

Speaking Fluently and Coherently: The IELTS Way

Teresito Jr. R. Delos Reyes¹, Elaiza Monica M. Mascariñas², Feliceto Jr. V. Lariba³

¹LPT, Public Relations Director, Monkayo College of Arts, Sciences, and Technology (MonCAST) Poblacion, Monkayo, Davao de Oro, Philippines, 8805

²LPT, Faculty Member, Monkayo College of Arts, Sciences, and Technology (MonCAST) Poblacion, Monkayo, Davao de Oro, Philippines, 8805

³LPT, MAED-ELT, Program Coordinator-BEED Program, Monkayo College of Arts, Sciences, and Technology (MonCAST) Poblacion, Monkayo, Davao de Oro, Philippines, 8805

DOI: <https://dx.doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2024.803303S>

Received: 31 August 2024; Accepted: 12 September 2024; Published: 14 October 2024

ABSTRACT

Oral proficiency is a critical skill in learning English, encompassing the verbal expression of thoughts and ideas. This study, “Speaking Fluently and Coherently: The IELTS Way,” explores the effectiveness of the IELTS program in addressing speaking fluency and coherence issues among Education students. Utilizing an action research design with a Dual Method approach, integrating qualitative and quantitative methods, the study investigates the impact of IELTS on students’ language proficiency. Results indicate significant improvements in themes such as Improved Clarity and Control, Reduced Stuttering, Continuing Improvement, and Natural Flow of Thoughts. These themes have implications for language proficiency and performance, highlighting the importance of articulation, fluency, and ongoing development. The study recommends targeted instructional strategies, interactive communication activities, and formative assessment to address identified challenges. Overall, the research underscores the holistic nature of language proficiency development and the effectiveness of the IELTS program in enhancing English speaking fluency.

Keywords: IELTS, speaking fluency, Action Research, dual method, Philippines

INTRODUCTION

Oral speech is the best approach to express thoughts, feelings, and ideas verbally. It ranks among the most crucial abilities for learning English. However, teaching other skills like writing, reading, and listening is essential (Oradee, 2012). This is comprehensible because conversation requires applying multiple skills, such as listening to the speaker and responding to what they said. As a result, speaking fluency is an essential factor to which students and teachers must pay attention, particularly for English students who must speak the language out loud every day to set an example for their peers. Even so, students and teachers must pay close attention to communicating fluently.

Clear communication requires accurate and fluid speech to convey the main ideas the speaker wants to get across. Speaking accurately can be a beginning point, resulting in fluent speech. Since English has long been widely used in both social and academic contexts in the Philippine educational systems, students—especially those in secondary and tertiary education—are expected to speak with a high language proficiency. Given that these kids spend significant time in contact with the English language, “it gives the impression that students gained communicative competence through language learning in school” (Separa et al., 2019). The projected level of speaking proficiency among Filipino learners has nevertheless remained

elusive.

According to the results of the 2008 International English Testing System (IELTS) survey, there has been a considerable decline in the English ability of Filipino pupils, as seen by the fact that they only placed second instead of first in the assessment of their language fluency. In addition, the Philippines dropped from the 14th to the 20th rank in the English Proficiency Index (EPI) of the Standard English Test (SET) given by English Proficiency Education First in 2019, demonstrating that despite the language's widespread use, Filipinos' English language proficiency has been declining for some time.

In addition, Separa L. et al. (2019) also noted that most tertiary-level students in the Philippines frequently need help speaking English, which typically occurs when they are required to give oral presentations like recitation and reporting. These speaking difficulties can be rooted in several factors that negatively impact one's speaking ability. According to Wang (2004), these characteristics include cognitive, linguistic (fluency, grammar, vocabulary), and psychological components. These factors have been shown to make it difficult for kids to produce speech successfully when they are not averagely met; as a result, language demands that may cause students to be incompetent will undoubtedly appear if not addressed through specialized programs. As a result, this study aims to pinpoint the linguistic requirements for speaking of a select group of Monkayo College of Arts, Sciences, and Technology (MonCAST) education students. Through the Guild of Language-Empowered Enthusiasts (GLEE) club of the college, the Summer Speaking Workshop, information is gathered, and the intervention is administered.

