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Abstract

The current study aimed to enhance and develop adult participants’ oral fluency with special reference to phonological awareness. To identify the learners’ oral fluency different levels, the researcher designed two rubrics and a pre/post-test. Then, the researcher designed a program based on the eclectic approach to enhance the learners’ oral fluency and their phonological awareness. Participants were five adult learners (N= 5), enrolled in a course to enhance their English oral fluency with special reference to their phonological awareness. They had a ten–day intensive online English course; approximately three and half hours a day to boost their oral fluency besides their phonological awareness. The participants had some assignments, which may take them approximately four hours on a daily basis to be accomplished. The participants’ scores on the pre/post–test were statistically analyzed and compared using a non–parametric Wilcoxon signed–rank test, a parametric t–test; besides the normality test to compare the mean scores, the effect size, besides Z value of the study participants. In addition, a qualitative analysis of the participants’ progress was conducted and analyzed. Both quantitative and qualitative results revealed varied positive effects of using the eclectic approach in developing the adult learners’ oral fluency, increasing their phonological awareness, enhancing both grammatical
accuracy and complexity, besides improving learners' lexical sophistication and diversity.
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مستخلص البحث

هدفت الدراسة الحالية إلى تعزيز وتطوير الطلاقة الشفوية للمشاركين البالغين مع الإشارة بشكل خاص إلى الوعي الصوتي. لتحديد المستويات المختلفة للطاقة الشفوية للمتعلمين، صمم الباحث نموذجين تقييم واختبار قبلي وبدري. بعد ذلك، صمم الباحث برنامجًا يعتمد على النهج الانتقائي لتعزيز الطلاقة الشفوية لدى المتعلمين ووعيهم الصوتي. كان المشاركون خمسة متعلمين بالغين، تم تسجيلهم في دورة لتعزيز طاقة اللغة الإنجليزية لديهم مع إشارة خاصة إلى وعيهم الصوتي. كان لديهم دورة مكثفة في اللغة الإنجليزية على الإنترنت لمدة عشرة أيام؛ ما يقرب من ثلاث ساعات ونصف في اليوم لتعزيز الطلاقة اللغوية إلى جانب تعزيز الوعي الصوتي. كان لدى المشاركين بعض المهام التي قد تستغرق حوالي أربع ساعات يوميًا لإنجازها. تم تحليل درجات المشاركين في الاختبار القبلي/البدري إحصائيًا ومقارنتها باستخدام اختبار تصنيف ويلكوكسون العلوي/الأسود، بالإضافة إلى الاختبار المعياري. 

بجانب اختبار التوزيع الطبيعي لمقارنة متوسط الدرجات وحجم التأثير وقيمة اختبار Z للمشاركين في الدراسة، بالإضافة إلى ذلك، تم إجراء تحليل نووي لقياس مدى تقدم المشاركون. كشفت النتائج الكمية والتوثيقية أثرًا إيجابيًا متنوعًا لاستخدام النهج الانتقائي في تطوير الطلاقة الشفوية للمتعلمين البالغين، وزيادة وعيهم الصوتي، وتعزيز الدقة النحوية، إلى جانب تحسين التطور التنوع اللغوي لدى المتعلمين.

الكلمات المفتاحية: النهج الانتقائي، الطلاقة الشفوية، الوعي الصوتي، الاصطلاحات، التنوع المعجمي
1. Introduction

With a growing need for a more effective, successful, and active foreign language learning approach, besides looking for innovation in the language field, there has been stimulation for learning through the integration of various teaching approaches which may positively contribute to affecting the learning process. Combining more than one approach in teaching could be essential to integrate the benefits of a plethora of approaches which may enhance the intended learning outcomes (ILOs). Thus, a considerable amount of effort is required to create an innovative approach of learning English. An eclectic approach may be taken into account as a convenient approach for teaching in the 21st century.

