ISSN 1798-4769
Journal of Language Teaching and Research, Vol. 6, No. 5, pp. 1081-1092, September 2015
DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.17507/jltr.0605.22

The Effect of Lecturing in Student-generated Photomontage on EFL Learners' Fluency, Accuracy and Complexity

Jaleh Hassaskhah
English Department, Guilan University, Rasht, Iran

Behzad Barekat
English Department, Guilan University, Rasht, Iran

Shohreh Rahimizadeh Asli
English Department, Guilan University, Rasht, Iran

***Abstract*—This study examines if the two tasks exploited, model-based lecture and the photomontage one, have been effective in upgrading students' speaking skills in CAF domain. From a methodological point of view an independent samples t-test design is used to obtain data from 33 subjects consisting of both male and female studying EFL in Guilan University. Group one and two are Oral II students and group three are Oral I, each consisting of 11 members. The video recorded data are transcribed and coded for later analysis. Measures include areas of CAF. Results of t-tests show that lecturing on photomontage generated higher fluency and some trend in accuracy with no effect on complexity. The results are discussed in the light of Skehan's CAF triad, as well as competing theories of attention allocation during task performance. The findings provide insight into impact of task use and present suggestions for EFL/ESL teachers and materials developers.**

***Index Terms*—student-generated photomontage, EFL, fluency, accuracy and complexity**

I. Introduction

"The innateness of speech in human development and its primacy as a mode of communication would suggest that the teaching of speaking has been central force in language learning" (Martinez-Flor & Uso-Juan, 2006). However as the course of history proves many teaching methods failed in improving learners' speaking ability and that lead to more research in this respect. Vygotsky's theories have had a huge influence on media and literacy educations toward a social model of learning that cannot be narrowed to a teaching transmission model. (Goodwyn, 2004) Vygotsky observed that learning is thoroughly social and that we learn when we are active (Petrina, 2007).Also Ellis (2006) views learning as originating from social interaction. Teacher is the only person in the class who can lead students to authentic, interactive use of language and that would not be possible through using exercises and repetitive tasks suggested in the course books. "EFL teachers need to be particularly adept at organizing class activities that are authentic, motivating and varied." (Celce-Murcia, 2001) "Where speaking is a priority, language classroom need to become talking classrooms" (Thornbury, 2005, p.131)in this respect photomontage with its multi- dimensional aspects is not only authentic but absolutely motivating and engaging as students enthusiastic lecturing proves this.

Photomontage with its multidisciplinary features opens new avenues, as we know left brain is associated with artistic orientations, so one can deploy art to teach language (Long and Doughty, 2009, p.75). Photomontage combines art with language and this may appeal to many students that in the other cases show reluctance toward active participation in classroom talks. Petrina (2007) expresses that: pictures "worth a thousand words". They are evocative, more precise and potent in triggering wide array of associations therefore they provide creativity, therefore inserting photomontage as a task can trigger students' creativity and that in turn will ostensibly escalate their participation in talk and negotiation of meaning. This leads students toward a more dialogic task and that is the focus of social constructivism that emphasizes the interaction between learners and also others (Pritchard, 2007). Learning is viewed as originating from social interaction (Ellis, 2006). As Richards (2006) declares: "second language learning is a highly interactive process" and "the quality of this interaction is thought to have considerable influence on language learning. Savignon (1972 cited in Savignon 2002) stated that it is not easy for learners to use their learning unless they had much opportunity to practice in circumstances similar to those of real life situations.

For the purpose of this study "communicative competence" is defined as the ability to use the language to express a variety of meaning, for diverse purposes in spontaneous, unrehearsed, authentic communication. This study postulates that photomontage as a task defined in current CLT (communicative language teaching) or TBLT (task based language teaching) is able to result in students' initiation and negotiation in class talk and as a result expand their oral repertoire.

II. Literature Review

Despite a history of second-language learning that certainly predates writing, formal accounts of second-language teaching neglected teaching speaking at the expense of mastering target language structure, and vocabulary (Bailey, 2004, Chastain, 1988; Richards & Rodgers, 2002). Certainly, a prevailing belief that all language teaching prior to the mid-twentieth century entailed a grammar-translation approach would support such a notion. Then, for many years, English language teachers have continued to teach speaking just as a repetition of drills or memorization of dialogues (Bygate, 2001 cited in Uso-Juan & Martinez-Flor, 2006). Today, world requires that the goal of teaching speaking should improve students communicative skills, because only in that way, students can express themselves and learn how to follow the social and cultural rules appropriate in each communicative circumstance (Uso-Juan &Martinez-Flor, 2006). It was argued that the nature of "interaction" requires learners to recognize: 1. the very different functions speaking perform in daily communication and 2. the different purposes for which students need speaking skills. Accordingly, as cited in Uso-Juan and Martinez-Flor (2006),Levelt's (1989) model of speech production along with functional (Haliday, 1985) and pragmatic (Leech, 1983; Levinson, 1983) view of language and also concept of discourse analysis (McCarthy, 1991) gave rise to considering speaking as interactive, social and contextualized communicative event. Therefore theoretical foundation for teaching speaking in a communicative framework emerged. Communicative approach tended to emphasize the spontaneous and creative speech of learners seeking to avoid rather than exploit repetition. Even Hadley (2003 cited in Aliakbari & Jamalvandi, 2010) proposed a shift from grammatical to communicative competence.

