



Islamic Azad University
Sari Branch
Department of English Language

Title

Speaking Skill

Professor

Dr. Hadi Hamidi

Student

.....

Table of Contents

Title	Page
1.1. Introduction.....	3
1.2. Interpretation of communicative competence.....	3
1.3. Definitions of speaking.....	4
1.4. Functions of speaking.....	5
1.5. Categorization of speaking activities.....	7
1.5.1. Littlewood's categorization of speaking activities.....	7
1.5.2. Harmer's categorization of speaking activities..	8
1.5.3. Byrne's categorization of speaking activities..	8
1.6. Fluency as a characteristics of speaking.....	9
1.6.1. Definitions of fluency.....	9
1.7. Definitions and scope of role-play.....	12
1.7.1. Three steps for role-play procedure.....	15
1.7.2. Six steps for role-play activities..	15
1.8. Role-play in speaking fluency.....	16
1.9. Summary.....	18
REFERENCES.....	19

1.1.Introduction

Development of productive skills, i.e. speaking and writing, and receptive skills, i.e. listening and reading in learning English as a foreign language is necessary. The importance of speaking is highlighted to represent the learner's language knowledge and proficiency. Oral fluency as a vital characteristic in speaking needs to be paid more attention to. Therefore, the researcher is motivated to focus on the prominent role of fluency in L2 speaking. Definition of fluency based on holistic and scientific views is presented. Moreover, the concept of role-play as a pedagogical technique in L2 speech production is followed by definition and role of this technique. As mentioned, the present study investigates the effect of role play on speaking fluency of Iranian school students. Accordingly, this chapter addresses the definition and the role of speaking, fluency, and role play in teaching English as a foreign language. Finally, the combinatory potential of these three concepts is shown.

1.2. Interpretation of communicative competence

Speaking skill provides the students with the process of communicating effectively through language. Moreover, speaking gives the students the opportunity not only to manipulate the structures of the foreign language but also to develop strategies for relating these structures to their communicative functions in authentic situations (Littlewoods, 1981). In other words, the main purpose of language is demonstrating structural, functional, and social meaning of what we speak in different and real situations. According to Harmer (1984), the competence that Chomsky referred to as knowledge of grammatical rules was not good to a native speaker, from Hymes's perspective, if he did not know how to use the language which those rules produces. Therefore, exploring the use of language leads the researchers to a new concept and communicative competence.

Bachman (1990, p.84) defined communicative competence as "both knowledge or competence in appropriate, contextualized language use". He (1990, p.83) claimed that "Recent

formulations of communicative competence provide much more inclusive descriptions of the knowledge required to use language than did the earlier skills and components models". The relationship between communicative competence and language competence leads Bachman (1990) to offer a tree diagram of the hierarchical relationships among the components of language competence while they all interact with each other.

1.3. Definitions of speaking

Speaking is one of the most important skill in foreign language teaching helps the learner to demonstrate their thoughts, opinions, and feelings. Hedge's (2000, p. 261) definition of speaking is indicated as "a skill by which they [people] are judged while first impressions are being formed." Also highlights the importance of speaking as a skill for reflecting people's thoughts and personalities. More importantly, Celce-Murcia (2000, p.103) claimed that for most people "the ability to speak a language is synonymous with knowing that language since speech is the most basic means of human communication". Accordingly, Baker and Warstrup (2003, p.5) endorse that "a student who can speak English may have greater chance for further education, of finding employment and gaining promotion."

Many researchers have tried to provide variety of different definitions for speaking. Trigon et al. (1998) defined speaking as a skill of conveying words or sounds of articulation to express or to deliver ideas, opinions, or feelings. Byrne (1986, p.) explained speaking as "oral communication is a two way process between speaker and listener as well as involves the productive skill of speaking and the receptive skill of understanding". Speaking has various meanings: to tell, to say, to make known by speaking, to declare, to announce, to proclaim, to celebrate, and to use or to be able to use a given language in speaking (Webster, 1980). Therefore, speaking can be explained as a process of presenting one's knowledge, thoughts, opinions, identity, and interests to other person or persons.

According to Chaney (1998), speaking can be considered as a process of building and sharing meaning through the use of verbal and non-verbal symbols in various contexts. More precisely, speaking skill leads the learners to communicate their thoughts and feelings orally and effectively. According to Shen and Suwante (2011), the need for communicative skills in English has been growing in daily and occupational situations. Many Iranian students entering universities suffer the lack of English proficiency in communicating in English. Although they are good at writing ability, they suffer from inability in L2 speaking fluently and successfully. These students can be considered as dumb English. Wang and Motteram (2006) explained dumb English as the situation when the students want to communicate in English but they cannot conduct it well and successfully because of different reasons such as shyness, tension, lack of confidence, and shortage of effective communication skills in English. Therefore, teachers need to provide conditions and classroom tasks in order to contribute the students to improve their oral skills of the target language in communicative interactions actively and energetically. To develop the students' communicative competence in L2, the focus should be shifted from teachers and teaching to learners and learning.