The eclectic approach is a combination of different teaching and learning approaches. This approach is effectively adapted by researchers to all learners, regardless of their age or level. An eclectic approach has become commonly applied in various language majors. Kumar (2013) states that the eclectic approach is considered to be a combination of different teaching approaches and learning approaches. Additionally, it could be considered as a principled eclecticism; meaning that the approach
to language education is characteristically desirable, consistent and multidimensional. Furthermore, Gao (2011) refers to the eclectic approach as an approach which integrates listening, speaking, reading, and writing skills, as well as classroom practice. The researcher believes that language skills should not be taught separately all through language teaching stages because separation in teaching would be a hinder for acquiring and applying the language in various real-life situations. Integrating different language learning pillars and avoiding separated teaching skills would enhance the ILOs which result in elimination of language learning barriers that adult learners may encounter. As a result of this separation, the trainees are not able to balance mastering the language skills; which causes inequality in the comprehension of the language. The separation of teaching the language pillars is one of the major reasons that causes the stagnancy of English language acquisition and is going to be modified in the designed program.

An eclectic approach is preferable because each approach has its advantages and disadvantages. Therefore, a mixture of more than one approach provides an opportunity to nominate the advantages of each. The eclectic approach represents a diverse,
inclusive, self-triggered educational approach that thoroughly and rationally integrates and nominates the best techniques from different teaching approaches. It best addresses the equally diverse and differentiated individual needs of the learner (Freeman: 2004; and Aslam: 2003, p.61). Brown (2002) argued that dynamic classroom eclecticism could provide a solution. This approach allows researchers to nominate the pros of each approach for achieving dynamic classroom conditions. Eclection means nominating from a plethora of sources.

2. Theoretical Background

Numerous studies have been conducted to investigate the effectiveness of implementing various teaching methods at different English levels. The findings of these studies revealed that the use of various teaching approaches has positive effects on the academic achievement when compared to traditional teaching approaches, the results showed that traditional teaching methods were ineffective. (Sood, 2013; Agboghorom, 2014; Adeyemo and Babajide, 2014; Udo and Udofia, 2014). According to the researcher’s experience, as an English instructor, the approach applied for teaching adults must be pertinent to their needs. It is essential to develop a study in this area, in order to
delineate the most appropriate approach to enhance learners’ oral fluency with special reference to their phonological awareness for adults with limited English proficiency.

As a language learning approach, the eclectic approach has several advantages and disadvantages. According to Jakir (2020), in most cases, the lecturers develop the eclectic approach for a specific class or session based on the requirements and skills of their learners. In teaching, a certain lecturer chooses on a method or mix of approaches. As a result, knowledge and application of the approach should be contextualized or, in other words, localized in accordance with the context of teaching and learning. According to Kumaradivadelu (2006), global principles are for broad direction, but their consequences for local everyday practice should be addressed and modified properly.

First, the eclectic approach provides correction of mistakes at the end of each communicative activity. The trainees are involved in correcting their mistakes that would enhance their acquisition. Second, multiple approaches are adapted to suit and cover the requirements and enhance learners’ acquisition under different conditions. Eclecticism entails engaging in a variety of language learning activities, each with distinct qualities and
objectives. In this study paper, the Interactive approach, Multimedia Case Based Learning approach (MCBL), and the Challenge Based Learning approach (CBL) are all adapted and integrated to examine their effectiveness on enhancing the adult learners’ oral fluency with special reference to phonological awareness.

In the Interactive approach, Nicolai (2015) claims that this approach breathes life, freedom, and creativity into what is often a tedious, ineffective, and constrained formal approach to teaching; which includes grammar drilling, lectures, and repetitions of correct forms. In this approach, the instructor’s role is a leader, rule enforcer, and learner evaluator. In the interactive approach, the responsibility of learning and teaching is shared between the learner and instructor. Language is developed through the cycle of interaction; which begins with input (p. 158). Brown (2007) claims that the interactive approach relies on classroom elements such as; context or learning subject, learners, instructor, besides the interaction among them. There is no specific method for teaching the interactive approach, but the classroom can be set up in such a manner that interaction and learning are fostered (Nicolai 2015, p. 160).
MCBL is a teaching method that integrates concepts, theories, and practices over time in various settings. It promotes reflection, instructor–learner dialogue, and group discussions (Ferrario, 2003). Case developers can provide guidelines for customizing the content to match the learners’ levels (Morrow et al., 2011). This approach could be used in multiple majors besides teaching. In the medical major, Abboud (2000) defined MCBL as a process in which learners acquire extra information about a clinical entity by utilizing a clinical presentation as a stimulus to solve issues. Cases that approximate real–world settings increase the likelihood that learners will transfer their learning from one setting to another (Weiss & Levison, 2000). Cases should reflect the backgrounds, needs, and diversity of learners. They should address the goals and objectives of both learners who are required to assess challenges given in situations and draw rational inferences (Snyder & McWilliam, 2003).