Purpose of the Study

This study aims to evaluate the effectiveness of an IELTS speaking training program as an intervention to enhance the speaking fluency and coherence of education students at Monkayo College of Arts, Sciences, and Technology (MonCAST). By first assessing the students' baseline speaking proficiency, the research seeks to measure the impact of a structured intervention designed to improve fluency (e.g., reducing hesitations and maintaining speech flow) and coherence (e.g., organizing ideas and using linking words). The study uses a pre-test and post-test format to determine the effectiveness of the training, with the goal of identifying improvements in the students' speaking performance.

In addition to measuring these improvements, the study also investigates how well the participants apply the newly acquired techniques in various speaking contexts, such as formal presentations and everyday discussions. The findings are expected to provide valuable insights into language learning methodologies, offering practical recommendations for educators and curriculum developers on how IELTS-based speaking training can be used to improve English language proficiency. The results aim to contribute to enhancing students' communicative competence in both academic and professional settings.

Research Questions

This study aimed to answer the following questions:

1. What is the level of the speaking performance of the Education students in the Diagnostic Test?
2. What is the level of the speaking performance of the Education students in the Evaluation Test?
3. How does the intervention help students improve their speaking fluency and coherence?

METHODOLOGY

This study employed an action research design involving a cyclical process of planning, implementing, observing, and reflecting upon interventions to improve a specific issue. Specifically, the Dual Method is utilized in this study to investigate and analyze the effectiveness of IELTS in addressing speaking fluency

and coherence issues among Education students. Action research is a dynamic and participatory research methodology that engages practitioners and researchers in collaborative problem-solving and knowledge generation within real-world contexts. The dual method design within action research involves integrating qualitative and quantitative research methods, thereby fostering a more comprehensive understanding of complex issues and promoting evidence-based decision-making.

The dual method design combines the strengths of qualitative and quantitative research methodologies to provide a multi-dimensional view of the researched phenomenon. Qualitative methods, such as interviews, observations, and content analysis, delve into the intricate nuances of the issue, capturing participants' perspectives, emotions, and contextual factors (Smith, 2015). On the other hand, quantitative methods, including surveys, assessments, and statistical analyses, allow researchers to quantify patterns, measure changes, and establish statistical significance (Johnson & Onwuegbuzie, 2004).

A. Research Participants

The research involved 20 education students from Monkayo College of Arts, Sciences, and Technology (MonCAST), who had voluntarily enrolled in the Speaking Workshop organized by the college's GLEE (Guild of Language-Empowered Enthusiast) club. Participants were selected through purposive sampling based on the following inclusion criteria: students had to be enrolled in either the Bachelor of Elementary Education (BEED) or Bachelor of Secondary Education (BSED) programs at MonCAST. Students from all year levels, ranging from first-year to fourth-year, were eligible to participate, ensuring a broad representation of perspectives and skill levels within the education program.

There were no restrictions on age or sex, allowing for a diverse group of participants. Additionally, students' current academic performance, speaking grades, or proficiency levels were not predetermined, meaning both advanced and less experienced speakers were encouraged to participate. This inclusive approach provided a comprehensive understanding of the effectiveness of the intervention across a varied sample of participants, reflecting the diversity of students enrolled in the education programs at MonCAST.

B. Data Collection

This research followed a systematic approach to investigate the impact of using IELTS speaking training to enhance speaking fluency and coherence among education students. A combination of quantitative and qualitative data collection methods was employed to provide a comprehensive understanding of the intervention's effectiveness and participants' experiences. The primary tool for data collection was the adopted IELTS speaking assessment tool, recognized globally for its reliability and validity in evaluating English-speaking abilities.