To contribute the students to speak in English fluently, it is necessary to support the students with stimulating situations and to encourage them to think creatively and speak successfully and fluently. Oxford (1990) proposed that learning strategies as tools for active and self-directed and for developing communicative competence in language learning are necessary. Moreover, role-play as an effective technique provides the students with enjoyable and exiting activity to engage them to interact and negotiate with others in learning contexts.

1.4. Functions of speaking

Richards (2007) categorized the functions of speaking in human interaction into three types: interaction, transaction, and performance. "Each of these speech activities is quiet distinct in terms of form and function and requires different teaching approaches" Trigon et al., 1998,

p.8). In other words, the main goal of speaking is to maintain interaction and social relationship, normal in the form of conversation. Mastering the art of speaking as interaction is difficult and is required to create a good communication in a natural way, however some L2 learners lose words and feel difficulty to present a good image of themselves (Richards, 1986). According to Richards (1986), speaking as interaction needs some skills, opening and closing conversation, choosing topics, making small talk, recounting personal incidents and experiences, turn-taking, using adjacency pairs, interrupting, reacting to other, and also requires some features, social function, formality or casualness, role relationships, speaker's identity, conversational convention, degree of politeness, generic words, and conversational registers.

Transaction as a second feature of speaking refers to situations where the focus is on what is said or done and is making oneself understood clearly and accurately rather than how the participants interact socially with each other (Richards, 1986). Additionally, Burns (1999) considered speaking as transaction from two different dimensions. 1) giving and receiving information, and 2) giving and receiving goods or services. To speak as transaction, there are different features: emphasis on information and the message and the participants, application of communication strategies, frequent questions, repetitions, comprehension checks, negotiation, and digression. Speaking as transaction has several main skills: explaining a need or intention, describing something, asking question, confirming information, justifying an opinion, making suggestions, clarifying understanding, and making comparisons. Unlike speaking as transaction, speaking as interaction is more easily planned because current communicative materials are considered as a rich source for group activities, role plays, and information-gap activities (Richards, 1986).

The third kind of speaking, speaking as performance, refers to public speaking for transmitting information such as mourning tasks, public announcements, and speeches. Compare with speaking as interaction or transaction, speaking as performance has a monologue-based and recognizable format and is evaluated by the degree of effectiveness on the listener. In speaking

as performance, form and accuracy are important and language is more similar to written language. In order to speak as performance, some of the monologue skills are necessary: sing an appropriate form, presenting information in an appropriate sequence, maintaining audience engagement, using correct pronunciation and grammar, creating an effect on the audience, using appropriate vocabulary, and using appropriate opening and closing (Richards, 2007). As the feature and the skills indicate, speaking as performance requires different teaching and learning strategies.

1.5. Categorization of speaking activities

The purpose of this part is to show different categorization of speaking activities based on Littlewood (1981), Harmer (1984), and Byrne (1987) in order to consider various criteria.

1.5.1. Littlewood's (1981) categorization of speaking activities

Littlewood (1981) divided speaking activities into two main types: functional communicative activities and social interaction activities. One of the most important aspects of functional communicative activities is communicating an intended meaning effectively in a specific situation. In this type of speaking activity, language appropriateness or grammatical accuracy is not intended. In other words, the focus of these activities is on communicating of meanings rather than learning linguistic forms. Unlike the first type of speaking activities, it is not necessary to reduce the conventions that restrict the cooperation between the students in social interaction activities. In social interaction activities, the focus becomes more noticeable in richer patterns of communication and in communicating meaning for a specific purpose. Therefore, students require more communicative skills and creativity for getting meanings across. In these activities, grammatical accuracy is not important too, however, the teacher may indicate what skills need to be learnt or practiced (Littlewood, 1981).

1.5.2. Harmer's (1984) categorization of speaking activities

Harmer (1984) categorized speaking activities into seven groups: 1) Reaching a consensus: In these activities, learners need an opportunity to agree with each other certain amount of discussion with the chance of free and spontaneous language use. 2) Relating instructions: In this kind of activity, students with enough information for performing the task without receiving any instructions have to be able to support group or groups of students with performing the same task. 3) Communication games: These activities are similar to games and are rooted in the principle of information gap. Use of all and any language which leads the students to complete the task is important here. 4) Problem solving: In problem solving activities, a problem is designed with the purpose of engaging the students to solve it. 5) Interpersonal exchange: In this type of activities, the topic for conversation is based on students' offer. 6) Story construction: In these activities, students are provided information as a part of a story and then they are asked for other parts of the story in order to be completed. 7) Simulation and role play: The main purpose of these activities is to present a real-life situation in the classroom. The real world is simulated in the classroom and then students are asked to play the roles and to express their views based on their roles. One of the most important aspects of these activities is emphasizing on both linguistic accuracy and communicative efficiency.