CBL is a pedagogical approach that actively engages learners in identifying, analyzing, and designing solutions to real–life problems among different situations (Tecnologico de Monterrey, 2018). CBL is a learning framework based on solving real world challenges (M. Nichols, K. Cator, and M. Torres.)
The framework was developed in a partnership between Apple Inc. and educators, and it has been applied in both professional and educational settings. From an education standpoint, learners engage more in the learning process since they can clearly see the correlation between content and real life problems (C. Marin, J. Hargis & C. Cavanaugh, 2013, pp. 22–34). The current study examines the integration of multiple approaches which may boost the benefits rather than applying a single approach and accepting its pros and cons. Integrating multiple approaches may assist the researcher in electing the benefits from each to enhance the ILOs; which are, in the current study, the oral fluency with special reference to phonological awareness.

The development of oral fluency in a foreign language has been the focus of numerous foreign language acquisition study (De Jong et al., 2013; Derwing et al., 2009; Freed et al., 2004; Hilton, 2008, 2009; O’Brien et al., 2007; and Osborne, 2011). A separate, more recent area of oral fluency study, that affect the learners’ oral fluency, has investigated the relationship between fluency and grammar, vocabulary, and processing speed. De Jong et al. (2013) found that each of the three measures of
grammar, vocabulary, and processing speed significantly correlated with at least two measures of fluency, with the strongest correlations for vocabulary knowledge and sentence building, a measure of grammatical processing speed. Hilton (2008) found moderate-to-strong correlations between each of the eight measures of fluency and the scores on grammar and vocabulary tests. Although more studies are needed to confirm the results, these findings imply that grammar, vocabulary, and processing speed are all related to the enhancement of oral fluency. However, this study has focused on integrating those language outcomes because the researcher is convinced that language is acquired as one unit and all its skills are integrated to enhance both language acquisitions besides the ILOs. The researcher thinks that the implicit acquisition of grammar, and vocabulary would have a positive impact on the learners’ oral fluency. The acquisition of the oral fluency is a construct with various definitions and is applied to reading, writing, and listening as well as speaking skills. In oral production, there is a relationship between specific aspects of speech production such as pronunciation, intonation, and hesitation. There are various perspectives on oral fluency that need more illustrations.
According to Koponen and Riggenbach (2000), there are four primary perspectives of oral fluency. The first is to conceive about oral fluency largely in terms of speech smoothness, which is determined by phonetic and acoustical features of speech (p. 8). They describe this conception of fluency as being used to define fluency in the rating guidelines of some oral fluency tests. This concept of fluency was applied by Derwing and Rossiter (Derwing and Rossiter, 2003, p.8). In addition, Derwing and Rossiter (2003) defined fluency as proficiency or as a component of proficiency (p. 13). This is a broader, more global view of fluency that includes smoothness as only one component of overall fluency. A third view of oral fluency is that fluency; which is viewed as the automaticity of psychological processes (p. 16). Those who take this view are largely concerned with investigating the psychological learning mechanisms that may help explain how oral fluency is acquired and developed and its relation to accuracy (pp. 16–17).

Koponen and Riggenbach (2000) noted that the definition of oral fluency varies from a situation to another; hence, the rating criteria will also vary depending upon the definition of fluency that is being used. Lennon (2000) suggests that fluency, which deals
with smoothness and speech rate, is of a lower order than that which deals with global proficiency. Higher-order oral fluency is defined as the rapid, smooth, accurate, lucid, and efficient thoughts or communicative intent into language (p. 26). He illustrated that oral fluency may increase more aspects of language production; which would become automatized. Practicing an eclectic approach may help overcome dull classroom activities, besides enhancing the learners’ oral fluency with special reference to their phonological awareness.

Phonological awareness is essential in oral language since it refers to the ability to think about the sounds of a word rather than just the content. Phonological awareness instruction helps learners to establish new knowledge using normal developmental or typical learning processes as a guide (Schüle & Boudreau, 2008). Phoneme awareness is a component of phonological awareness and is related to knowledge of words at the individual sound level and how to segment, blend, or manipulate individual phones within a word.