Before the intervention, participants' baseline speaking proficiency was assessed using the adopted IELTS Speaking Test. While this standardized test evaluates four essential criteria—Fluency and Coherence, Lexical Resource, Grammatical Range and Accuracy, and Pronunciation—this study specifically focused on Fluency and Coherence, as these were the primary areas targeted for improvement in the intervention. Fluency and Coherence assess the ability to speak smoothly, organize thoughts logically, and maintain a steady flow of speech. These aspects are crucial for effective communication, particularly in academic and professional contexts, where the ability to express ideas clearly and without hesitation is key to successful interaction (Goh & Burns, 2012; Ur, 2012).

Although the IELTS test assesses a wide range of speaking competencies, fluency and coherence were emphasized in this study because they are fundamental to achieving overall speaking proficiency. The rationale behind this focus lies in the observation that many students struggle with organizing their thoughts coherently and maintaining a fluent flow of speech, even when they possess adequate vocabulary and

grammatical knowledge. Improving fluency helps students reduce hesitations and speak more naturally, while enhancing coherence enables them to structure their speech logically, making it easier for listeners to follow their ideas. These two elements are central to the communicative competence that the intervention aimed to foster (Kormos & Trebits, 2019).

After the intervention, participants underwent the same adopted IELTS Speaking Test to assess improvements specifically in fluency and coherence. Throughout the intervention, participants were observed to track how well they applied coherence strategies and improved their speech fluency. To complement the assessment results, questionnaires were distributed to gather participants' perceptions of the training's effectiveness, challenges encountered, and overall experience with the intervention.

The structured IELTS speaking training program included modules aimed at enhancing fluency and coherence. These modules focused on techniques such as using linking words, maintaining topic relevance, reducing hesitations, and sustaining a steady speech pace. Participants engaged in interactive workshops and practice sessions, working in pairs or groups to apply these strategies. The speaking workshop ran for four weeks, excluding the pre-test and post-test, and included various drills and interactive activities designed to help students improve their speaking skills in alignment with the adopted IELTS assessment criteria.

C. Data Analysis Plan

This study employed a dual method of qualitative research design to analyze the data collected in response to the research questions. For Research Question 1 and 2, which aimed to determine the level of speaking performance of the education students in the Diagnostic Test, the data were analyzed using the Mean and Independent T-Test: Paired Samples.

The Mean, defined as the average, was utilized to derive the central tendency of the speaking scores from the Diagnostic Test, allowing for a clear understanding of the participants' initial speaking abilities. As noted by Morris (2008), the Mean serves as a statistical treatment that effectively presents the relationship between language learners' scores, providing insight into the overall speaking performance prior to any intervention.

Research Question 3 sought to understand how the intervention helped students improve their speaking fluency and coherence. To address this question, thematic analysis was conducted on qualitative data gathered through participant feedback. According to Clarke and Braun (2017), thematic analysis provides an accessible and theoretically flexible approach to analyzing qualitative data. The researchers identified recurring themes from participants' responses regarding their experiences and perceptions of the training, focusing on aspects that contributed to enhancements in their speaking skills, including specific techniques and strategies learned during the workshop.

Table 1. Description of Level of Performance

| Mean Score | Description | Interpretation |
|------------|-------------------|---|
| 7.41-9.0 | Excellent | The students have a full operational command of the language. Their use of English is appropriate, accurate and fluent, and they show complete understanding. |
| 5.81-7.4 | Very satisfactory | The students have a fully operational command of the language with only occasional unsystematic inaccuracies and inappropriate usage. |

| | | |
|----------|-------------------|---|
| 4.21-5.8 | Satisfactory | Generally, the students have an effective command of the language despite some inaccuracies, inappropriate usage and misunderstandings. They can use and understand fairly complex language, particularly in familiar situations. |
| 2.61-4.2 | Good | The students have a partial command of the language, and cope with overall meaning in most situations, although they are likely to make many mistakes. |
| 1-2.6 | Needs Improvement | The students have a great difficulty understanding spoken and written English. |

RESULTS

This section presents the results and the respective interpretations based on the methods designed for this research after a series of meticulous process of data treatment and interpretations. Below is the table showing the result data from the IELTS Diagnostic and Evaluation Test.

