



## DEVELOPING SPOKEN FLUENCY FOR STUDENTS OF ARAB GULF ACADEMY FOR MARITIME STUDIES

**Ayaad M. Abood**

Basrah & Arab Gulf Studies Centre  
The University of Basrah, Iraq  
ayaad@dr.com

### **Abstract**

*Speaking is critical to a person's living procedure and maybe it is the most normal approach to speak with others. It is an intelligent procedure of making implying that comprises delivering, getting and handling data. Frequently, the capacity to speak is considered as the measure for knowing a specific language. "For the vast majority, the capacity to speak a language is synonymous with realizing that language since discourse is the most essential methods for human correspondence" (Lazaraton, 2001: 103). A speaker of a specific language is frequently decided by his/her capacity to talk with others, significantly more than the capacity to read, write, or grasp oral language. J. C. Richards and W. A. Renandya (2003) report that a huge level of the world's language students studies English to create capability in speaking.*

*The paper in hand, investigate how it can be enhancing speaking performance of students of first levels at Arab Gulf Academy for Maritime Studies in city of Basrah, Iraq.*

### **Introduction**

Among the four language abilities (listening, speaking, reading and writing), "speaking appears to be instinctively the most significant. Individuals who realize a language are alluded to as 'speakers' of that language, as though speaking incorporated every single other sort of abilities, and many, if not most, unknown dialect students are principally keen on figuring out how to speak" (Ur, 2009: 120). To summarize, speaking is the way toward offering to others a person's information, interests, dispositions, suppositions, and thoughts.

Communicating in a subsequent language (L2) has been considered as the most testing of the four language aptitudes, given the way that it includes a perplexing procedure of developing significance. This procedure requests the speaker's basic leadership capacity, with the goal that he/she knows why what, how and when to speak, contingent upon the social and social setting in which the demonstration of speaking happens. Moreover, it includes a unique interrelation among speakers and listeners that outcomes in their concurrent cooperation of delivering and handling spoken talk under time limitations. Given all these characterizing parts of the mind-boggling and complicated nature of the spoken talk, expanding research directed in the course of the most recent couple of decades has perceived talking as an intuitive, social and contextualized open occasion (Uso-Juan and Martinez-Flor: 2006).

### **Elements of speaking:**

A few language specialists have endeavored to sort the elements of speaking in human cooperation. Brown and Yule (1983) recognize interactional capacities (to set up and keep up social connection) and value-based capacities (trade of data) of talking. J. C. Richards (2002) adjusts the system of Brown and Yule and expands it by ordering the elements of speaking into three classifications: talk as communication, talk as exchange and talk as execution.

### *Talk as Interaction*

It alludes to what we ordinarily mean by discussion. The essential goal of speaking as a connection is to keep up a social relationship. Quite a bit of our day by day correspondence stays interactional and it can happen both informal and easygoing conditions. For the majority of the L2 students, it is hard to ace the specialty of talk as an association.



### *Talk as Transaction*

It alludes to circumstances where the focal point of consideration lies in the message and making oneself saw plainly and precisely. Bums (1998), (cited in Richards: 2002) recognizes two unique sorts of talk as exchange. The first includes a circumstance where the attention is on trading data. Here, Accuracy may not be a need as long as data is effectively conveyed or comprehended. The subsequent kind incorporates exchanges which center around getting products or administrations (model: requesting nourishment from a menu, looking into an inn and so forth).

### *Talk as Performance*

This alludes to open talk which transmits data before a group of people, for example, morning talks, open declarations, and discourses. Talk as execution is as a rule as a monolog as opposed to a discourse. It regularly pursues a comparable organization that is nearer to written language as opposed to conversational language. Talk as execution is unique concerning the past two capacities since it is frequently assessed by its viability or effect on the audience.

### *Sub-aptitudes of speaking:*

Douglas Brown (2000: 271) claims that "In showing oral correspondence, we don't restrain understudies' consideration regarding the entire picture, even though that entire picture is significant. We additionally help understudies to see pieces-directly down to the little pieces of language that make up the entirety. Similarly, as you would educate a tenderfoot craftsman in creation, the impact of shading tints, concealing and brushing stroke procedures, so language understudies should be told the subtleties of the best way to pass on and arrange the ever-tricky implications of language."