3. Statement of the problem

Some EFL adult learners have difficulty in oral fluency which affects negatively their English speech. Oral fluency seems
to be a difficult task for those learners. Mostly, those difficulties have a negative impact on their academic career prohibiting them from communicating with native English customers or doing some tasks related to implementing the English Language in various contexts such as forming the terms of contracts. Learners even encounter barriers such as understand or being understood by native speakers due to various fossilized pronunciation errors they have experienced during the school, university, and after graduation stages.

4. Research Questions

In order to tackle this problem, the current study attempted to answer the following main questions:

What is the effect of using an eclectic approach on enhancing the adult learners’ oral fluency with special reference to phonological awareness?

The study was guided by the following sub-questions:

Sub-questions

1. What are the main difficulties adult learners experience with the learning of English oral fluency with special reference to their phonological awareness?
2– What strategies, materials, and activities can best help adult learners overcome the difficulties experienced with the learning of English oral fluency and pronunciation?

3– What are the required oral fluency components with special reference to phonological awareness based on the Eclectic approach for the targeted learners?

4– What is the impact of the proposed program on a group of adult learners’ oral fluency and phonological awareness?

5. Hypotheses

In order to address the study questions two corresponding study hypotheses were tested:

- There is a statistically significant difference at the significance level of 0.05 between the mean scores of the study participants on the pre and post oral fluency test administrations with regard to the development of their "Overall oral fluency" favoring the posttest scores.

- There is a statistically significant difference at the significance level of 0.05 between the mean scores of the study participants on the pre and post oral fluency test administrations with regard to the development of their "Fluency" favoring the posttest scores.
• There is a statistically significant difference at the significance level of 0.05 between the mean scores of the study participants on the pre and post oral fluency test administrations with regard to the development of their “Pronunciation and Acoustic Features” favoring the post test scores.

• There is a statistically significant difference at the significance level of 0.05 between the mean scores of the study participants on the pre and post oral fluency test administrations with regard to the development of their “Grammatical Accuracy and Complexity” favoring the post test scores.

• There is a statistically significant difference at the significance level of 0.05 between the mean scores of the study participants on the pre and post oral fluency test administrations with regard to the development of their “Comprehensibility and Task Relevance” favoring the post test scores.

• There is a statistically significant difference at the significance level of 0.05 between the mean scores of the study participants on the pre and post oral fluency test administrations with regard to the development of their “Comprehensibility and Task Relevance” favoring the post test scores.
administrations with regard to the development of their “Lexical Sophistication and Lexical Diversity” favoring the post test scores.

- There is a statistically significant difference at the significance level of 0.05 between the mean scores of the study participants on the pre and post oral fluency test administrations with regard to the development of their “Assimilation” favoring the post test scores.

- There is a statistically significant difference at the significance level of 0.05 between the mean scores of the study participants on the pre and post oral fluency test administrations with regard to the development of their “Elision” favoring the post test scores.

- There is a statistically significant difference at the significance level of 0.05 between the mean scores of the study participants on the pre and post oral fluency test administrations with regard to the development of their “Reduction” favoring the post test scores.

6. Procedures of the Study

The present study followed these procedures:
1– Conducting an unstructured interview on some experienced EFL instructors.

2– Conducting a pilot study using an oral test on a group of five adult learners (n= 5).

3– Selecting, editing, and designing study instruments (the study program, rubrics, and the pre/post test).

4– Randomly selecting the study participants.

5– Administering study instruments prior to the intervention.

6– Implementing the study program and apply the new technological tools.

7– Administering study instruments after the intervention.

8– Analyzing the quantitative data using both parametric and non-parametric tests.

9– Analyzing the qualitative data.

10– Interpreting and discussing both the quantitative and qualitative results.

11– Presenting recommendations and suggestions for further research.
7. Method

7.1. Design of the Study

This study adopted the one-group pre-post test design along with a mixed study approach incorporating both quantitative and qualitative assessments. The one-group pre-posttest design was selected because the applied qualitative techniques aimed at detecting the development that occurred in the performance of the participants' oral fluency and phonological awareness before and after implementing the Eclectic Approach. The researcher conducted both a parametric and a non-parametric test besides a normality test to measure the effectiveness of the investigated dependent variables.