Communicative language teaching (CLT) sets as its goal the teaching of communicative competence (Richards, 2006). The teaching of oral communication skills and the development of fluency in language use became the focal point. Fluency is natural language use occurring when a speaker engages in meaningful interaction and maintains comprehensible and ongoing communication despite limitations in his or her communicative competence (Bailey, 2004; Richards, 2006; Skehan, 2003). EFL teachers should create a classroom environment where students have real-life communication, authentic activities, and meaningful tasks that promote oral language. This can occur when students involve in the process of speaking by thinking which later develops into words in a number of phases, moving from imaging to inner speech to inner speaking to speech (Vygotsky, 1962 cited in Petrina, 2007). Therefore, it will not be out of place to suggest that classrooms must provide the learners with tasks to change images into speech. This will not only fill the classes with talk as much as possible but also opens windows to the ways learners think!

In addition, in CLT framework, some activities are suggested to enhance communication. The most common type of communicative output activities are role plays and discussion, task-completion, information-gathering, opinion-sharing, information-transfer and reasoning-gap activities. Therefore, tasks which focus on fluency, natural language use, communication, handling unpredictable language, and linking language to context, may lead to fluent, confident, and persuasive speech. One such task which is potentially able to involve student in an interactive, social and contextualized communicative event, and results in simultaneous interaction under time constraints is 'Photomontage'. Photomontage is a technique by which students design a composite photographic image by combining images from separate photographic sources. These visual images are known to be powerful tools for expressing the interests, and opinions The term was coined by Berlin Dadaists in 1918 and was employed by artists such as George Grosz, John Heartfield, Raoul Hausmann and Hannah Höch for images often composed from mass-produced sources such as newspapers and magazines (Ades, 1976). A similar method is realized today through image-editing software. This latter technique is referred to by professionals as "compositing", and in casual usage is often called "photoshopping". The creation of artificial immersive virtual reality, arising as a result of technical exploitation of new inventions is a practice that creates good reason for meaningful interaction. In addition, in the education sphere, media arts director Rene Acevedo and Adrian Brannan have left their mark on art classrooms the world over. This study postulates that EFL classrooms also, can benefit from the task because first of all it requires natural language use, as students' talk revolves around the piece of artwork that they themselves have created. Second, in cases of miscommunication, the speaker is expected to try his/ her best to resolve the problem, using communication strategies. Third, the language is simply used to communicate meaning as is the case in natural communication which happens spontaneously and under time pressure, and fourth, the topic of discussion revolves around the artwork /Photomontage, created by the students themselves which is likely to be authentic, novel and motivating.

III. Photomontage in CLT Framework

Speaking resulted from using Photomontage can be authentic, because it is commonly observed that people see a piece of artwork and start talking to the artist, seeking some information, or even defending ideas upon which they have been produced, or revealing inner thoughts to what it may or may not be. Authentic materials provide exposure to real language, relate more closely to learners' needs and support more creative approach to teaching. This is supported by Celce-Murcia (2001) who suggests 'the use of authentic, engaging material should be the basis for in-class activities.' Besides, Clarke and Silberstein (1977, p.51) cited in Richards (2006) urged: "classroom activities should parallel the 'the real world' as closely as possible (see also: Opp-beckman & Klinghammer, 2006).

Pictures are manipulated in a variety of strategies (Rueckert, 2006) as well. Pictures can evoke mental images to help learners recall a term or concept; they are easily accessible and can reinforce literal, critical and creative thinking. (Wood & Tinajero, 2002). Joyce, Hrycauk and Calhoun (2001 cited in Wood & Tinajero,2002) use pictures in a special way called 'Picture Word Inductive Model' (PWIM) which uses pictures containing familiar objects and actions to elicit words from children's listening and speaking vocabularies(See also: Calhoun, 1999; Joyce and Calhoun,1998; cited in Wood & Tinajero,2002).Pictures are used for a variety of purposes from ice-breaking, dictation, storytelling, working on specific vocabulary or grammar item, developing different and even difficult topics, playing games, teaching prepositions, activities, jobs, use of gerunds and many more in language teaching (Teaching with pictures, 2012:see also Terry, 2008).Visual stimuli can be utilized in several ways as starter material for interaction (Richards and Renandya, 2002). Goldstein (2008) prefers using images rather than pictures and he defines them as more direct representations or more open to interpretation. He uses images to open up students' thinking and has no pre-defined outcome in mind. He states: "we should be granting the image the space it deserves in our classroom." (p.2) He mentions image as tool for higher-level thinking in both students and teachers. Lee and Liang (2012) incorporated audiovisual stimulations in various forms to enhance speech because many students have reported speech as essential for career development (Zekeri, 2004 cited in Lee & Liang, 2012).

As the literature indicates, despite the diversity of the strategies employed in teaching speaking, some points were common. In most cases teaching aids such as visuals (images, pictures, etc.) are used along with topics, technologies, or tasks which were considered appropriate for eliciting talk from the learners. However, none tried to focus on students' attempt to represent their inner thoughts through the visual & technology- supported images as a source of eliciting topic, discussion, and negotiation. This study therefore is contributory for employing this perspective in the teaching of speaking to EFL students.

IV. Research Questions and Hypothesis

Research question: "What areas of CAF triad -Complexity, Accuracy, Fluency- (Skehan, 2009) improve in students' performance on photomontage in comparison with their model-based lectures?"

