, Lowe, Miles, & Swender, 2000; Chambers, 1997; Skehan & Foster, 1999; Tavakoli& Foster, 2008 cited in Marashi & Dolatdoost, 2016). The factors include:

- “The number of utterances that were abandoned before being complete (false starts);
- The number of repetitions of words, phrases, or clauses (repetitions);

- The number of lexicosyntactic repairs or reformulations for correction (reformulations); and
- The number of lexical items that are substituted for another (replacements). (Marashi & Dolatdoost, 2016, pp. 110-111).

In line with Marashi and Dolatdoost, “In this way, higher measures show higher dysfluency; hence, all dysfluency measures were subtracted from 100 to obtain the fluency measures and the range of fluency measure was between 0 and 100” (p. 111). The reliability of the measure was estimated by piloting it on the sample of 30 EFL learners. By employing Pearson correlation coefficient inter-rater reliability was found 0.89.

#### **2.2.4 Authentic Audio Materials**

Some authentic audio materials were downloaded from the Internet and used in the classroom as treatment for the auditory group. The materials selected were relevant to the topics of the respective lesson in the course book. These materials were taken from TED talks available at <https://www.ted.com/talks>.

#### **2.2.5 Authentic Video Materials**

Some authentic video materials were also downloaded from the Internet and used in the classroom as treatment for the visual group. The materials selected were relevant to the topics of the respective lesson in the course book. These materials were taken from TED talks available at <https://www.ted.com/talks>. It should be noted that the audio and video materials used in this study were had the same content.

#### **2.2.6 Course Book**

The course book being utilized by the institute at the time of this investigation was Top Notch (Ascher & Saslow, 2012) comprising 6 units, which was taught per-term (52 hours). This book consists of the following activities in each unit:

- Extensive speaking, pronunciation and vocabulary sections
- Thorough grammar sections with clear examples and practice
- Comprehensive listening activities with scripts
- Contemporary, engaging reading materials taken from authentic sources
- And finally, the Review and Practice pages after each unit which bring all the learning activities together.

### 3. Procedure

At the outset of the study, the researcher selected 120 female participants in a language institute in Tehran. The participants were given Perceptual Learning Style questionnaire to identify the most auditory and visual learners. To this end, 30 auditory and thirty visual learners were selected. Next, a PET was administered to both groups and the scores were analyzed to assure that there was not any significant difference between the two groups. Furthermore, they were given a speaking test and the results were used to measure the fluency level of the two groups and to make sure that both groups were the same for the speaking fluency. Next the treatment was carried out in the following steps:

In both groups along with the materials used in the course book some authentic materials were also used which was in line with the speaking topic of the lesson. To this aim, authentic audio and video materials were used for the auditory and visual groups, respectively. To carry out the activities in each group the following steps were taken:

- The audio or video material selected in line with the topic of the lesson was played for the learners and the learners were asked to pay attention to the main ideas in the material and note down the gist and the keywords
  - The teacher wrote down the keywords and put them on the board.
  - The learners were asked to guess the meaning of the words.
  - The teacher gave them the definition of the keywords and asked learners to make some sentences with them.
- The teacher asked the learners to compare their notes concerning the gist of the materials.
  - The teacher then asked the learners to listen to (in the audio group) or watch the material (in the visual group) again.
  - Then, there was a follow up speaking activity held in groups in which the learners discussed their reaction to the content of the materials.
  - At the end, there was a round off class discussion in which the whole class discussed the content of the authentic materials they were exposed to.

The treatment lasted for 10 sessions in each group. At the end of the treatment, the participants in both groups were given a speaking post-test which was used to measure the speaking fluency level of the participants. The results of this test was employed to explore the research questions.

## 4. Results

### 4.1 Reliability of Measures

Before embarking on the main study it deemed necessary to check the reliability of the instruments of the study. The two main instruments in the study were the perceptual learning style questionnaire and speaking fluency measure. Since the fluency measure needed qualitative assessment inter-rater reliability was employed for estimating the reliability and as for the perceptual learning styles questionnaire Cronbach's Alpha was used. All the reliability analyses was done on a pilot sample of 30 language learners before the main study. Table 2 shows the reliability indices of the speaking measure and Table 3 shows the reliability index of the auditory and visual subscales of perceptual learning styles.