Participants of the Study

The participants were 5 adult learners (N= 5), who studied Arabic as their first language. Their ages range from 30 to 45. They have studied the English language during their educational stages. Their levels range from intermediate to upper intermediate level and that was according to the conducted placement test. They were enrolled in a course to enhance their English oral fluency with special reference to the phonological awareness. Online learning sessions were held. In the current study, they had
a ten–day intensive English course, approximately three and half hours a day. The learners had some assignments, which took them approximately four hours on a daily basis to be accomplished. The instructor aimed to boost the learners’ oral fluency with special reference to phonological awareness. The duration of the program; including the time dedicated to the entire pre–post test, the class–based program, the assignments, and the online activities, was about seventy–five hours. The learners had a diagnostic placement test, before being enrolled in the course to determine their current English level. The test contained multiple choice questions that covered grammar complexity and accuracy, lexical sophistication, writing, and reading abilities. The learners had twenty multiple–choice grammar questions, twenty multiple–choice vocabulary questions, two extensive reading passages with five questions on each, and two writing topics; one of them is to write an email and the other is to write an essay on the given topic in not less than 450 words. The time dedicated to the diagnostic test is three hours.

**Settings of the Study**

Online learning sessions were held to support self–determined, discovery learning in which learners could
interactively browse through multimedia content, consolidate the material of interest, and skip irrelevant ones. This included database information, texts, images, videos, and simulations. Microsoft Teams program, which acted as a central hub for workplace conversations; video chats, collaborative teamwork, and document sharing, was used to hold the online learning sessions.

**Instruments and Materials of the Study**

The instruments and materials of the current study are:

- A pre/posttest,
- Oral fluency and phonological awareness and
- A proposed program based on the eclectic approach.

**8. Results of the Study**

The results of the current study were elicited from both quantitative and qualitative analyses. The quantitative section included the statistical comparisons of the participants' mean scores in the pre–test and their mean scores in the post–test. The comparison in the quantitative section was based on the statistical results of the participants' oral fluency according to the conducted pre and posttest. The qualitative section was illustrated through the participants' oral samples.
8.1. The quantitative section

A non-parametric, a parametric and a normality tests were conducted to evaluate the effectiveness of the applied program. After conducting the parametric test of t-test and obtaining positive results; which reflected the effectiveness of the applied program, a normality test was conducted to determine if the data set was well-modeled by a normal distribution and to compute how likely it is for a random variable underlying the data set to be normally distributed.

It was found that normality test reflected a non normal distributed sample population and data did not meet normality assumptions. The histogram had not formed the bell shape which resembled the non-normal distribution. Thus, a nonparametric test; “Wilcoxon signed-rank test”, was conducted to compare and contrast the interpreted results. SPSS (Statistical Package for Social Sciences) version 25.0 was used for the analysis of the data. Mean and standard deviations were used for descriptive statistics.
## 8.1.1. The Parametric t-Test

**Table (1):** T-test results of differences between the learners' Mean scores, P-value, and Effect size on the pre and the post oral fluency administration test

Table (1) clarifies that the effect size values of overall oral fluency, fluency, pronunciation, grammatical accuracy and complexity, comprehensibility and task relevance, lexical sophistication and lexical diversity, elision, and reduction are medium because their effect size values are higher than 0.50 and

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measured oral fluency and phonological awareness components</th>
<th>Stages</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>D.F</th>
<th>Tc value</th>
<th>T-Tab</th>
<th>Probability value</th>
<th>Effect size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall oral fluency</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre Application</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>86.6</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>0.64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Application</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>91.5</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td>medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fluency</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre Application</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Application</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>pronunciation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre Application</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Application</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>grammatical accuracy and complexity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre Application</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.38</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Application</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>comprehensibility and task relevance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre Application</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.35</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Application</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>lexical sophistication and lexical diversity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre Application</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Application</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>assimilation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre Application</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Application</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>elision</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre Application</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>611.6</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Application</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>reduction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre Application</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Application</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>medium</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
less than 0.8. This reflects their medium effectiveness on the dependent variable and on developing the targeted components. However, the effect size of assimilation is low because its effect size is (0.39) which is less than 0.5. This reflects its low effectiveness on the dependent variable and on developing the targeted component.