Research Hypothesis: Some areas of CAF triad will improve in learners' self-generated photomontage in comparison with model-based lectures.

V. Methodology

There are a range of approaches to account for performance on language learning tasks. As Skehan (2009) suggests complexity, accuracy and fluency (CAF) triad has proved useful in measuring second language performance. CAF (complexity, accuracy and fluency) as a triad has been used for evaluating performance in written and oral tasks.

For this study independent t-test of the 8 variables was carried out. These include: Different rates to measure the CAF triad such as: Complexity 1) Percentage of Lexical Words (LD), Complexity 2)Ratio of Lexical to Function words(L/F), Accuracy 1)the percentage of error free verb forms (EFVF), Accuracy 2) the percentage of Error-free T-units (EFTU) and Fluency 1-a) average number of words per minute of each task (ANWPM), 1-b) average number of words in the whole task(ANWT), Fluency 2-a) average number of T-units per minute of each task (ANTUPM), 2-b) average number of T-units in the whole tasks(ANTUT), Fluency 3-a) average number of syllables per minute of each task(ANSPM), and 3-b) average number of syllables in the whole tasks(ANST).

A. Participants

The participants in this study were 45 English major Freshers at University of Guilan, branch of humanities both male and female. Due to some problems in data transcription, audibility problems and voice quality some of them were discarded from the final data analysis therefore we had 33 persons in Oral 1 and Oral 2 courses in two semesters. Oral 2 groups that shape our G1 and G2 groups were video recorded during winter semester of 2012-2013 and G3 students which were Oral 1 were video recorded during the spring course of 2013. Each group consisted of 11 participants. The age range of the participants is between 18 to 22 (94%) and the rest of them are between 26 to 30 (6%).

In this study every participant is compared for the two tasks. All groups, G1, G2 and G3 had Oral classes twice a week for ninety minutes. The procedure that all groups went through was identical. They first listened to a lecture (in G1 and G2 about 'New trends in children's media use' and in G3 about 'News media and different ways of getting the news') and discussed about it in the classroom. The text and the DVD of the lecture were also provided for them. The following sessions each student had the chance to present the topic as a lecturing task to the other classmates and this procedure was video recorded. After all students had gone through the first task the second one was introduced. Each student had to make a photomontage (about any topic) and then in class present it to the other students.

B. Materials and Procedures

This procedure took place in two different semesters of the academic year 2012-2013. In the winter semester 22 English major participants of the Oral II courses were video recorded and the following semester 11 of the Oral I freshers were video recorded. Learners were supposed to do the two tasks, one model-based lecture that they watched

and discussed in class and had access to its text and DVD to practice at home and give lecture the following session and the other was Photomontage task that they made at home, thought about its topic and presented in class for the others

C. Data Analysis

All statistical analyses were carried out using statistical package SPSS 20 for Windows. Different kinds of statistical analyses are used such as descriptive statistics, which provide information about means, standard deviations and skewness, also independent t-tests, are used for the comparison of the two task features based on the CAF triad.

First of all the researcher watched all the films through to familiarize with the topics. It was very necessary because in photomontage students demonstrated on different topics. The second stage the program Pot Player was installed. This program provides this capacity to control it while you are in a Microsoft Word file; therefore as you are typing you have access to the video file. After writing holistically, the transcription conventions were also utilized. This stage clarifies the written data for later coding and analysis. Burns (1999, P176) believes that transcription provides useful details of classroom interaction. All data was coded for T-units, words and syllables in order to calculate fluency also the lexical and function words were codified in order to make the counting easier for complexity measures, furthermore all kinds of errors in the text were highlighted, tagging different kinds of errors for accuracy measures, to ease operationalization of the procedures of the current study.

Intrarater measures were used in the transcription and coding of the narratives. The transcription of the narratives was carried out by the researcher. Intrarater reliability reached 97%.

D. Results of Part One, Complexity

Table1 & 2. Mean scores, Standard Deviations, and t-values of the students' lectures on model-based and photomontage based on LD & L/F in group one. (Table 1 is presented in the appendix- all descriptive tables are in appendix)

TABLE 2,
G1,INDEPENDENT SAMPLES TEST

		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
LD	Equal variances assumed	.759	.394	.908	20	.375	.01819091	.02002801	-.02358679	.05996861
	Equal variances not assumed			.908	17.439	.376	.01819091	.02002801	-.02398367	.06036549
L/F	Equal variances assumed	2.350	.141	.259	20	.798	.03465091	.13358635	-.024400534	.31330716
	Equal variances not assumed			.259	17.983	.798	.03465091	.13358635	-.24602238	.31532420

Significant at the 0.05 level (P< 0.05)

In table 2, there is not any significant difference as the t-test analysis reveals. This indicates that using photomontage did not affect learners' lexical density and lexical complexity as a result it was not generally effective for their oral repertoires' complexity.

TABLE 4,
G2,INDEPENDENT SAMPLES TEST

		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
LD	Equal variances assumed	2.170	.156	1.643	20	.116	.04216364	.02566326	-.01136900	.09569627
	Equal variances not assumed			1.643	16.764	.119	.04216364	.02566326	-.01203932	.09636659
L/F	Equal variances assumed	2.411	.136	.522	20	.607	.04332727	.08299041	-.1297869	.21644223
	Equal variances not assumed			.522	14.267	.610	.04332727	.08299041	-.13435766	.22101221

In table 4, there is not any significant difference as the t-test analysis reveals. However we can claim that for the lexical density a trend is distinguishable as the t is 1.64 for this group. This indicates that using photomontage did not holistically affect learners' complexity; as a result it was not generally effective for their oral repertoires' complexity although a trend in the lexical density is noticeable.