The far-reaching expertise of speaking is an association or contribution of littler sub-abilities (Fulcher: 2003). A firm hold on the sub-aptitudes or miniaturized scale abilities is important to accomplish authority in speaking a language.

Brown (2000) gives a comprehensive rundown of sub-aptitudes or "micro-skills" of speaking. Such an agenda distinguishes the strategy required for arranging a speaking module. It encourages in understanding what students precisely need to ace to procure viable speaking aptitude. As an instructor/mentor designs a particular speaking module, it will require him/her to concentrate on explicit sub-aptitudes as a goal. Indeed, even while surveying speaking, these small scale aptitudes can be considered as testing criteria. Darker's rundown of sub-abilities or "micro-skills" of speaking is given underneath.

### *Micro skills of oral correspondence:*

it very well may be inferred that sub-aptitudes of speaking incorporate the accompanying:

- Fluency
- Accuracy (syntactic rightness, jargon)
- Strategies
- Ability to deliver lumps of language
- Appropriateness (register, conversationalist and so forth.)
- Understanding circular structures
- Use of durable gadgets

### **Fluency:**

"Research-and-presence of mind proposes that there is much more to talking than the capacity to frame syntactically address sentences and afterward to articulate them. For a beginning, talking is intelligent and requires the capacity to co-work in the administration of



speaking turns. It additionally happens continuously, with a brief period for nitty-gritty arranging. In these conditions, verbally expressed fluency requires the ability to marshal a store of remembered lexical pieces" (Thornbury, 2005: iv).

As per J. C. Richards and R. Schmidt (2002: 204), fluency alludes to "the highlights which give discourse the characteristics of being regular and typical, including local like utilization of delaying, cadence, sound, stress, the pace of talking, and utilization of interpositions and interferences". It further depicts the highlights of fluency through the accompanying focuses:

- \* The capacity to create written as well as communicated in language easily.
- \* The capacity to talk with a "decent" yet not basically with an "immaculate" handle overpitch, jargon, and sentence structure.
- \* The capacity to express contemplations "viably".
- \* The capacity to create discourse ceaselessly "without causing cognizance challenges or a breakdown of correspondence".

While examining fluency, C. J. Fillmore (1979) conceptualized fluency with four unique ways (as referred to in Brumfit, 1984: 53). He expressed that fluency incorporates the accompanying capacities to:

- \* occupy time with talk (for example to talk without delaying for quite a while). What's more, for this to create, there ought to be least self-observing, and it ought to be "programmed" and the amount of talk ought to be given more significance than quality.
- \* "talk incognizant, contemplated, and semantically thick sentences".
- \* "have proper comments in a wide scope of settings" with the goal that the speaker isn't at speechlessness while talking.
- \* Have the option to get jokes, punning and so on and react as needs are; hence he/she ought to be "innovative" and "inventive" in utilizing the language.

Marie-Noelle Guillot (1999: 57) echoes Fillmore while characterizing fluency. As indicated by her, fluency isn't only the capacity to "talk better", "talk more, or all the more effectively", rather it implies three things: the capacity to impart all the more productively in a given circumstance, the capacity to adapt to a bigger assortment of circumstances, and thirdly, the capacity to utilize it to "extend and refine language limits".

One of the main meanings of second language fluency was given by Pawley and Syder (1983) (quoted in Kormos, J., 2004: 147), who viewed locally like fluency as "the local speaker's capacity to deliver familiar stretches of talk". This definition is of much smaller extension than that of Fillmore. P. Lennon (1990) out that 'fluency' is commonly utilized in two detects the expansive sense and the restricted sense. In the expansive sense, fluency alludes to worldwide oral capability, for example, a familiar speaker has central leadership of the remote or second language. On a comparative line, F. Chambers' (1997) meaning of fluency is that "it regularly has an all-encompassing significance and is utilized as an equivalent word of generally oral capability" (p.535). In its smaller sense, fluency can be considered as a segment of oral capability, which is regularly utilized as one of the scores in surveying up-and-comers' oral language abilities in a testing circumstance.