8.1.2. The Nonparametric Wilcoxon Signed–Rank Test

Table (2): Paired Samples Wilcoxon Test results comparing the pre–post administrations mean scores of the participants’ grade ranks in both of the oral fluency and phonological awareness components:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Oral Fluency measured component</th>
<th>N (S)</th>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
<th>Sum of Ranks</th>
<th>M (pre)</th>
<th>M (post)</th>
<th>S.D (pre)</th>
<th>S.D (post)</th>
<th>z</th>
<th>Sig. level</th>
<th>Effect Size η</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall Oral Fluency</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>86.6</td>
<td>116.4</td>
<td>14.72</td>
<td>20.55</td>
<td>2.023</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluency</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>2.023</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pronunciation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.023</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grammatical accuracy and complexity</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>2.023</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>comprehensibility and task relevance</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>2.023</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lexical sophistication and lexical diversity</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>2.023</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assimilation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>2.023</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>elision</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reduction</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>2.023</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table (2) elucidates that the learners' mean scores in the post test administration were higher than their mean scores in the
pre administration. The positive ranks are 5 in all of the oral fluency and phonological awareness measured components. It could be interpreted that the effect size scores are high (.90) in most of the oral fluency and phonological awareness measured components indicating that the study's program had a high effectiveness in developing the learners' oral fluency with special reference to phonological awareness. Additionally, Z value is (2.023) in most of the measured oral fluency components except for the elision (2.06) , which is significant at the level of (0.05). Therefore, there are statistically significant differences between the study participants' mean scores on the pre and post administration of the eclectic approach study program in favor of the post administration.

9. Discussion of the results

First, results clarified in table (1) illustrates that through using t–test and calculating the effect size of t calculated value (5.4) indicated a significant statistical difference between the learners' mean scores in the pre and post administrations of the overall oral fluency test compared with t–table (2.132) which indicated development in the trainees' level of overall oral fluency. In addition, the effect size score (64%) is medium which indicated
a medium effectiveness on the dependent variable and on developing the overall oral fluency which may need more enhancements.

Therefore, it could be concluded that from the previous results the learners' overall oral fluency was developed due to the program; and that the program was effective in developing the learners' overall oral fluency. Therefore, the 1st study hypothesis has been verified.

Second, Results clarified in table (1) illustrates that through using t-test and calculating the effect size of t calculated value of fluency is (3.31) with a medium effect size, pronunciation (4.7) with a medium effect size, Grammatical accuracy and complexity (7.38) with a medium effect size, comprehensibility and task relevance is (8.35) with a medium effect size, lexical sophistication and lexical diversity (5.2) with a medium effect size, elision (11.66) with a medium effect size, and reduction (11.66) with a medium effect size. The previous results indicated a significant statistical difference between the learners' mean scores in the pre and post administrations of both the oral fluency and phonological awareness components test compared with t-table (2.132) which indicated medium development in the trainees'
level of some of both of the oral fluency and phonological awareness components which are the dependent variables and on developing the overall oral fluency components. These components may need further development in other researches by investigating other means.

Moreover, there is a variation of some results of the oral fluency components. The results were illustrated using t–test and calculating the effect size of t calculated value of overall oral assimilation (3.03) with a small effect size (0.39). The oral fluency component needed more training because they were rarely encouraged or developed in the training environment. Most of the English training courses work mainly on acquiring and memorizing the vocabulary and grammar rules without knowing how to use them correctly. Pronunciation and phonological awareness are rarely taught in schools’ syllabus rather in English courses. Some researchers need to modify the followed teaching approaches and vary them according to the learners’ different needs. That would reflect positively on the new acquired vocabulary, and the targeted task. Researchers need to encourage their trainees to reflect, comprehend and address their points of view, to tackle the given task from different perspectives,
and not to deviate from the targeted points. All the trainees' points of view are respected but needed the researchers directing. The researchers could give learners a hand to vary the used chunks and complex grammatical rules which contribute to fulfill and retain relevant information and ideas to obtain the target score. Loose and insufficient details and fossilized pronunciation errors are remarkable issues as a respond for most of the English oral fluency tasks in Egypt. Therefore, learners need more training to support these components.