TABLE 6,
G3,INDEPENDENT SAMPLES TEST

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
LD	Equal variances assumed	1.074	.312	.831	20	.416	.01687273	.02029743	-.02546697	.05921242
	Equal variances not assumed			.831	18.663	.416	.01687273	.02029743	-.02566232	.05940777
L/F	Equal variances assumed	1.965	.176	1.390	20	.180	.18010000	.12958572	-.09021108	.45041108
	Equal variances not assumed			1.390	18.419	.181	.18010000	.12958572	-.09170636	.45190636

In table 6, there is not any significant difference as the t-test analysis reveals. This indicates that using photomontage did not affect learners' lexical density and lexical complexity as a result it was not generally effective for their oral repertoires' complexity.

E. Results of part 2, Accuracy

Here we aim to consider the effect of lecturing on photomontage on EFL learners' Accuracy. In this section we will shed light on two subsections of accuracy, error free verb forms (EFVF) and error free T-units (EFTU) in each group (G1, G2 and G3). The results are as follows:

Tables 7& 8.Mean Scores, Standard Deviations and t-values for the students' model-based lecture and photomontage in group one based on accuracy measures.(table 7 is descriptive and is presented in the appendix)

TABLE8,
G1,INDEPENDENT SAMPLES TEST

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
EFVF	Equal variances assumed	1.869	.187	-.026	20	.980	-.00398182	.15346596	-.32410621	.31614257
	Equal variances not assumed			-.026	18.979	.980	-.00398182	.15346596	-.32521428	.31725064
EFTU	Equal variances assumed	9.000	.007	-5.943	20	.000	-.37517273	.06313283	-.50686550	-.24347995
	Equal variances not assumed			-5.943	11.886	.000	-.37517273	.06313283	-.51287426	-.23747119

*Significant at the 0.05 level (P< 0.05)

As is shown in Table7, the mean score for error free verb forms (EFVF) of the model-based group is0.71and for Photomontage group is 0.72; the Standard deviation of the two groups is 0.31 and 0.39 respectively. The mean score for the error free T-units (EFTU) of model-based is 0.52and for Photomontage group is 0.90 and the Standard deviation of the two is 0.20 and 0.06 respectively. In table 8, there is not any significant difference for EFVF as the t-test analysis reveals however there is a significant change in EFTU. This indicates that using photomontage did not affect learners' EFVF in group one nevertheless it significantly affected EFTU, as a result it can be claimed that it was somehow effective for developing accuracy in the group one learners' oral repertoires'.

Tables 9 and 10.Mean Scores, Standard Deviations and t-values for the students' model-based lecture and photomontage one in group two based on accuracy measures (EFVF and EFTU).(table 9 is in the appendix)

TABLE 10,
G2,INDEPENDENT SAMPLES TEST

		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
EFVF	Equal variances assumed	5.305	.032	1.979	20	.062	.30915455	.15619119	-.01665457	.63496366
	Equal variances not assumed			1.979	18.382	.063	.30915455	.15619119	-.01850308	.63681217
EFTU	Equal variances assumed	18.208	.000	.066	20	.948	.00711818	.10817659	-.21853423	.23277060
	Equal variances not assumed			.066	13.417	.949	.00711818	.10817659	-.22584712	.24008349

*Significant at the 0.05 level (P< 0.05)

In table 10, there is not any significant difference for EFTU as the t-test analysis reveals however there is a trend distinguishable in EFVF. This indicates that using photomontage did not affect learners' EFTU in group two nevertheless to some extent it affected EFVF, as a result it can be claimed that it was somehow effective for developing accuracy in the group two learners' oral repertoire.

Tables 11 and 12.Mean Scores, Standard Deviations and t-values for the students' model-based lecture and photomontage one in group three based on accuracy measures.(table 11 is in the appendix)

TABLE 12,
G3,INDEPENDENT SAMPLES TEST

		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
EFVF	Equal variances assumed	23.742	.000	1.649	20	.115	.24692727	.14974414	-.06543353	.55928808
	Equal variances not assumed			1.649	15.334	.119	.24692727	.14974414	-.07164073	.56549528
EFTU	Equal variances assumed	3.367	.081	-1.579	20	.130	-.15648182	.09908712	-.36317393	.05021029
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.579	16.068	.134	-.15648182	.09908712	-.36646539	.05350175

*Significant at the 0.05 level (P< 0.05)

In table 4.18, there is not any significant difference for EFVF and EFTU as the t-test analysis reveals however there is a trend distinguishable in both cases. This indicates that using photomontage did not affect learners' EFVF and EFTU in group three drastically, nevertheless to some extent it affected both, as a result it can be claimed that it was somehow effective for developing accuracy in the group three learners' oral repertoires'

F. Results of Part Three, Fluency

Here the assumption is that using photomontage will change fluency features in students' oral repertoires these include: average number of words per minute (ANWPM), average number of words in the whole speech (ANWT), average number of T-units per minute of speech (ANTUPM), average number of T-units in the whole speech (ANTUT), average number of syllables per minute of speech (ANSPM) and average number of syllables in the whole speech (ANST).