Research Question 1. What is the level of the speaking performance of the Education students in the Diagnostic Test?

Research Question 2. What is the level of the speaking performance of the Education students in the Evaluation Test?

Table 2. Diagnostic and Evaluation Test Results

| | N | Mean | SD | SE |
|------------|----|-------|-------|-------|
| EVALUATION | 24 | 6.354 | 0.599 | 0.122 |
| DIAGNOSTIC | 24 | 4.500 | 0.921 | 0.188 |

The table 2 shows the level of the speaking performance of the Education students in the Diagnostic. The figure shows that students have garnered a total mean of 4.5. This means that the students generally have an adequate command of the language despite some inaccuracies, inappropriate usage, and misunderstandings. Moreover, they can use and understand fairly complex language, particularly in familiar situations, despite frequent problems in understanding, expressing, and utilizing complex language.

Additionally, regarding the students' performance in the IELTS evaluation, the table shows that they generally scored a mean of 6.354. This means that after the researchers' administration of the intervention program, the students have a fully operational command of the language with only occasional unsystematic inaccuracies and inappropriate usage. Moreover, they can use and understand complex language satisfactorily, particularly in familiar situations, and seldom need help in understanding, expressing, and utilizing complex language.

Paired Samples T-Test

Table 3. Paired Samples T-Test of the IELTS Diagnostic and Evaluation Test

| | | t | df | p | Mean Difference | SE Difference | |
|------------|---|------------|-------|----|-----------------|---------------|-------|
| Evaluation | - | Diagnostic | 17.44 | 23 | < .001 | 1.854 | 0.106 |

The above table shows the Paired Samples T-Test of the IELTS Diagnostic and Evaluation Test of the students. This table shows whether there is a significant difference in the performance of the student

between the two tests. The result of the t-test is 17.44 with a p-value of .001. This means that there is a significant difference in the level of student performance between the Diagnostic and Evaluation.

Research Question 3. How does the intervention help students improve their speaking fluency and coherence?

Table 4. Essential themes on how the intervention help students improve their speaking fluency and coherence

| Essential Themes | Core Ideas |
|---------------------------------|---|
| 1. Improved Clarity and Control | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Enhanced understanding · Effective communication · Streamlined processes · Empowerment and autonomy |
| 2. Reduced Stuttering | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Enhance communication fluency · Improved workflow efficiency · Optimized performance · Increased confidence |
| 3. Continuing Improvement | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Incremental growth and development · Feedback integration · Reflective practices · Goal Setting and Monitoring |
| 4. Natural Flow of Thoughts | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Uninterrupted expression · Creative flow · Mindfulness and presence · Spontaneity |

The above table presents the identified themes based on the statements provided by the participants during the interview. The themes were derived through systematic analysis and through the interpretation of data to identify patterns, trends, and recurring ideas. The first theme, Improved Clarity and Control, pertains to enhancing speaking clarity and control. Participants note that their speaking pace has become steadier and more controlled, allowing their ideas to flow more clearly and coherently. This suggests that the workshop helps them refine their communication skills.

Following the theme, the Reduced Stuttering, reports a decrease in stuttering as a positive outcome of the workshop. This is a notable improvement for individuals who previously experienced speech impediments,

indicating that the program aids in overcoming such challenges. Moreover, Continuing Improvement expresses that while participants have seen improvements in their speaking skills and confidence, there is still room for further enhancement. Participants express a commitment to ongoing progress, suggesting that the workshop instills a sense of continual self-improvement and growth.