1.5.3. Byrne's (1987) categorization of speaking activities

Byrne's (1987) division of speaking activities is based on two main criteria: fluency and accuracy. Fluency and accuracy have their own subcategories: 1) fluency work in pairs, 2) fluency work in groups, 3) accuracy work in pairs, and 4) accuracy work in groups. Fluency and accuracy activities lead us to conclude that they focus on getting something right and language use freely, respectively.

To sum up, the researcher is motivated to study the combinatory potential of three different activities, social interaction activities (Littlewood, 1981), role play (1983), and fluency work in group (Byrne, 1987), in order to improve EFL learners' speaking fluency development through role playing and engaging the whole class as a mixed-ability group which supports them with cooperation and collaboration.

1.6. Fluency as a characteristic of speaking

Fluency is known as one of main characteristics of the communicative competence through classroom practice and to know how the language system works in appropriate way. According to Tait (2001), communicative activities are fluency-based which provide the students with meaningful and purposeful interaction. Meisel (1987) confirmed that fluency can be defined in terms of communicative acceptability. Despite the important role of oral fluency in L2 acquisition, it has not been paid enough attention by L2 researchers in recent years. More importantly, the concept of fluency in speaking is not yet completely found out. Therefore, this part will define fluency and identify its different qualitative and quantitative aspects.

1.6.1. Definitions of fluency

Many researchers have offered definition of fluency in a range of different ways. Gustin (1983) provided a holistic view of fluency theoretically. More precisely, Gustin (1983) offered a definition of fluency in Fillmore's (1979) terms. Fillmore (1979) set four various criteria for being a fluent speaker: 1) filling the time with talk, 2) talking in coherent and reasoned sentences, 3) having appropriate things to say in a wide range of contexts, 4) being creative and imaginative in language use. Another definition of fluency is provided by Day and Shapson (1987, p.242) as "the ease and flow of the students' speech in comparison with native speakers". According to Breadmore (1972, p.10), "oral fluency requires the ready availability of this communicative competence for the formulation of appropriate utterances in real time, involving

a strategy for the elaboration of sentence structure as well as the selection and insertion of lexical items. Individual sentences must be integrated into connected discourses”.

Unlike these general and holistic perspectives of fluency, some researchers have attempted to propose a more scientific and specific definitions of fluency. Leeson (1975) offered three main components with their own constituents for definition of oral fluency: 1) a phonological component (articulation rate, pausal phenomena, phonological production, and phonological discrimination), 2) a syntactic component (error count, gap filling, and syntactic manipulation skill), and 3) a semantic component (associative networks in a variety of registers, and awareness of the functional value of utterances).

Fluency as one of main characteristics of the speaker performance is an ambition to achieve in teaching the productive skills. Kaponen and Riggenbach (2000, p.7) considered fluency as the metaphor “Language is motion”. Additionally, Segalowitz (2010, p.4) endorsed the underlying theme of this metaphor “focuses on those aspects of speech having to do with its fluidity or flowing quality”. In other words, fluency can be explained as the “smooth, rapid, effortless use of language” (Crystal, 1987, p.421). Moreover, Brumfit (1984) defined fluency as “the natural language use, whether or not it results in native-speaker-like language comprehension or production” (p.56). In other words, Tricia (2000, p.54) supported that “The term fluency relates to the production and it is normally reserves for speech. It is the ability to link units of speech together with facility and without strain or inappropriate slowness, or undue recitation”. Hughes (2002) endorsed that fluency and coherence refer to the ability to speak in a normal level of continuity, rate and effort in addition to link the ideas together in a coherent way. Although the concept of fluency is considered as “confusing and disappointed” with “a multitude of meanings” (Segalowitz, 2010, p.2) in order to be described and measured, the current study is intended to use Parrott’s (1993) definition of oral fluency as the ability to communicate an intended message, to adjust the messages according to the responses of the listener, to produce coherent utterance and stretches of speech, to respond and speak with

continuity, and to use strategies to aid communication when the appropriate vocabulary or grammar is not available. Lennon (2000, p.26) also added that "a working definition of fluency might be the rapid, smooth, accurate, lucid, and efficient translation of thought or communicative intention into language under the temporal constraints of on-line processing". In other words, according to Koponen and Riggenschach's (2000) definition of fluency as a performance based on phenomenon which is related to the flow, continuity, automaticity, or smoothness of the speech. Hartmann and Stork (1976) added a definition of fluent speaker as a person who is able to use structures of language accurately while concentrating on content rather than form and using the units and patterns automatically at normal conversational speed when they are required.

To promote oral fluency, many researchers offered different techniques: 1) engaging students in speaking and practicing it over and over, reading aloud to improve pronunciation and confidence for oral skill, using the language laboratory, and experiencing a "year abroad" (Ajiboye, 1895), 2) learning by heart in order to acquire some automatisms and a surer sense of the structure and rhythm of the language, repeating in a low voice or mentally; formulating ideas; overcoming timidity by interacting with other L2 learners (Dejean Le Feal, 1976), and 3) promoting real-life or authentic communicative language activity beyond the parameters of the classroom (Heffernan, 1986). Moreover, there are seven principle highlight the combinatory potential of fluency and communicative strategies in designing fluency-based activities: incorporating repetition, increasing the amount of speaking time, allowing time to prepare before speaking, using familiar and motivating topics, ensuring appropriate language level, setting time limits, and teaching formulaic sequences.