Table 13 and 14. Mean Scores, Standard deviations, t-values of group one for Fluency measures, Average number of words per minute (1-a,ANWPM) ,average number of words in the whole speech (1-b,ANWT), average number of T-units in one minute(2-a,ANTUPM), average number of T-units in the whole speech(2-b, ANTUT), average number of syllables per minute (3-a, ANSPM) and average number of syllables in the whole speech (3-b, ANST). (table 13 is in appendix)

TABLE 14,
G1,INDEPENDENT SAMPLES TEST

		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
1-a	Equal variances assumed	.796	.383	3.064	20	.006	43.45455	14.18013	13.87532	73.03377
	Equal variances not assumed			3.064	17.287	.007	43.45455	14.18013	13.57490	73.33419
1-b	Equal variances assumed	9.104	.007	-4.580	20	.000	-351.18182	76.68141	-511.13643	-191.2272
	Equal variances not assumed			-4.580	11.704	.001	-351.18182	76.68141	-518.72534	-183.6383
2-a	Equal variances assumed	.152	.701	-.664	20	.514	-.27273	.41060	-1.12923	.58378
	Equal variances not assumed			-.664	19.969	.514	-.27273	.41060	-1.12932	.58386
2-b	Equal variances assumed	11.253	.003	-5.023	20	.000	-27.90909	5.55617	-39.49907	-16.31911
	Equal variances not assumed			-5.023	10.793	.000	-27.90909	5.55617	-40.16689	-15.65129
3-a	Equal variances assumed	1.117	.303	.018	20	.986	.18182	10.13781	-20.96528	21.32892
	Equal variances not assumed			.018	18.854	.986	.18182	10.13781	-21.04803	21.41166
3-b	Equal variances assumed	10.755	.004	-4.955	20	.000	-335.00000	67.61094	-476.03396	-193.9660
	Equal variances not assumed			-4.955	10.689	.000	-335.00000	67.61094	-484.34131	-185.6586

*Significant at the 0.05 level (P< 0.05)

In table 14, the t-test analysis indicates that in group one both measures of 1-a ANWPM and 1-b ANWT were statistically significant at , 3.06 and -4.58 respectively (P<0.05). In the other two measures, 2-a ANTUPM and 2-b ANTUT, just the second one show statistically significant change with -5.02 (P<0.05). In the third group of measures 3-a ANSPM and 3-b ANST, again the second part shows statistically significant change with -4.95 for the t-value (P< 0.05).

Table 15and 16. Mean Scores, Standard deviations, t-values of group two for Fluency measures, Average number of words per minute (1-a,ANWPM) ,average number of words in the whole speech (1-b,ANWT), average number of T-units in one minute(2-a,ANTUPM), average number of T-units in the whole speech(2-b, ANTUT), average number of syllables per minute (3-a, ANSPM) and average number of syllables in the whole speech (3-b, ANST).

TABLE 16,
G2,INDEPENDENT SAMPLES TEST

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
1-a	Equal variances assumed	2.203	.153	-.421	20	.679	-3.72727	8.86371	-22.21664	14.76209
	Equal variances not assumed			-.421	18.684	.679	-3.72727	8.86371	-22.30050	14.84595
1-b	Equal variances assumed	21.690	.000	-4.925	20	.000	-1038.4545	210.85475	-1478.2898	-598.6192
	Equal variances not assumed			-4.925	10.759	.000	-1038.4545	210.85475	-1503.8118	-573.0972
2-a	Equal variances assumed	1.432	.245	-1.119	20	.276	-.90909	.81210	-2.60310	.78492
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.119	18.416	.277	-.90909	.81210	-2.61249	.79430
2-b	Equal variances assumed	25.487	.000	-4.593	20	.000	-51.45455	11.20235	-74.82223	-28.08686
	Equal variances not assumed			-4.593	10.376	.001	-51.45455	11.20235	-76.29299	-26.61610
3-a	Equal variances assumed	.242	.628	-.609	20	.549	-7.90909	12.97894	-34.98269	19.16450
	Equal variances not assumed			-.609	19.979	.549	-7.90909	12.97894	-34.98450	19.16632
3-b	Equal variances assumed	17.674	.000	-5.082	20	.000	-1434.0000	282.14650	-2022.5472	-845.4527
	Equal variances not assumed			-5.082	10.750	.000	-1434.0000	282.14650	-2056.7671	-811.2328

In table 16,the t-test analysis indicates that in group two, measures of 1-a ANWPM and 1-b ANWT just 1-b was statistically significant with t-value at , -10.10 (P<0.05). In the other two measures, 2-a ANTUPM and 2-b ANTUT, both measures show statistically significant change with t-values at 2.56 and -3.77 respectively (P<0.05). In the third group of measures 3-a ANSPM and 3-b ANST, again the second part shows statistically significant change with -9.15 for the t-value (P< 0.05) however the other one 3-a ANSPM shows a trend in photomontage group and that needs consideration.