Table 2

*Inter-rater Reliability of Speaking Fluency Measure*

		SPrater2
SPrater1	Pearson Correlation	.893**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	30

\*\* Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

As seen in Table 3 Pearson correlation coefficient shows the correlation value of 0.89 between the speaking fluency scores given by the two raters. This value is above 0.70 which means that the fluency measure has the required reliability.

Table 3

*Descriptive Statistics and Alpha Value of Auditory and Visual Scales*

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation	Alpha
Audio Pilot	30	9.00	25.00	18.9667	5.08197	0.755
Visual Pilot	30	15.00	25.00	19.5333	2.60944	0.821
Valid N (listwise)	30					

As seen in Table 3 the Cronbach's Alpha was found 0.75 for the auditory scale and 0.82 for visual scale and both of them are acceptable indices of reliabilities.

### 4.2 Language Proficiency and Speaking Fluency of the Two Groups of the Study

At the outset of the experimentation, the language proficiency and speaking fluency scores of the two groups of the study (auditory and visual groups of students) were compared to make

sure the two groups are homogenized in terms of language proficiency and speaking fluency. Table 4 shows the mean scores and standard deviations of two groups.

Table 4

*Descriptive Statistics of the Auditory and Visual Groups in terms of PET and Fluency Scores*

		Descriptive				Kolmogorov-Smirnov		
	Groups	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	Statistic	df	Sig.
PET	Auditory	30	76.8000	3.08947	.56406	.983	30	.890
	Visual	30	75.2333	3.92765	.71709	.957	30	.266
Fluency Pre	Auditory	30	56.7333	2.85190	.52068	.986	30	.948
	Visual	30	55.5000	2.89768	.52904	.979	30	.787

In the PET, auditory group had a mean score of 76.80 (SD=3.08) and visual group had a mean score of 75.23 (SD=3.92). In fluency pretest, auditory group had a mean score of 56.73 (SD=2.85) and visual group had a mean score of 55.50 (SD=2.86). In addition Kolmogorov-Smirnov test of normality showed that the PET and Fluency pretest scores in the two groups were normally distributed ( $p>0.05$ ). Table 5 displays the result of independent samples t-test between the two groups.

Table 5

*Result of Independent Samples t-test between the Two Groups*

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means		95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
		F	Sig.	T	df	Sig.(2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
Fluency Pre	Equal variances assumed	.118	.73	1.66	58	.102	1.23	.74	-.25	2.71

	Equal variances not assumed	1.66	57.98	.102	1.23	.74	-25	2.71		
PET	Equal variances assumed	2.30	.13	1.71	58	.091	1.56	.91	-25	3.39
	Equal variances not assumed	1.7	54.95	.092	1.56	.91	-26	3.39		

According to the output of independent samples t-test there was no significant differences between the auditory and visual groups in terms of fluency ( $t=1.66, p>0.05$ ) and also in terms of language proficiency ( $t=1.71, p>0.05$ ).

### 4.3 Answering the First Research Question

The first research question of the study was about the effect of using authentic video materials on the speaking fluency of Iranian intermediate visual learners. In order to find the answer to this question speaking fluency scores of the students receiving authentic video materials before and after the treatment were compared. Table 6 shows the descriptive statistics of visual group of the study before and after the treatments.

Table 6  
*Descriptive Statistics of Visual Group of Study before and after the Treatments*

Group Statistics						Kolmogorov-Smirnova		
	Groups	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	Statistic	df	Sig.
Visual	Pretest	30	55.5000	2.89768	.52904	.073	30	.200*
	Posttest	30	68.1333	3.35007	.61164	.083	30	.200*

Table 6 shows that the students receiving authentic video materials had a mean score of 55.50 (SD=2.89) in fluency pretest and a mean score of 68.13 (SD=3.35) in fluency posttest. Kolmogorov Smirnov test of normality also showed that all the scores in pretest and posttest are normally distributed. ( $P>0.05$ ). Although descriptive statistics give some clues regarding the performances of the visual group on fluency pretest and posttest, it cannot be judged if the

differences in performances are significant or not. Table 7 shows the results of paired samples t-test on the pretest and posttest scores of visual students.

Table 7  
*Results of Paired Samples t-test on the Pretest and Posttest Scores of Visual Students*

		Paired Differences							
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference		t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
					Lower	Upper			
Pair 1	pretest – posttest	-1.26333	3.15664	.57632	-13.8120	-11.4546	-21.92	29	.000

According to results of t-test there was a significant difference between the fluency pretest and posttest of the visual group of students ( $t=21.92$ ,  $p\leq 0.05$ ). Therefore, using authentic visual material had positive and significant effect on the speaking fluency of the Iranian EFL learners.