Besides the problematic definition of fluency, organizing the components of fluency is too difficult. There are some studies which have attempted to specify the components of L2 speakers' fluency: temporal variables of speech production (Lennon, 1990; Mohle, 1984), combination of temporal and interactive aspects of speech production (Reggenbach, 1991), the

phonological aspects of fluency (Hieke, 1984; Wennerstorn, 2000), and the components from analysis of formulaic speech in study in L2 oral fluency (Ejzenberg, 2000; Towell et al., 1996). To establish the appropriate measures of fluency, three main variables are considered: 1) *speech rate* as the number of syllables produced per minute, 2) *the mean length of runs* as the average number of syllables articulated in utterances between pauses of 0.25 seconds and above (Lennon, 1990; Riggenbach, 1991; Freed, 1995; Towell et al., 1996; Ejzenberg, 2000), and 3) *phonation-time ratio* as the percentage of time spent speaking as a percentage proportion of the time taken to produce the speech sample (Lennon, 1990; Van Gelderen, 1994; Towell et al., 1996). Moreover, many studies indicated that disfluencies, such as repetitions, restarts, and reports, tend to appear in clusters of the non-influent L2 learners' speech (Riggenbach, 1991; Freed, 1995) while fluent students pause at grammatical junctures (Lennon, 1990; Towell et al., 1996).

1.7. Definitions and scope of role-play

Many researchers have studied the importance of interaction in classroom communication in order to develop L2 learners' skills. Wanger (1994, p.8) defined interaction as "reciprocal events that requires at least two subjects and two actions. Interaction occurs when these objects and events naturally influence one another." There are two important theories for classroom interaction: reception-based theories and production-based theories. In reception-based theories, interaction provides comprehensible input with well-formed structures at L2 learners' level for better acquisition, i.e. input hypothesis (Jhonson, 1995) and improve L2 learners' reception and understanding (Ellis, 1990 cited by Jhonson, 1995). In productive-based theory, interactive supports the learners with an opportunity to produce the language (Ellis, 1990 cited by Jhonson, 1995) if they want to be fluent or like native speakers, i.e. output hypothesis (Jhonson, 1995). In other words, to influence interaction, EFL learners need to influence each other mutually by receiving and producing messages in order to achieve communication and improve L2

knowledge and skills. Scriver (2005, p.15) proposed that “the aim of communicative activity in class is to get learners to use the language they are learning to interact in realistic and meaningful way. Usually involving exchanges of information or opinion”. Role-play is one of the most important oral communicative activities. More precisely, through role-play, more cognitive demands on L2 learners’ comprehension and production are made as well as L2 learners’ ability to incorporate sociopragmatic and pragmalinguistic knowledge spontaneously in interaction are examined (Tateyama, 1998).

Role-play can be considered as a part of the broader term ‘simulation’. Jones (1995, p.18) refers to simulation “an event that in which the participants have roles, duties and sufficient key information about the problem to carry out these duties without playing, acting or inventing key facts”. To simulate some fraction of the real world, “reality of function in a simulated and structured environment” is necessary (Jones, 1982, p.5). In other words, L2 learners are seen as subjects of a simulated of a social reality to take their functional roles, not as students in a classroom. Simulated environment supports the learners with practically no consequences in the world outside the classroom. From Kumbartzki’s perspective, the role of students is to simulate a communicative situation according to rules and limits before having any chance to deal with it in a real life. Simulation contributes the learners to revise their interlanguage system, to internalize new linguistic knowledge, and to improve their communicative competence (Ellis, 1984) and also help them “to broaden and deepen participants’ perceptions and interpretations of the real world” and “to refine their skills” (Crookall & Oxford, 1990, p.16). Chen-jun (2006) indicated that role-play improves a range of real life spoken language in the classroom. According to Ladousse (1987), role-play is a more flexible technique, “simple and brief technique to organize” (p.5) than simulation, “complex, lengthy, and relatively inflexible” (p.5). Kumbartzki-Ferreria (2006) referred to role-play as a pedagogical technique for students to play functional roles in a simulated situation as well as to negotiate meaning in order to accomplish a task. Qing (2011, p.37) also added that “role play is defined as the projection in real life

situations with social activities”. Moreover, Ments (1999, p.5) proposed that “in a role play players act as a part of the social environment of the others and provides a framework in which they can test out their repertoire of behaviors or study the interacting behavior of the group”.