TABLE 18,
G3,INDEPENDENT SAMPLES TEST

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
1-a	Equal variances assumed	2.203	.153	-.421	20	.679	-3.72727	8.86371	-22.21664	14.76209
	Equal variances not assumed			-.421	18.684	.679	-3.72727	8.86371	-22.30050	14.84595
1-b	Equal variances assumed	21.690	.000	-4.925	20	.000	-1038.4545	210.85475	-1478.2898	-598.6192
	Equal variances not assumed			-4.925	10.759	.000	-1038.4545	210.85475	-1503.8118	-573.0972
2-a	Equal variances assumed	1.432	.245	-1.119	20	.276	-.90909	.81210	-2.60310	.78492
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.119	18.416	.277	-.90909	.81210	-2.61249	.79430
2-b	Equal variances assumed	25.487	.000	-4.593	20	.000	-51.45455	11.20235	-74.82223	-28.08686
	Equal variances not assumed			-4.593	10.376	.001	-51.45455	11.20235	-76.29299	-26.61610
3-a	Equal variances assumed	.242	.628	-.609	20	.549	-7.90909	12.97894	-34.98269	19.16450
	Equal variances not assumed			-.609	19.979	.549	-7.90909	12.97894	-34.98450	19.16632
3-b	Equal variances assumed	17.674	.000	-5.082	20	.000	-1434.0000	282.14650	-2022.5472	-845.4527
	Equal variances not assumed			-5.082	10.750	.000	-1434.0000	282.14650	-2056.7671	-811.2328

In table 18 the t-test analysis indicates that in group three from the two measures of 1-a ANWPM and 1-b ANWT just the second was statistically significant at , -4.925 ($P<0.05$). In the other two measures, 2-a ANTUPM and 2-b ANTUT, just the second one shows statistically significant change with -4.59 ($P<0.05$).However in the first measure, 2-a a trend is traceable. In the third group of measures 3-a ANSPM and 3-b ANST, again the second part shows statistically significant change with -5.08 for the t-value ($P< 0.05$).

VI. Discussion

According to the findings, the learners' lecture on photomontage benefited mostly in fluency measures, higher t-value results, and in this respect outperformed the other lecture. In this study our three groups called G1, G2 and G3 all consisting of 11 participants went through two stages of giving lecture based on a model and having DVD and the text for practicing at home and the other was preparing a photomontage (a kind of composite picture) and talking about it in the class. First of all the model-based lecturers benefited from practice effect and everything was ready made for learners, on the other hand in the photomontage case each person should think of a topic and related pictures to present and it adds to the difficulty of the task. As far as in the model-based case there was memorization in most cases therefore students complexity remained well and photomontage task was affected negatively in this respect. In the second part of the CAF triad, accuracy, although some trends is noticeable but it was not statistically significant. It can be due to practice effect that learners' had in the case of model-based lectures however in the second task as everything goes step by step through class discussion and unveils on the spot and also the engagement of other students may affect the speaker, and in many cases improvisation leads to unwanted mistakes. In the third item, fluency, undoubtedly the photomontage group performed better. Another point should not be forgotten and that is the other learners' participation. During the first task the participants participation barely reaches 12% whereas during the photomontage task the participation is definitely 100% and this monologic and dialogic feature of the two tasks affect performances. Based on Vygotsky's theory, learning through interaction is central to learning. He states that interaction and negotiation of meaning are through tasks that require attention to meaning and transfer of information. In his view learning is as both a social as well as cognitive process. (Richards, 2003) In this case if students' interlanguage development was observed maybe other outcomes would be noticed however that was out of the scope of the current study and can be studied later on. One final point to be considered is attentional resources; Skehan's (2009) trade-off hypothesis suggests that committing attention to one area might cause lower performance in others.

The time should also be taken into account, as tables 1, 2 and 3 (Appendix, tables), speaking on the model-based took much shorter time than photomontage task and again it is considerable because if you talk for two to three minute it differs with the time that you talk for 20 or more minutes. In any case you manage your talk differently. The fruit of using photomontage was that learners who are afraid of lecturing and cannot talk for more than a couple of minutes, manage the class and their lecturing better and stay longer on the stage.

VII. Conclusions

According to statistic findings, it was found that our photomontage group outperformed the model-based group in most Fluency measures in the three groups. Robinson (2001, cited in Salimi & Dadashpour, 2012) found that complex tasks elicited less fluent, but more accurate and complex production than simple tasks and that is in line with this study if we assume that model-based lecture was more complex for a learner that is why their fluency suffered, however; on the other hand they had gains in complexity and accuracy domains. Also for Yuan and Ellis, fluency and accuracy are the two dimensions of production which are in competition for resources (Gilabert, 2004). Without a doubt, accuracy is the dimension of performance that has triggered the widest variety of results. In the experiment presented in this dissertation, no differences in accuracy were found for either the percentage of error-free T-units (EFTU) or for error free verb forms (EFVF) among the two groups but it can be stated that a trend is recognizable. The results of accuracy went against what was stated in Hypotheses 2, explanations by different researchers about what takes place with accuracy during performance have differed considerably. Foster and Skehan (1996) did not find any significant improvements in accuracy between planning conditions for the narrative task they used, while these existed for complexity. (as cited in Gilabert, 2004) While they speculated about the possible causes of increased complexity (either the consequence of reduced cognitive load or cognitive effects that pushed learners to try out more complex language) the lack of effects for accuracy was attributed to trade-off effects between accuracy and complexity. 'Complexity and accuracy are seen as relating primarily to L2 knowledge representation and to the level of analysis of internalized linguistic information' on the contrary fluency is primarily related to learner's control over their linguistic knowledge and is reflected in the speed and ease with which they retrieve information to communicate meaning in real time (Housen & Kuiken, 2009). Skehan's 1998 Limited Attentional Capacity Model suggests that human attentional capacity is limited and selective, and focusing on one area may take attentional resources from others and may lead to fluency/ accuracy competition (Housen & Kuiken, 2009) therefore our result is compatible with Skehan's model. Despite this Skehan (2003) mentions that interactive work of the learners will lead to more advanced and accurate language but a less fluent one that is in contrast with the results of the current research. Ejzenberg (2000 cited in Derwing et al, 2004) argues that in monologic tasks the cognitive demands on the speaker are greater and thus fluency would be negatively