As indicated by Lennon (1990) fluency is simply an exhibition wonder, and along these lines, he characterizes fluency as "an impact on the audience's part that the psycholinguistic procedures of discourse arranging and discourse generation are working effectively and productively" (p.391). He contends that fluency uncovers the speaker's capacity to concentrate the audience's consideration on the message by showing a "completed item", instead of causing the listener to notice the working of the "creation instruments" (pp.391-392). Schmidt (1992) adds to Lennon's (1990) definition by remembering that fluency for discourse generation is "programmed procedural ability" and familiar discourse "is programmed, not requiring a lot of consideration or exertion" (p.358). In another examination, Lennon (2000) (quoted in Kormos, J., 2004: 148), joins prior definitions and

suggests that fluency is the "quick, smooth, precise, clear, and effective interpretation of thought or informative aim into language under the fleeting requirements of on-line handling".

C. Brumfit (1984: 56) states that fluency, "is to be viewed as regular language use", regardless of whether it reflects local like language appreciation or creation. He additionally alludes to Fillmore's four fluency abilities and cases that these fluency aptitudes are identified with four qualities: speed and progression, intelligibility, setting affectability, and inventiveness. He further contends that the attributes are identified with four essential arrangements of capacities: psycho-engine, intellectual, full of feeling, and tasteful capacities. Brumfit likewise asserts that fluency "can be viewed as the maximally successful activity of the language framework so far gained by the understudy" (p.57). Alluding to Fillmore's and Brumfit's clarification on fluency, Paul Nation (1989) measures fluency by taking a gander at (1) the speed and stream of language generation, (2) the level of control of language things, and (3) how language and substance associate. In this way, it tends to be said that fluency relies upon a lot of elements like speedy access to the necessary lexical and syntactic things, the capacity to choose and productively utilize those proper things, and nature with the talk schemata.

Kaponen and Riggenbach (quoted in Segalowitz 2010: 3) express that in English just as indifferent dialects, there is an applied similitude basic the importance of fluency, to be specific "language moving". It alludes to the conveyance perspective for example "development like or smoothness" parts of the discourse. Consequently, the topic hidden the significance of the word fluency is the applied analogy of language moving. This analogy centers around those parts of discourse having to do with its ease or streaming quality. On a comparative line Tricia Hedge (1993: 275) characterizes fluency as "the capacity to connect units of discourse with office and without strain or unseemly gradualness or undue faltering". Be that as it may, I. S. P. Nation and J. Newton (2009) don't confine fluency to arranging and conveyance of discourse alone; they incorporated the part of an understanding of discourse. They clarify fluency through the accompanying attributes:

- \* Learners show fluency when they perform "significance centered action" decisively or separating the stream in the discussion. Fluency can be estimated by several filled stops like um, ah, er and number of unfilled delays.
- \* A familiar speaker can react suddenly absent a lot of cognizant exertion or consideration.
- \* Fluency is improved by the rebuilding of information.

### **Accuracy**

Richards and Schmidt (2002) characterize accuracy as "the capacity to create linguistically right sentences yet may exclude the capacity to talk or write smoothly" (p.204). It is the ability to create the right sentences utilizing the right language structure and jargon.

Brumfit (1984), clarifies the term 'accuracy' in subtleties which are outlined underneath:

- \*Fluent language doesn't mean incorrect language and it doesn't infer that familiar language is without accuracy,
- \* Excess spotlight on accuracy can hamper adapting, subsequently causing students to lose certainty and inspiration through an educator's over the amendment.
- \* In a movement, if a student isn't getting the hang of something normally as he/she would do in LI, it is an accuracy action.
- \* The "quality" of the language is insignificant. Action that spotlights on language alone is exactness movement and action that spotlights on the utilization of the objective language is fluency action.



\* In a fluency movement, observing should happen however with "a similar aim" of a local speaker. Also, "instructive self-observing" is considered as interruption/impedance of accuracy in a fluency movement.