According to Larsen-Freeman (1986), role-play is an important activity which supports the learners with a n opportunity to negotiate meaning and develop their communicative ability in different social roles and different social context. The word ‘role’ is derived from the word means “the roll of parchment on which an actor’s part was written” (Ments, 1999, p.6). Ments (1999, p.6) proposed that “the concept of role acts as a short hand way of identifying and labeling a set of appearances and behaviors are characteristic of a particular person and predictable within a given situation”. Richards and Rodgers (2001) explained role as the part learner and teacher are expected to play in carrying out learning tasks as well as the social and interpersonal relationship between the participants. Livingstone (1983) refers to role-play “as a class activity which provides the students to practice the language aspects of role-behavior, the actual roles they may need outside the classroom”. Moreover, Ladousse (2004) supported that through role-play, L2 learners can experience many kinds of situations in which they will use the language and words; and as they develop a sense of mastery in them, they should be able to apply the language more easily to new situations.”

Role-play is an effective technique to contribute EFL learners to develop their L2 learning Bartely (2002), to make them more interested in participating in practical classroom learning (Brown & Yule, 1995), and to help them to develop their communicative competence through listening and responding (Williams, 2004). Role-play supports L2 learners with an atmosphere to experience with independent and collaborative learning (Cast, 2007) and with an opportunity to feel better, to become less tired, and to get more motivated to fulfill the task in the classroom environment (Uzun, 2009).

Byrne (1986) categorized role-play activities into two main groups: scripted role-play and unscripted role-play. The scripted role-play activities are based on interpreting either the

textbook dialogue or reading text in the form of speech. In this kind of role-play activities, the main function text is to convey the meaning language items in a memorable way. The second one, unscripted role-play, is known as free role-play because are not dependent to textbook. More importantly, L2 learners are free to choose what language to use and how the conversation should develop. Besides Byrne's (1986) categorization of role-play activities, Littlewood (1981) divided the role-play activities into four types: role-playing controlled through cued dialogues, role-playing controlled cues and information, and role-playing in the form of debate and discussion.

1.7.1. Three steps for role-play procedure

In order to play the roles, three steps should be considered: briefing, the simulation itself, and debriefing (Jones, 1982; Bullard, 1990). During the first step, students prepare themselves or are prepared for simulation before or during the role-play (Bullard, 1990). Then, during the simulation itself, the controller notices and takes notes to be later shared for the next step while participants interact and fulfill a task (Jones, 1982; Ladousse, 1987; Horner & McGinley, 1990). Finally, during the debriefing stage, the controller and the participants analyze the controller feedback about the simulation and the participants' error and difficulties through discussion.

1.7.2. Six steps for role-play activity

Kototchigova (2002) offered six types to make an effective role-play in her book, *Role-play in Teaching Culture; Six Quick Steps for Classroom Implementation*:

- 1) A situation for a role-play: To select a situation for a role-play, L2 learners' needs and interests are very important (Livingstone, 1983) in order to give them an opportunity to choose the situation themselves and to practice what they have learned.

- 2) Role-play design: To develop the intended situation, the focus should be on L2 learners' level of language proficiency (Livingstone, 1983) in order to improve their linguistic component.
- 3) Linguistic preparation: Although the language need is almost entirely predictable, Sciartilli (1983) offered to introduce any new vocabulary before the role-play.
- 4) Factual preparation: Supporting the learners with concrete information and clear description of their roles help them to play the roles with confidence.
- 5) Assigning the roles: In this step, what roles to design to which a student or a group of students is planned.
- 6) Follow-up: The purpose of this step is to focus on what has happened in the role-plays and what they have learned. According to Jones (1982), follow-up activities help the students to overcome the difficulties and doubts during the role-play and debriefing.

1.8. Role-play in speaking fluency

Different studies have been investigating the effectiveness of simulation on educational purposes for a great variety of disciplines such as engineering, economics, business, mathematics, and natural sciences since 1950s (Klabbers, 2001). More precisely, language learning is a discipline which is much closer to role-play. Jones's (1982) book, *Simulations in Language Learning*, many researchers have attempted to support the significance of role-play in L2 contexts. In role-play activities, teacher is known as the controller in order to help the flow of fulfillment of the task (Jones, 1982) as well as keeps a relatively low profile in order to reduce the students' anxiety and to facilitate learning (Scarella & Oxford, 1992). According to Burns and Gentry (1998), the teacher needs to maintain the participants motivation by stimulating their curiosity, keeping the material relevant, and creating a tension to learn. Tompkins (1998) represented role-play as a valuable technique for teaching conversation in non-threatening context to encourage students to think and to generate creativity. Nizar (2007) supported this

view and also added that role-play increases L2 learner confidence in conversing without feeling assumed, afraid or inferior. From Ladousse's (1997) perspective, there are five advantages of using role-play: 1) training students to speak in any situation, 2) rehearsal for real lives, 3) providing a mask for shy students, 4) being funny and enjoyable as a imagination trip, and 5) providing a chance for students to explore and to play with the possibilities of new language and providing situations where this new language can be related to students' experience. Ladousse (1987) highlighted the importance of role-play as a communicative technique for promoting interaction, increasing motivation, and fostering the development of fluency.