#### 4.4 Answering the Second Research Question

The second research question of the study concerned the effect of using authentic audio materials on the speaking fluency of Iranian intermediate auditory learners. In order to find the answer to this question, speaking fluency scores of the students receiving authentic audio materials before and after the treatment were compared. Table 8 shows the descriptive statistics of the auditory group of the study before and after the treatments.

Table 8  
*Descriptive Statistics of Auditory Group of Study before and after the Treatments*

Group Statistics						Kolmogorov-Smirnov		
Groups		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	Statistic	df	Sig.
Auditory	Pretest	30	56.7333	2.85190	.52068	.096	30	.200*
	Posttest	30	68.5667	2.88496	.52672	.111	30	.200*

Table 8 shows that the students receiving authentic audio materials had a mean score of 56.73 (SD=2.85) in fluency pretest and a mean score of 68.56 (SD=2.88) in fluency posttest. Kolmogorov Smirnov test of normality also showed that all the scores in pretest and posttest are normally distributed. ( $P>0.05$ ). Table 9 shows the results of paired samples t-test on the pretest and posttest scores of auditory students.

Table 9  
*Results of Paired Samples t-test on the Pretest and Posttest scores of Auditory Students*

		Paired Differences							
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference		t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
					Lower	Upper			
Pair 1	pretest – posttest	-1.1833	.7466	.1363	-12.11	-11.55	-86.80	29	.000

According to results of t-test there was a significant difference between the fluency pretest and posttest of the auditory group of students ( $t=86.80$ ,  $p\leq 0.05$ ). Therefore, using authentic audio material had positive and significant effect on the speaking fluency of the Iranian auditory EFL learners.

#### 4.5 Answering the Third Research Question

The third research question of the study was about the comparative effect of audio vs visual materials on the speaking fluency of the students. It was earlier demonstrated that visual and auditory students were homogeneous in terms of speaking fluency before the treatments. Therefore, it can be argued that any difference in the fluency scores of the visual and auditory students after treatment could be attributed to the effect of treatment. Table 10 compares the fluency scores of the visual and auditory students after the treatments.

Table 10  
*Fluency Scores of the visual and Auditory Students after the treatments*

	Groups	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Fluency Post	Auditory	30	68.5667	2.88496	.52672
	Visual	30	68.1333	3.35007	.61164

Descriptive statistics indicated that both auditory and visual students had similar performance on the fluency measure after the treatments. In other words, auditory students had a mean score of 68.56 (SD=2.88) and visual students had a mean score of 68.13 (SD=3.35). To further make sure about the equality of the visual and auditory students in terms of speaking fluency after treatment, their scores were compared using the statistical technique of independent samples t-test.

Table 11

*Results of Independent Samples Test between Speaking Fluency Posttest of the Visual and Auditory Students*

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means									
				Sig.		Mean Difference (95% CI)		t		Sig. (2-tailed)		95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
				.000		.407		.807		.04907		Lower Bound Upper Bound	
FluencyPost	Equal variances assumed	50	48	53	8	593	3333	.407	.807	1.182	.04907		
	Equal variances not assumed			53	6.7	593	33	.433	.807	1.183	.04983		

Independent samples t-test indicated (see Table 11) that there was no significant difference between the speaking fluency posttest of the visual and auditory students ( $t=0.53$ ,  $p>0.05$ ). Therefore it was concluded that authentic video materials in visual group and authentic audio materials in auditory group had similar positive effect on the speaking fluency of the Iranian EFL learners.

## 5. Discussion and Conclusion

The purpose of the study was to investigate the effect of authentic auditory and visual materials on speaking fluency of Iranian EFL learners with auditory and visual styles of learning. The study adopted a pretest posttest design and students of the study took the speaking fluency test

before and after treatment. The participants of the study included 30 language learners with visual learning styles and 30 students with auditory learning styles who were instructed with authentic visual and authentic auditory materials respectively. The results of the data analyses indicated that using authentic visual materials had positive and significant effect on the visual students and authentic auditory materials had positive and significant effect on the students with auditory preference. The cross comparison between the two groups of students indicated that there was no significant difference between the speaking fluency scores of the visual and auditory students after treatment which point to the fact that both authentic visual and auditory materials had similar effect on visual and auditory students.