affected and if we consider the current study the model-based lecture was the monologic task and this is exactly compatible with our results. Skehan (cited in Shehadeh & Coombe, 2013) mentions that 'tasks that are cognitively demanding in their content are likely to draw attentional resources away from language forms' here our photomontage task seems more demanding because of its rich and novel content and it may be one reason why our learners did not perform well in the accuracy domain. The results of the study are not compatible with Output Hypothesis that assumes that interaction can lead to improved grammatical performance because in our photomontage as the dialogic task the learners' accuracy was negatively affected.

APPENDICES

TABLE1,
G1,GROUP STATISTICS

	lecture	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
LD	Model-based	11	.4421000	.03688721	.01112191
	photo montage	11	.4239091	.05524189	.01665606
L/F	Model-based	11	.6520882	.36196403	.10913626
	photo montage	11	.6174373	.25550046	.07703629

TABLE3,
G2,GROUP STATISTICS

	lecture	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
LD	Model-based	11	.4395364	.07220726	.02177131
	photo montage	11	.3973727	.04506380	.01358725
L/F	Model-based	11	.7143909	.24878529	.07501159
	photo montage	11	.6710636	.11775979	.03550591

TABLE5,
G3,GROUP STATISTICS

	lecture	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
LD	Model-based	11	.4703182	.04073519	.01228212
	photo montage	11	.4534455	.05359558	.01615968
L/F	Model-based	11	.7791336	.25553608	.07704703
	photo montage	11	.5990336	.34556962	.10419316

TABLE 7,
G1,GROUP STATISTICS

	lecture	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
EFVF	based	11	.7176273	.31541153	.09510015
	photo montage	11	.7216091	.39948140	.12044817
EFTU	based	11	.5249545	.20008639	.06032832
	photo montage	11	.9001273	.06171493	.01860775

TABLE 9,
G2,GROUP STATISTICS

	lecture	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
EFVF	Model-based	11	.7095455	.30719044	.09262140
	photo montage	11	.4003909	.41711701	.12576551
EFTU	Model-based	11	.4765818	.13884631	.04186374
	photo montage	11	.4694636	.33082567	.09974769

TABLE 11,
G3,GROUP STATISTICS

	lecture	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
EFVF	Model-based	11	.7272273	.23514936	.07090020
	photo montage	11	.4803000	.43744848	.13189568
EFTU	Model-based	11	.3536364	.16518309	.04980458
	photo montage	11	.5101182	.28410451	.08566073

TABLE 13,
G1,GROUP STATISTICS

	lecture	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
1-a	Model-based	11	123.7273	25.84218	7.79171
	photo montage	11	80.2727	39.29400	11.84759
1-b	Model-based	11	222.6364	71.51122	21.56144
	photo montage	11	573.8182	244.06262	73.58765
2-a	Model-based	11	5.8182	.98165	.29598
	photo montage	11	6.0909	.94388	.28459
2-b	Model-based	11	24.8182	3.60051	1.08559
	photo montage	11	52.7273	18.07258	5.44909
3-a	Model-based	11	163.5455	20.63668	6.22219
	photo montage	11	163.3636	26.54533	8.00372
3-b	Model-based	11	333.7273	40.93432	12.34216
	photo montage	11	668.7273	220.47226	66.47489

TABLE 15,
G2,GROUP STATISTICS

	lecture	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
1-a	Model-based	11	113.0909	13.80184	4.16141
	photo montage	11	114.5455	23.23086	7.00437
1-b	Model-based	11	518.1818	185.27429	55.86230
	photo montage	11	1990.3636	446.04445	134.48746
2-a	Model-based	11	6.0909	1.81409	.54697
	photo montage	11	4.2727	1.48936	.44906
2-b	Model-based	11	26.9091	8.53762	2.57419
	photo montage	11	101.3636	64.93885	19.57980
3-a	Model-based	11	160.0000	19.20417	5.79027
	photo montage	11	148.1818	28.86111	8.70195
3-b	Model-based	11	732.6364	231.26577	69.72925
	photo montage	11	2592.1818	632.87863	190.82009

TABLE 17,
G3,GROUP STATISTICS

	lecture	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
1-a	Model-based	11	97.0000	23.38376	7.05047
	photo montage	11	100.7273	17.81623	5.37180
1-b	Model-based	11	270.8182	133.85053	40.35745
	photo montage	11	1309.2727	686.39713	206.95652
2-a	Model-based	11	4.1818	1.60114	.48276
	photo montage	11	5.0909	2.16585	.65303
2-b	Model-based	11	11.3636	5.04525	1.52120
	photo montage	11	62.8182	36.80983	11.09858
3-a	Model-based	11	138.2727	30.92601	9.32454
	photo montage	11	146.1818	29.94267	9.02806
3-b	Model-based	11	383.8182	178.02293	53.67593
	photo montage	11	1817.8182	918.68437	276.99376