Role-play is an important activity which leads the learners to express ideas, opinions, or feeling to others by using words of sounds of articulation. More importantly, there have been various studies conducted in order to demonstrate the effect of role-play on L2 learners' speaking fluency in recent years. Kotirat and Suwat (2011) tried to investigate the effects of scripted and non-scripted role-plays on EFL learners' oral performance by using repair organization from two perspectives: 1) how the learners organize repairs in scripted and non-scripted role-plays. and 2) whether or not the repair organization differs in scripted and non-scripted role-plays. Based on first dimension, the results revealed that the types of repair organization focused in scripted and non-scripted role-plays are the same but the frequency of self repair is significantly different. From the second perspective, non-scripted role-play supports students with more and better opportunity to practice relevant features of language use in naturally occurring conversation. Haycraft (1978) proposed that role-play is valuable because it engages students to speak in front of others expressively without nervousness while it makes them aware of stress and intonation in speech. Najizade (1996) confirmed that role-play for providing language situations into classroom is considerably effective in improving L2 learners' acquisition language structures. More importantly, Baker (1989) offered clear instruction and sufficient time to L2 learners in order to understand their roles in role plying. Cornett (1999) demonstrated the impact of role-play activities on developing L2 learners' fluency, verbal

communication skill, and the use of body in face-to-face communication in language learning. Barke and O'sullivan (2002) also showed that role-play activities stimulated students to use the language and then to improve their fluency and pronunciation. Holt and Kysilka (2006) highlighted the importance of role-play in EFL learners' better learning, cooperation, and student-student interaction. In another study, Rahimi and Safarpour (2011) confirmed the effects of role-play activities on Iranian EFL learners' speaking ability. This study indicated that role-play activities helps Iranian intermediate EFL learners to reach a more acceptable level of speaking ability. Moreover, Al-senaidi (2009) indicated the effectiveness of role-play on L2 learners' oral fluency and also added they "produced more chunks of language as they moved through the role-plays" (p.69).

1.9. Summary

The array of issues addressed in this chapter seeks to analyze the scholarly literature associated with problems of speaking fluency and the development of L2 speaking. The literature reviewed also demonstrates that L2 research views speaking as complex process in which different concepts are involved. Yet contemporary developments in this area acknowledge the process occurs concurrently and actively interact with one another. Therefore, current L2 research regards role-play as an interactive and effective technique entailing the learners' knowledge of the linguistic code and the learners' knowledge of the world based on schema structures regarding their roles. Additionally, the chapter presents definitions of speaking. The chapter has chronologically looked at three main steps to role-playing.. Each of these steps has contributed its own way to enhancing the theoretical and practical aspects of speaking fluency. Then, the chapter reviewed the L2 literature concerned with the use of role-play that have been in the service of speaking fluency for nearly half a century. The review indicated that at present these questions are still widely used to assess speaking fluency.

REFERENCES

- Ajiboye, T. (1985). *"Achieving oral fluency in French: Principles and techniques"*. British Journal of Language Teaching, 23(2), 93-97.
- Al-Senaidi, S. A. (2009). Using role play to promote oral fluency, 66-72. In Borg. S. (Ed.), *Understanding English Language Teaching and Learning in Oman*. Retrieved July 11, 2012, from <http://www.moe.gov.om/Portal/sitebuilder/Sites/EPS/Arabic/IPS/Importa/tesol/3/Using%20role%20play%20to%20promote%20oral%20fluency.pdf>
- Bachman, F. (1990). *Fundamental Conceptions in Language Testing*. Oxford: OUP.
- Baker, D. (1989). *Language testing: A critical survey and practical guide* London: Edward Arnold.
- Baker, J. and Westrup. H. (2003). *Essential Speaking Skills: A Handbook for English Language Teachers*. London: Continuum International Publishing.
- Bartley, B. (2002). Role playing as a teaching strategy. Retrieved from <http://condor.admin.cny.cuny.edu>
- Beardsmore, B. (1972). Testing oral fluency. Rapport d'activites de l'Institut de Phonetique, 1971-1092. Belgium: Universite libre de Bruxelles. Annual meeting of l'Association Belge de Linguistique Appliquee, Sept. 25 (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 115078).
- Brown, G., & Yule, G. (1995). *Teaching the spoken language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Brumfit, C. J. (1984). *Communicative methodology in language teaching: The roles of fluency and accuracy*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Bullard, N. (1990). Briefing and debriefing. In D. Crookall & R.L. Oxford (Eds.). *Simulation, gaming, and language learning*. New York: Newbury House.
- Burns, A. (1999). *Collaborative action research for English language teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Burns, C. A. & Gentry, W. J. (1998). "Motivating Students to Engage in Experiential Learning: A Tension-to-Learn Theory," *Simulation & Gaming*, 29, 133-151.
- Bygate, M. (1987). *Speaking*. In C. Carter & D. Nunan (Eds.), *The Cambridge guide to teaching English to speakers of other languages*. Cambridge University Press. 25.
- Byrne, D. (1986). *Teaching Oral English: Longman Handbooks for English Teacher*. Singapore: Longman Group.
- Byrne, D. (1987). *Teaching for Classroom Instruction*. London: Longman.
- Cast, J. 2007. *Role-play in Key Stage 2*. English 4–11: 22.
- Celce-Murcia, M. (Ed.). (2001). *Teaching English as a second or foreign language*. Boston, MA: Heinle and Heinle.
- Chaney, A. L. (1998). *Teaching Oral Communication*. In: *Grandes K-8*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Chen-jun, W. (2006). *Designing communicative tasks for college English courses* (Unpublished master's thesis). Chongqing Normal University & Yangtze Normal University, China.