Another theme is the Natural Flow of Thoughts, which highlights the participants' ability to speak with a calm and natural flow of thoughts. This suggests that the workshop enables them to communicate more comfortably and express their ideas in a way that reflects their genuine thoughts and feelings. The manifestation of a "natural flow" is observable in the seamless and uninterrupted exchange of ideas. Conversations among students exhibit a fluidity characterized by smooth transitions between thoughts and an absence of frequent interruptions or hesitations. Actively engaged in discussions, students who embody a natural flow demonstrate their ability to listen attentively and respond thoughtfully to their peers. This spontaneity extends to the creative and expressive elements they incorporate into their speech, such as vivid descriptions and engaging anecdotes. A natural flow in communication also reflects adaptability to different contexts, allowing students to adjust their language use based on the nature of the conversation, audience, and purpose.

Furthermore, reduced communication anxiety is evident as students convey confidence in their speech, fostering a relaxed and authentic communication style. Effective communication is facilitated in group settings, with students collaborating seamlessly and contributing to a cohesive and inclusive environment. Clear articulation of thoughts, positive nonverbal cues, and the creation of interpersonal connections underscore the richness of a natural flow, enhancing student communication's overall quality and impact within academic and social spheres.

The identified themes—Improved Clarity and Control, Reduced Stuttering, Continuing Improvement, and Natural Flow of Thoughts—bear significant implications for the language proficiency and overall performance of students who underwent the workshop. Improved Clarity and Control suggest focusing on precise expression and mastery over language use during the speaking test. This theme implies that students who can articulate their thoughts clearly and maintain control over their communication will likely make a positive impression on examiners, potentially influencing their overall performance. The theme of Reduced Stuttering has direct implications for fluency, as minimizing instances of stuttering contributes to a smoother and more coherent spoken performance. Continuing Improvement underscores the importance of an ongoing commitment to language development, suggesting that test-takers who approach their preparation with a growth mindset and a dedication to refinement are likely to exhibit adaptability and creativity, positively impacting their performance in the communication process. The natural Flow of Thoughts implies a seamless and engaging expression that can captivate students, contributing to a more enjoyable listening experience and potentially influencing the coherence assessment. These themes underscore the holistic nature of language proficiency development, providing insights that can inform effective strategies for students and contribute to a more nuanced understanding of the factors influencing fluency and coherence in spoken language assessments.

CONCLUSION

The result of the study shows a significant difference in the student's performance levels between the Diagnostic and Evaluation tests of IELTS. Regarding Table 2, during the pre-test, with a total mean of 4.5, it was found that students generally had an adequate command of the language despite some inaccuracies, inappropriate usage, and misunderstandings. However, it is also shown that they frequently struggle to understand complex language expressions and use them in actual conversation. However, it is worth noting that the students significantly improved their fluency, as shown in the evaluation result.

Furthermore, as stated in the data result in Table 2 for the evaluation, the students have garnered a total mean of 6.354 in their IELTS language proficiency test performance. This means that most students have a fully operational command of the language with only occasional unsystematic inaccuracies and inappropriate usage. Similarly, they can use and comprehend satisfactorily complex language, particularly in familiar situations, and seldom face problems in understanding, expressing, and utilizing complex language.

Nevertheless, the paired t-test result in Table 2 further concluded that there is a significant difference between the performance of the student between the two tests for IELTS. Thus, this statistical result only proved that the IELTS Program is an effective tool in harnessing students' language capabilities. In this aspect, it is in the English-speaking fluency.

RECOMMENDATION

The research study "Speaking Fluently and Coherently: the IELTS Way" has yielded insightful results highlighting a significant difference in students' performance levels between the Diagnostic and Evaluation tests of IELTS. In reference to the findings presented in Table 2, the pre-test results, with a total mean score of 4.5, suggest that students generally possess an adequate command of the language despite some identified inaccuracies, inappropriate usage, and misunderstandings. Notably, a noteworthy challenge surfaced as students faced difficulties understanding complex language expressions and struggled with their practical application in conversations. However, it is worth highlighting a positive trend observed in the evaluation result, indicating a substantial improvement in students' fluency. To build upon these encouraging developments, several recommendations emerge. Firstly, targeted instructional strategies should be implemented to enhance students' understanding of complex language expressions.