Table (2) illustrates the mean and standard deviation scores obtained from the non-parametric test which are the same scores obtained from the conducted parametric t–test. It is noticed the learners' mean scores in the post test administration were higher than their mean scores in the pre administration. The positive ranks are 5 in all of the oral fluency and phonological awareness measured components and no negative ranks were noted. It could be interpreted that the effect size scores of the oral fluency and phonological awareness measured components range from (90) to (92) which considered as high effect size scores indicating that the study's program had a high effectiveness in developing the learners' oral fluency with special
reference to phonological awareness. Thus, it could be inferred that there are statistically significant differences between the study participants’ mean scores on the pre and post administration of the eclectic approach study program in favor of the post administration.

10. The Qualitative Section

The instructor selected some oral essays' samples which reflected the learners' benefit from the application of the study program through applying the eclectic approach. The selected oral samples reflected the learners' progress in speaking confidently and naturally with no distracting hesitations. Their Ideas flew smoothly. The learners pronounced clearly and accurately throughout the context. They mastered the correct place of articulation. The learners mastered a variety of grammatical structure with a complex and accurate grammar. The learners made a good use of the artificial intelligence and enhanced the acquired knowledge through learning from different sources. The learners learned how to blend the practices of listening, speaking, reading and writing as integrated skills not separated ones. The results indicated that they had a high level
of suprasegmental awareness with respect to identifying stress, intonation, and places of articulation of English sounds.

Questions and Procedures conducted in the study

In order to tackle this problem, the current study attempted to answer the following main questions:

What is the effect of using an eclectic approach on enhancing the adult learners’ oral fluency with special reference to phonological awareness?

In attempting to answer the above question, the following sub-questions were also answered:

The study was guided by the following sub-questions:

The first sub-question was answered as follows:

This sub-question was answered through holding unstructured interview with a sample of English instructors assuring that oral fluency and phonological awareness are major problems they encounter when teaching to adults. Additionally, a pilot study on a sample of adult English learners, working in diverse types of jobs, reflected their lack of essential oral fluency components in addition to major deficiencies in their phonological awareness. That was also answered through holding a pre oral
fluency test on the one group sample to assess their level in speaking fluency.

The second sub-question was answered as follows:

"In the light of the literature review, and further readings, the researcher designed nine lectures, seven activities that cover the oral fluency components. The first two lectures of the program were theoretical to brief and illustrate how to think in English, how the brain process languages, what the advantages of learning languages are, what trainees need to master oral fluency, in addition to the definitions of: linguistics, phonetics, phonology. The learners were also trained to use the Interactive Phonemic Alphabet Chart (IPA) to practice the correct pronunciation of short vowel sounds, long vowel sounds, diphthongs and consonants. The other seven lectures reflect the significance of embedding applications depending on the artificial intelligence besides the assigned activities as home assignments. The researcher also embedded the rubric as an assessment tool.

The third sub-question was answered as follows:

The components of the proposed program were elicited from the literature review and the previous studies in chapter two
and illustrated in detail in chapter three. Furthermore, the study instruments were also based on the program's components.

The fourth sub-question was answered as follows:

By the end of the application of the program, the researcher conducted a post oral fluency test to measure the adult learners' oral fluency progress. The researcher assigned the learners to practice their oral fluency using the assigned programs and the power of artificial intelligence, and practice the pronunciation rules to enhance the acoustic features. The learners learned how to pronounce accurately with correct inflections using some programs such as Elsa Speak, speak confidently and naturally with no distracting hesitations using Lingbe program, enhance both grammatical accuracy and complexity using English Central, and YouGlish programs. The researcher elicited the statistical data, through the rubric, to monitor the progress of the learners. The researcher also conducted qualitative data of the learners' performance. Both quantitative and qualitative results and findings are presented in Chapter Four.

10. Conclusions

The study aimed at investigating the effectiveness of using eclectic approach on developing the adult learners' English fluency in
general and on developing the adult learners' oral fluency in particular. Based on the results of the study, the study reached the following conclusions

5.4.1. Teaching English by combination of various methods and approaches helps the instructors to teach English effectively.

5.4.2. Teaching English should be made easy by bringing it into realistic situation. The situation makes the language easily comprehensible. It connects a closer link between an expression and its usage by coordinating meaning.

5.4.2. Using both phonological training supplemented by technological tools and interacting with native speakers of the English language had an effective role on developing learners’ oral fluency with special reference to phonological awareness.