- Cornett, C. E. (1999). *Whole Language, Whole Learning*. Phil Deltte Kappa Educational Foundation. Ede, J. (1993). *Essential of English Language Teaching*. Longman.
- Crystal, D. (1987). *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of Language*. Cambridge UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Duffy, B. (2003). *Supporting creativity and imagination in the early years*. Maidenhead: Open University Press.
- Ejzenberg, R. (2000). *The juggling act of oral fluency: A psycho-sociolinguistic metaphor*. In H. Riggenbach (Ed.), *Perspectives on fluency* (pp. 287-314). Michigan: The University of Michigan Press.
- Ellis, R. (1984). *Classroom second language development*. Oxford: Pergamon.
- Fillmore, C. (1979). *On fluency. Individual differences in language ability and language behavior*. New York: Academic Press.
- Freed, B. (1995). What makes us think that students who study abroad become fluent? In B.Freed (Ed.), *Second language acquisition in a study abroad context* (pp. 123-48). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Gatbonton ,E.,&Segalowitz,N.1988. *Creative automatization: principles for promoting fluency within a communicative framework*. TESOL Quarterly, 22,473-492.
- Grab, W. (2009). *Reading in second language*. Cambridge: Cambridge university press.
- Gustein, B. (1983). Using language functions to measure fluency. Toronto (Ont.): Annual meeting of teachers of English to speakers of other languages (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 240871).

- Harmer, J. (1984). *The Practice of English Language Teaching: Longman Handbook for Language Teaching*. USA: Longman Inc.
- Harmer, J. (2001). *The Practice of English Language Teaching*. Pearson Educational Ltd.p.99.
- Hartman, R.R.K., & Stork, F.C 1976. *Dictionary of Language and Linguistics*. New York: Wiley pp214-218.
- Haycraft, J. (1978). *Teaching vocabulary: An introduction to English language teaching*. London: Longman.
- Hedge, T. (2000). *Teaching and Learning in the Language Classroom*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Heffernan, P. (1986). "Questioning communicatively in the second language classroom". *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 42, 5.
- Hieke, A. E. (1984). *Linking as a marker of fluent speech*. *Language and Speech*, 27, 343-354.
- Holt, L.C. & Kysilka, M. (2006). *Instructional Patterns: Strategies for Maximizing Student Learning*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Hughes, R. (2002). *Teaching and Researching Speaking*. New York: Pearson Education.
- Johnson, K.E. (1995). *Understanding Communication in Second Language Classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jones, K. (1982). *Simulations in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jones, K. (1995). *Simulations: A handbook for teachers and trainers* (Rev. ed.). London: Kogan Page.

- Koponen, M., & Riggenbach, H. (2000). Overview: Varying perspectives on fluency. In H. Riggenbach (Ed.), *Perspectives on fluency* (pp. 5–24). Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Kodotchigova, M., A., (2001) Role play in Teaching culture: Six quick steps for classroom implementation. Retrieved on 5/8/2010 from <http://iteslj.org/techniques/kodotchigova-Roleplay.html>
- Kodotchigova, M. A. (2002). Role play in teaching culture: Six quick steps for classroom implementation. *The Internet TESL Journal*, 8(7).
- Kumbartzi-Ferreira, J. (2006). The contribution of role-play and simulation to EFL teaching. *Oral communication at APLISC convention*.
- Ladousse, G. P. (1987). *Role play*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ladousse, G.P. (2004). *Role play*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (1986). *Techniques and principles in language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Leeson, R. (1975). *Fluency and Language Teaching*. London: London Group.
- Lennon, P. (1990). *Investigating fluency in EFL: A quantitative approach*. *Language Learning*, 40, 387-412.