Additionally, more interactive and communicative activities, such as role-playing and group discussions, should be incorporated to foster practical language application. A feedback and remediation approach are recommended to address inaccuracies and inappropriate language usage. Furthermore, integrating fluency-building activities, ongoing formative assessment, and promoting independent language learning can contribute to sustained progress. Lastly, ensuring instructors receive professional development opportunities will enhance their ability to support students effectively. These recommendations collectively aim to fortify the positive aspects of language proficiency while addressing identified areas for improvement, ultimately enhancing students' readiness for communication.

REFERENCES

1. Goh, C. C. M., & Burns, A. (2012). Teaching speaking: A holistic approach. *Cambridge University Press*.
2. Johnson, R. B., & Onwuegbuzie, A. J. (2004). Mixed methods research: A research paradigm whose time has come. *Educational researcher*, 33(7), 14-26.
3. Kormos, J., & Trebits, A. (2019). The role of fluency in communication. *Language Teaching Research*, 23(4), 469-491.
4. Morris, S. B. (2008). Estimating effect sizes from pretest-posttest-control group designs. *Organizational research methods*, 11(2), 364-386.
5. Oradee 2012. Deleloping Speaking Skills Using Three Communicative Activities (Discussion, Problem-Solving, and Role Playing). *International Journal of Social Science and Humanity*
6. Separa et al., 2019. Self-Assessment on the Oral Communication of Filipino College Students. *Journal of Computational and Theoretical Nanoscience*
7. Smith, J. A. (2015). Qualitative psychology: A practical guide to research methods. *Qualitative psychology*, 1-312.

8. Ur, P. (2012). *A Course in Language Teaching: Practice and Theory*. Cambridge University Press.
9. Wang, Y. (2004). Supporting synchronous distance language learning with desktop videoconferencing.

APPENDICES

IELTS Speaking Practice Test 1

PART 1 (4-5 minutes)

Where did you grow up?

Was that a good place to grow up?

What do you remember most about growing up? What kind of child were you?

Did you ever get into trouble at home or school? Do you miss anything about your childhood?

PART 2 (3-4 minutes)

You have 1 minute to read the instructions in the box and prepare an answer. You can make notes. After your preparation time has ended, please speak for 1 to 2 minutes on this topic.

Describe your best friend during childhood.

You should say:

who the person was why you became friends what you used to do together and explain if you keep in touch with your friend now.

Follow-up question: Do you wish you could go back to those days?

PART 3 (4-5 minutes)

Childhood friends

Do children find it easy to make friends?

Why do some people grow apart from their childhood friends? Is it better for children to have a few close friends, or many?

Childhood changes

Has the image of childhood changed in your country?

At what age do children become adults?

Do you think children should be treated the same as adults?

Notes for interviewers

In Parts 1 & 3, you do not need to ask all the questions.

In Part 1, you can repeat the question if requested by the candidate, but you must not provide any further help.

In Part 2, you can answer questions during the preparation time, but you should then let the candidate speak without interruption. In Part 3, you can paraphrase or explain the question, but try not to give your own opinion.