5.4.3. The program shed the light on the importance of embedding the eclectic approach on the program book besides the interactive phonemic alphabetical chart and the instructor illustrated this section theoretically and practically in the first two sessions.

5.4.4. The used activities served to deepen the adult learners’ understanding, and helped them make connections to the tackled topics.

5.4.5. The learners were taught how to speak fluently, confidently, and with no hesitation. Multiple programs, in the current study, were effectively used to enhance learners’ fluency such as Elsa Speak,
Lingbe, YouGlish, interactive phonemic alphabetical chart, Englishcentral, and Podcasts.

5.4.6 The Eclectic Approach was flexible enough and more effective to be adapted to meet specific lesson objectives and analyze complex oral fluency situations in teaching English.

5.4.7. Instructors should be trained for effective teaching methodologies such as eclectic learning approach to enhance and ensure effective and successful instructional process.

5.4.8. The participants reflected their deep appreciation towards the effectiveness of the instructional program, as they achieved the required score needed to obtain the scholarship.

5.4.9. Effective teaching aids and other relevant technologies, using the power of artificial intelligence, should be used effectively to make teaching learning process more effective, successful and rewarding.

Recommendations

Based on the results and findings of the study, the following recommendations are elicited:

5.5.1. There is a clear future orientation to abandon teaching explicit grammatical rules and divert to real–life communication.

5.5.2. There is a clear evidence to support using Eclectic approach in the classroom to encourage creative speaking and enhance learners’ oral fluency and pronunciation.
5.5.3. Instructors should implement the usage of technology in learning language relying on the widespread usage of smart phone to access information.

5.5.4. Instructors should associate their teaching and learning with current technological tools.

5.5.5. Increasing numbers and hours of pronunciation courses in English programs

5.5.6. More attention should be paid to EFL teaching approaches as implementing new applications could facilitate the learning process and have a positive impact on enhancing the learning outcomes.

5.5.7. Embedding passive listening enhances both learners’ pronunciation and lexical acquisition.

5.5.8. Looking up for mispronounced words; in watched native speakers’ videos, has a positive impact on not only modifying the articulation of looked up phrase, but also acquiring various new vocabulary.

5.5.9. Using Elsa Speak program has a prominent effect on improving learners’ pronunciation, enunciation, in addition to modifying mispronunciation errors.

5.5.10. Practicing the language with native speakers, using Lingbe program, has an effective impact on enhancing learners’ oral fluency, prohibiting hesitation, and improving phonological awareness.
5.5.11. Teaching grammar implicitly is more effective than teaching it explicitly. Teaching grammar implicitly through context helps learners to master the grammar rule without facing the burdens of remembering the construction of the grammar rule itself. This helps on acquiring the application of grammar rule without wasting effort and time on recalling the rule which leads to enhancing learners’ oral fluency.

5.5.12. EFL educators should become more aware of the necessity of teaching EFL oral fluency.

5.5.13. Phonological awareness strategies should be implemented in teaching EFL oral fluency to learners at the early stage.

5.5.14. Learner-centered activities allow learners to construct contextual learning outcomes.

5.5.15. Eclectic approach helps the instructors embed and integrate the technology in practicing the language.

5.5.16. English language instructors training has to be continuous during their carrier path.

5.5.17. Instructors and instructors should continue developing their acquired skills and knowledge through getting enrolled at workshops, in-service courses and extension courses provided by specialized universities. Such courses could improve the instructors’ method of instructions in lecture halls.
Suggestions for further study

Researchers may further explore the effectiveness of applying visual thinking strategies in EFL learning. The following examples may be taken into consideration:

5.5.18. Enhancing English Learner instructor who had low level of phonological awareness with respect to segmental and suprasegmental aspects of the English language.

5.5.19. Exploring the effectiveness of eclectic approach on developing English language fluency in general.

5.5.20. Exploring the effect of other eclectic approaches on developing the oral fluency with special reference to phonological awareness.

5.5.21. An investigation of the effectiveness of eclectic approach on developing writing fluency.

5.5.22. An investigation of the attitude of adult learns towards EFL oral fluency instruction.

5.5.23. Designing a training program to train instructors on using nontraditional approaches and modern teaching aids depending on the power of AI.
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