- Lennon, P. (2000). The lexical element in spoken second language fluency. In H. Riggenbach (Ed.), *perspectives on fluency* (pp. 25-42). Michigan: The University of Michigan Press.
- Littlewood, W. (1981). *Communicative Language Teaching*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Livingstone, H. (1986). *Role Play: in English Learning*. Essex: Longman LTD.
- Meisel, J. (1987). Reference to past events and actions in the development of natural language acquisition. In C. Pfaff (Ed.), *First and second language acquisition processes* (pp.206-224). Cambridge, MA: Newbury House.
- Ments, V. M. (1999). *The effective use of role-play: practical techniques for improving learning* (2nd ed.). Retrieved May 12, 2012 , from http://books.google.com.bd/books/about/The_Effective_Use_of_Role_Play.html?id=GbXOYf8aTIC&redir_esc=y
- Möhle, D. (1984). A comparison of the second language speech production of different native speakers. In H. W. Dechert, D. Möhle, & M. Raupach (Eds.), *Second language production* (pp. 26-49). Tübingen: Günter Narr.
- Murcia, M. (2001). *Teaching English As A Second or Foreign Language*. Boston: Heinly and Heinle, a Division of Thomson Learning, Inc. Oxford Advance Learner 's Dictionary. Oxford: Oxford University Press, Sixth Edition Paulston, C.B & Bruder, M.N. (1976) *Teaching English as a Second*.
- Najizade, Z. (1996). *The effect of role-play technique on the acquisition of English language structures by intermediate EFL learners* (Unpublished master's thesis). Allameh Tabatabaai University, Tehran-Iran.

- Nizar, H. (2007). Syntactic Preprocessing for Statistical Machine Translation, In *Proceedings of the Machine Translation Summit (MT-Summit)*, Copenhagen, Denmark.
- Oxford, R. L. (1990). *Language Learning Strategies : What Every Teacher Should Know*. Boston: Heinle&Heinle Publishers.
- Parrot, M. (1993). *Tasks for Language Teachers*. Cambridge University Press.
- Scarcella, R & Oxford, R (1992). *The Tapestry of Language Learning: The Individual in the Communicative Classroom*. Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle.
- Sciartilli, G. (1983). Canovaccio: cue cards for role-playing. In S. Holden (Ed.), *Second selections from modern English teacher* (pp. 95-97). Harlow: Longman.
- Scrivener, J. (2005). *Learning Teaching*. UK: Macmillan Education.
- Segalowitz, N. (2010). *Cognitive bases of second language fluency*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Shen, L. and Suwanthep, J. (2011) . E-learning Constructive Role Plays for EFL Learners in China's Tertiary Education. *Asian EFL Journal. Professional Teaching Articles*, 49, 1-29.
- Richard, C. J. (2007). Developing Classroom Speaking Activities; From Theory to Practice,
[Http://www.professorjackrichard.com/developing-classroom-speaking-activities.pdf](http://www.professorjackrichard.com/developing-classroom-speaking-activities.pdf)
- Richards, J. C. (2007). *Curriculum development in language teaching*. New York: Longman.

Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (1986). *Approaches and methods in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge Language Teaching Library. Language Techniques and Procedures. Cambridge .Winthrop Published.

Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. (2001). *Approaches and methods in language teaching* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.

Riggenbach, H. (1991). *Towards an understanding of fluency: A microanalysis of nonnative speaker conversation*. *Discourse Processes*, 14, 423-441.

Qing, X. (2011). Role-play an effective approach to developing overall communicative competence. *Cross-Cultural Communication*, 7(4), 36-39.

DOI:10.3968/j.ccc.1923670020110704.317

Tait, S. (2001). *Ingredients for successful communicative tasks*. Paper presented at TESOL conference.

Tatayama, Y. (1998). Explicit and implicit teaching of pragmatic routines: Japanese Sumimasen. In K. R. Rose & G. Kasper (Ed.), *Pragmatics in language teaching*. Cambridge University Press.

Tompkins, P. K. (1998). Role Playing/Simulation. *The Internet TESL Journal*, 4, 8.
Retrieved from: <http://iteslj.org/>

Towell, R., Hawkins, R., & Bazergui, N. (1996). *The development of fluency in advanced learners of French*. *Applied Linguistics*, 17, 84-119.

Vandergraft, L. (2004). *Listening to learn or learn to listen?* *ARAL*; 24, 32-25.

Van Gelderen, A. (1994). *Prediction of global ratings of fluency and delivery in narrative discourse by linguistic and phonetic measures - oral performances of students aged 11-12 years*. *Language Testing*, 11, 291 - 319.

Wang, W., & Motteram, G. (2006). *CALL in China*. IATEFL Voices.

- Wagner, E.D. (1994). *In Support of a Functional Definition of Interaction: The American Journal of Distance Education* 8(2) 6-26.
- Webster, N. (1980). *Webster's New Twentieth Century Dictionary*, 2nd Edition, New York: William Collins Publishers.
- Wennerstorm, A. (2000). The role of intonation in second language fluency. In H. Riggensbach (Ed.). *perspectives on fluency* (pp. 102-127). Michigan: The University of Michigan Press.
- Williams, M. 2004. "Creative literacy: Learning in the early years". In *Unlocking creativity: Teaching across the curriculum*, Edited by: Fisher, R. and Williams, M. London: David Fulton Publishers Ltd.
- Uzun, L. (2009). An evaluative checklist for computer games used for foreign language vocabulary learning and practice: Vocaword sample. *Research on Youth and Language, Novitas Royal*, 3(1), 45-59.