REFERENCES

[1] Ades, D. (1976). Photomontage. London: Thames & Hudson, Ltd.
[2] Aliakbari, M., & Jamalvandi, B. (2010). The impact of 'role play' on fostering EFL learners' speaking ability: A task-based approach. *Pan-Pacific Association of Applied Linguistics,* 14(11),15-29.
[3] Bailey, K.M. (2004). Issues in teaching speaking skills to adult ESOL learners (chapter 5), Teaching speaking skills. National Center for the Study of Adult Learning and Literacy.
[4] Burns, A. (1999). Collaborative action research for English language teachers. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
[5] Celce-Murcia, M. (2001). Teaching English as a second or foreign language (3rd ed.). USA: Heinle & Heinle, Thomson Learning.
[6] Chastain, K. (1988). Developing second language skills: Theory and practice. Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc.
[7] Derwing, T.M., Rossiter, M.J., Munro, M.J., & Thomson, R.I. (2004). Second language fluency: Judgments on different tasks. University of Alberta. *Language Learning* 54:4, Dec 2004, pp.655-679.
[8] Ellis, R. (2006). Connecting theory and practice: Theoretical approaches and research informing the development of the EAL curriculum. Retrieved September 10, 2013 from: http://www.edu.gov.mb.ca/k12/cur/eal/framework/section2.pdf.
[9] Gilabert Guerrero, R. (2004).Task complexity and L2 narrative oral production (Doctoral Thesis).University of Barcelona.
[10] Goldstein, B. (2008). Working with images: A resource book for the language classroom (Cambridge handbook for language teachers). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
[11] Goodwyn, A. (2004). English teaching and the moving image. New York: Routledge.
[12] Housen, A., & Kuiken, F. (2009). Complexity, accuracy and fluency in second language acquisition. *Applied Linguistics 30/4: 461-473*, Oxford University Press.

[13] Lee, Y.J., & Liang, J. (2012). Using video technology to diagnose EFL students' cognitive learning difficulties in public speaking. *Procedia Social & Behavioral Sciences*, 64(2102), pp. 671-680
[14] Long, M.H., & Doughty, C.J. (Eds.). (2009). The handbook of language teaching. London: Blackwell Publishing.
[15] Opp-Beckman, L., & Klinghammer, S. J. (2006). Shaping the way we teach English: Successful practices around the world. University of Oregon, Eugene, USA. Office of English Language Programs, United States Department Washington, DC 2054 http://englishprograms.state.gov e-mail: english@state.gov.
[16] Petrina, S. (2007). Advanced teaching methods for the technology classroom. The University of British Columbia, Canada, Information Science publishing.
[17] Pritchard, A. (2007). Effective teaching with internet technologies: Pedagogy and practice. London: Paul Chapman Publishing.
[18] Richards, J.C., & Renandya, W.A. (Eds.). (2002). Methodology in language teaching: An anthology of current practice. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
[19] Richards, J.C., & Rodgers, T.S. (2002). (2nd Ed.). Approaches and methods in language teaching. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
[20] Richards, J.C. (2006). Communicative language teaching today. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
[21] Rueckert, C. (2006). ESL lesson plan. Retrieved September 6, 2012 from http://www.esl-lesson-plan.com/.
[22] Salimi, A., & Dadashpour, S. (2012). Task complexity and second language development: Doe task complexity matter? *Procedia-Social & Behavioral Sciences*, 46(2012), pp. 726-735.
[23] Savignon, S.J. (2002). Interpreting communicative language teaching: Contents and concerns in teacher education. USA: Yale University Press, New Haven & London.
[24] Shehadeh, A., & Coombe, C.A. (Eds.). (n.d.). Task based language teaching in foreign language context. Retrieved September 2012 from Google Scholar.
[25] Skehan, P. (2003). Focus on form, tasks and technology. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 2003, Vol. 16. No. 5, pp. 391-411. Taylor & Francis Ltd.
[26] Skehan, P. (2009). Modelling second language performance: Integrating complexity, accuracy, fluency and lexis. *Applied Linguistics* 30/4: 510-532.
[27] Teaching with pictures. (2012). Retrieved October 12, 2012 from Internet, teachers. Net, lcnm@koyote.com.
[28] Terry, C. (2008). How to teach speaking in an EFL class II. Ministry of Education, Jan 31, 2008, ICPNA, San-Miguel.
[29] Thornbury, S. (2005). How to teach speaking. Longman, Pearson Education Limited. Retrieved March 18, 2013 from Bookos.org.
[30] Uso-Juan, E. & Martinez-Flor, A. (Eds.). (2006). Current trends in the development and teaching of the four language skills. Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin.
[31] Wood, K.D., & Tinajero, J. (2002). Using pictures to teach content to second language learners. *AMLE, Middle School Journal*, May 2002, Volume 33, Number 5, pages 47-51.

Jaleh Hassaskhah is currently an assistant professor at the English Department of the University of Guilan. Her areas of interest include curriculum development, assessment and exploring new horizons in teaching language skills, which has led to the publication of different articles and books. She has also served as the reviewer and lecturer on these topics both nationally and internationally.

Behzad Barekat is an assistant professor at the English Department of the University of Guilan. He is the head of English teaching department and also University's IELTS department. He knows French very well and has studied in France. He has also published some books and many international articles.

Shohreh Rahimizadeh Asli holds an MA in Teaching English as a Foreign Language (TEFL). She is currently a language teacher at Kish Language Centre and has taught English in Ministry of Education for 9 years.