As for the findings of the investigation, it is possible to give multiple explanations. Initially, L2 teaching scholars and researchers have always attached importance to the application of authentic materials. A lot of scholars showed the efficacy of authentic materials to corroborate L2 learning and instruction (Guariento& Morley, 2001; Paltridge, 2001; Shrum&Glisan, 2000). The majority of these investigations show that this kind of materials make contribution to the improvement of learners' motivation towards reading. Otte (2006) and Thanajaro, (2000) assert that L2 learners' self-satisfaction and motivation increased following the use of authentic texts in the classroom. Guariento and Morely (2001) came to the conclusion that authentic materials play an important role in motivating individuals to learn the language through making them feel that they are learning the real language.

Moreover, this study adjusted the kinds of authentic materials to the L2 learners' learning styles. To put another way, participants with visual preferences were exposed to visual materials while students with auditory materials were exposed to auditory materials. Past studies show the consistency between the type of instruction and students' learning styles. Oxford (2005) asserts that learning styles and strategies seem to be the major factors which are useful in specifying how L2 learners learn a second or foreign language. Joy and Kolb (2009) say that the idea of learning styles is conceded with the individual differences as well as preferences. It also involves preferred or usual patterns of mental functioning, dealing with novel information. Consequently, the match between the learners' learning styles and type of instruction would result in better outcomes as learners would feel more comfortable with the instruction. It is claimed that an ideal method of instruction is the method which fits the learner's learning style (Kraus, Reed, & Fitzgerald, 2001). McLoughlin (1999) has shown that people learn best when information is given in ways that are consistent with their preferred styles.

## References

- Atas, M. (2015). The reduction of speaking anxiety in EFL learners through drama technique. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 176(10), 961–969.
- Breen, M., P. (1985). Authenticity in the language classroom *Applied Linguistics*. 6(1), 60-70.
- Breiner-Sanders, K. E., Lowe, P., Miles, J., & Swender, E. (2000). ACTFL proficiency guidelines speaking revised 1999. *Foreign Language Annals*, 33(1), 13-19.
- Brown, H. D. (2007). *Principles of language learning & teaching* (5th Ed.). New York: Longman.
- Brumfit, C.J. (Ed.). (1984). *General English Syllabus Design*. ELT Documents No. 118. London: Pergamon Press & the British Council.
- Çagatay, S. (2015). Examining EFL students' foreign language speaking anxiety: The case at a Turkish state university. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 199(7), 648 – 656.
- Carter, R., & Nunan, D. (2001). The Cambridge guide to teaching English to Speakers of other languages. *Cambridge University Press*.
- Chambers, J. K. (1997). Gloss and language learning: The evidence of Chesterfield. *Journal of English Linguistics*. 23(1), 155-66.
- Chaney, A. (1998). Teaching Oral Communications in Grades K-8, Boston: *Ellyn and Bacon*. London: Longman.
- Ejzenberg, R. (2000). The juggling act of oral fluency: A psycho-sociolinguistic Metaphor. In: Riggensbach, H. (Ed.), Perspectives on fluency. *The University of Michigan Press, Michigan*, pp. 287–3
- Fewell, N. (2010). Language learning strategies and English language proficiency: An investigation of Japanese EFL University students. *TESOL Journal*, 2, 159-174.
- Foster, P., & Skehan, P. (1999). The influence of source of planning and focus of planning on task-based performance. *Language Teaching Research*, 3, 215-247.
- Freed, B. (1995). What makes us think that students who study abroad become Fluent? In B. Freed (Ed.), *Second Language Acquisition in a Study Abroad Context* (pp. 123-148). Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Fung, Y, M., & Li Min, Y. (2016). Effects of board game on speaking ability of low-proficiency ESL learners. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics & English Literature*, 5(3), 261-271.
- Gower, R., Phillips, D., & Walters, S. (2005). *Teaching practice handbook*. Macmillan Publishing Company.
- Guariento, W. & J. Morely (2001) Text and task authenticity in the EFL classroom. *ELT Journal*, 55 (4), 347-353.
- Hammad Rafada, S., & Madini, A. A. (2017). Major causes of Saudi learners' speaking anxiety in EFL classrooms. *International Journal of English Language Education*, 5(1), 54-71.
- Harmer, J. (1991). *The Practice of English Language Teaching*. London: Longman.
- Housen, (2005). Structure complexity and the efficacy of explicit grammar