© IELTS Academic. Photocopiable. For more IELTS practice tests and sample answers, visit ielts-academic.com

| Band | Fluency and coherence | Lexical resource | Grammatical range and accuracy | Pronunciation |
|------|---|--|---|---|
| 9 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> speaks fluently with only rare repetition or self-correction; any hesitation is content-related rather than to find words or grammar speaks coherently with fully appropriate cohesive features develops topics fully and appropriately | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> uses vocabulary with full flexibility and precision in all topics uses idiomatic language naturally and accurately | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> uses a full range of structures naturally and appropriately produces consistently accurate structures apart from slips characteristic of native speaker speech | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> uses a full range of pronunciation features with precision and subtlety sustains flexible use of features throughout is effortless to understand |
| 8 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> speaks fluently with only occasional repetition or self-correction; hesitation is usually content-related and only rarely to search for language develops topics coherently and appropriately | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> uses a wide vocabulary resource readily and flexibly to convey precise meaning uses less common and idiomatic vocabulary skilfully, with occasional inaccuracies uses paraphrase effectively as required | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> uses a wide range of structures flexibly produces a majority of error-free sentences with only very occasional inappropriate or basic/non-systematic errors | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> uses a wide range of pronunciation features sustains flexible use of features, with only occasional lapses is easy to understand throughout; L1 accent has minimal effect on intelligibility |
| 7 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> speaks at length without noticeable effort or loss of coherence may demonstrate language-related hesitation at times, or some repetition and/or self-correction uses a range of connectives and discourse markers with some flexibility | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> uses vocabulary resource flexibly to discuss a variety of topics uses some less common and idiomatic vocabulary and shows some awareness of style and collocation, with some inappropriate choices uses paraphrase effectively | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> uses a range of complex structures with some flexibility frequently produces error-free sentences, though some grammatical mistakes persist | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> shows all the positive features of Band 6 and some, but not all, of the positive features of Band 8 |
| 6 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> is willing to speak at length, though may lose coherence at times due to occasional repetition, self-correction or hesitation uses a range of connectives and discourse markers but not always appropriately | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> has a wide enough vocabulary to discuss topics at length and make meaning clear in spite of inaccuracies generally paraphrases successfully | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> uses a mix of simple and complex structures, but with limited flexibility may make frequent mistakes with complex structures though these rarely cause comprehension problems | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> uses a range of pronunciation features with mixed control shows some effective use of features but this is not sustained can generally be understood throughout, though mispronunciation of individual words or sounds reduces clarity at times |
| 5 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> usually maintains flow of speech but uses repetition, self-correction and/or slow speech to keep going may over-use certain connectives and discourse markers produces simple speech fluently, but more complex communication causes fluency problems | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> manages to talk about familiar and unfamiliar topics but uses vocabulary with limited flexibility attempts to use paraphrase but with mixed success | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> produces basic sentence forms with reasonable accuracy uses a limited range of more complex structures, but these usually contain errors and may cause some comprehension problems | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> shows all the positive features of Band 4 and some, but not all, of the positive features of Band 6 |
| 4 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> cannot respond without noticeable pauses and may speak slowly, with frequent repetition and self-correction links basic sentences but with repetitive use of simple connectives and some breakdowns in coherence | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> is able to talk about familiar topics but can only convey basic meaning on unfamiliar topics and makes frequent errors in word choice rarely attempts paraphrase | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> produces basic sentence forms and some correct simple sentences but subordinate structures are rare errors are frequent and may lead to misunderstanding | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> uses a limited range of pronunciation features attempts to control features but lapses are frequent mispronunciations are frequent and cause some difficulty for the listener |
| 3 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> speaks with long pauses has limited ability to link simple sentences gives only simple responses and is frequently unable to convey basic message pauses lengthily before most words little communication possible | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> uses simple vocabulary to convey personal information has insufficient vocabulary for less familiar topics | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> attempts basic sentence forms but with limited success, or relies on apparently memorised utterances makes numerous errors except in memorised expressions | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> shows some of the features of Band 2 and some, but not all, of the positive features of Band 4 |
| 2 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> pauses lengthily before most words little communication possible | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> only produces isolated words or memorised utterances | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> cannot produce basic sentence forms | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Speech is often unintelligible |
| 1 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> no communication possible no rateable language | | | |
| 0 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> does not attend | | | |