- instruction. In A. Housen & M. Pierrard (Eds.), *Investigations in instructed second language acquisition* (pp. 235- 269). Brussels, Belgium: Mouton De Gruyter
- Joy, S., & Kolb, D. (2009) Are there cultural differences in learning Style. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 33 (1), 6 9-85.
- Kilickaya, F. (2004). Authentic materials and culture content in EFL classrooms. *The Internet ELT Journal*, (7)10.
- Kraus, J., Reed, S., & Fitzgerald, D. (2001). Validation of learning strategy Interventions For students with CD: *Results of a programmatic research effort*. In Y. L. Wong,
- Larsen-Freeman, D. & M.H. Long (1991). *An Introduction to Second Language Acquisition Research*. London: Longman.
- Lennon, P. (1990). Investigating fluency in EFL: A quantitative approach. *Language Learning*, 40 (3), 387-417.
- Marashi, H., & Dolatdoost, M. (2016). ADHD and adolescent EFL learners' speaking complexity, accuracy, and fluency in English. *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research* 4(2), 105-126.
- McLoughlin, C. (1999). The implications of the research literature on learning styles for the design of instructional material. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, 15(3), 222-241.
- Mulalic, A., Shah, P., & Ahmad, F. (2009). Learning-style preference of ESL students. *Asian Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, 1 (2), 9-17.
- Otte, J. (2006). *Real language to real people: a descriptive and exploratory Case study of the outcomes of aural authentic texts on the listening comprehension of adult ESL students enrolled in an advanced ESL listening course*. Dissertation Abstracts International.
- Oxford, R. (2005). *Language learning strategies: What every teacher should know*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle.
- Paltridge, B. (2001). Genre and the language learning classroom. *Michigan: University of Michigan*.
- Reid, J. M. (1984). Perceptual learning style preferences questionnaire. Laramie: *University of Wyoming, Department of English*.
- Reid, J. M. (1987). The learning style preferences of ESL students. *TESOL Quarterly*, 21(1), 87-111.
- Reid, J. M. (Ed). (1995). Preface. In J. Reid. (Ed.), *Learning styles in the ESL/ EFL classroom* (pp. viii-xvii). New York: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.
- Riazi, A. M., & Aryashokouh, A. (2007). Lexis in English textbooks in Iran: Analysis of exercises and proposals for consciousness-raising activities. *Pacific Association of Applied Linguists*, 11, 17-34.
- Richards, C. J., & Rodgers, T. S. (2002) *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J.C.(2006).Secondlanguage teacher education today.RELCJournal,39(2),1
58177. Toward An understanding fluency: A micro analysis of nonnative speaker conversations.” *Discourse Processes* 14, pp. 423-441.
- Riggenbach, (1991). Promoting oral skills. In M. Celce-Murcia (Ed.), *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (2nd ed., pp. 125-136). New York: Newbury House.

- Rost, M. (2005). *Generating student motivation. A paper presented at the Longman Teacher Training Tour*
- Schmidt, R. (1992). Psychological mechanisms underlying second language fluency. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 14(4), 357-385.
- Schmidt, R. (1993). Consciousness, learning and interlanguage pragmatics. In G.
- Kasper & S. Blum-Kulka (Eds.), *Interlanguage pragmatics* (pp. 21-42). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Shrum, J. L., & Glisan, E. W. (2000). *Teacher's handbook: contextualized language instruction*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle.
- Su Bergil, A. (2016). The influence of willingness to communicate on overall speaking skills among EFL learners. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 232(14), 177 – 187.
- Tavakoli, P., & Foster, P. (2008). Task design and second language performance: The effect of narrative type on learner output. *Language Learning*, 58(2), 439-473.
- Thanajaro, M. (2000). *Using authentic materials to develop listening Comprehension in the English as a foreign language classroom*. Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Blacksburg, Virginia.
- Towell, R., Hawkins, R., & Bazergui, N. (1996). 'The Development of Fluency in Advanced Learners of French'. *Applied Linguistics*, 17(1), 84-119.
- Ur, P. (1996). *A course in language teaching. Practice and theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wallace, C. (1992). *Reading*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Zare, P., & Noordin, N. (2011). The relationship between language learning strategy use and reading comprehension achievement among Iranian undergraduate EFL learners. *World Applied Science Journal*, 13 (8), 1870-1877.