As per Johnson and Johnson (1993), unequivocal punctuation educating and visit mistake revision are accuracy arranged to instruct through open language instructing and moderately less recurrence of blunder amendment are fluency situated educating. Brumfit (1984) also shares a comparative thought on accuracy/fluency differentiation. Accuracy includes more adherence towards schedule; it is educator focused and structure-based, though fluency improvement is "moderately flighty towards the prospectus"; student-focused and significance centered.

The accompanying segment manages accuracy/fluency qualification in subtleties.

### **Accuracy and Fluency differentiation:**

'Accuracy' and 'Fluency' are usually utilized ideas in the second language instructing. Concerning talking, these ideas are now and again stood out from one another, particularly, in open language instructing (Chambers: 1997). The ideas of exactness and fluency are viewed as being at far edges of a continuum. At the one finish of this continuum, discourse is viewed as exact and disfluent (reluctant, slow and so on), and at the opposite end discourse is viewed as off base and familiar (Fulcher: 2003).

As indicated by Brumfit (1984) the significance of the qualification among exactness and fluency relies upon whether language is practiced for testing/evaluation or for passing on one's appearance. The language utilized for assessment or testing is worried about the information on punctuation rules for example accuracy. Conversely, utilization of language progressively requires dependence on certain information, and programmed execution for example fluency. Aside from this perspective, the differentiation among accuracy and fluency likewise relies upon the student. The student can change his need/center from accuracy to fluency and the other way around as per the necessity of the circumstance. At the point when language is created for show purposes (like appraisal), student centers around accuracy by delivering language as indicated by the necessity of the instructor, who might be anticipating phonological, syntactic, lexical, useful, or elaborate rightness. Then again, fluency is practiced when students center around significance, for example, passing on their thought or articulations.

Be that as it may, this distinction seems, by all accounts, to be "especially a distortion" to Dave Willis (2000), however, he doesn't dismiss Brumfit's qualification. He explains by saying that "it is not necessarily the case that it's anything but a valuable qualification" (p.37). Willis proposes a three-way differentiation and he replaces Brumfit's term exactness with similarity and reclassifies the term accuracy. These three terms are clarified as pursues:

**Fluency:** Activities in which language is created unexpectedly absent a lot of readiness, as if there should arise an occurrence of casual conditions. In such exercises, students center around the importance, and they produce language without wanting to adjust to standard language standards.

**Congruity:** Activities in which students center around structure and there is almost no worry for importance. Here, students produce language structures "authorized" by the objective structures. In these exercises, the design is to investigate the objective language and there is an endeavor to deliver adequate structures independent of importance. Instances of such exercises are when students are approached to till holes, to listen in and rehash, or to take an interest in a drill by utilizing a specific language structure and dependent on their generation, the instructor gives input.



Accuracy: Activities in which students are worried about implications and yet satisfactory consideration is additionally given to frame. They are concerned whether the words they pick for sure pass on the significance of plainly and suitably.

Specialists have separated among fluency and accuracy every once in a while, yet this differentiation is regularly hard to keep up. Nation and Newton (2009) guarantee that fluency and accuracy are for the most part "related" (p.9) because as fluency expands, exactness likewise creates. Studies directed by them indicated that the movement that focused to create fluency, expanded syntactic multifaceted nature and decreased mistakes in the language delivered by the students. This is maybe because of the way that as students become acquainted with the language they use, they can give more consideration to the nature of the language they produce. The comparable proof is given by Nation (1989) who discovered that advancement in fluency (increment in discourse rate as estimated by words every moment) was joined by progress like the discussion (estimated by waverings, syntactic accuracy, and linguistic unpredictability). In this manner, it very well may be said that improvement in fluency isn't just improvement in discourse rate yet besides improvement like language for example accuracy. Another purpose for the parallel advancement of fluency and accuracy is 'rebuilding'. Rebuilding is the digestion and association of information parts, which includes a substitution of old segments by new ones. The rebuilding of information alongside rehashed practice builds fluency and this prompts the advancement of exactness. In this manner, it is "not astonishing that improvements in fluency are identified with advancements in accuracy" (Nation and Newton, 2009: 152).

### **Criteria for creating Fluency**

As expressed by Brumfit (1984: 56) characterizes fluency as "regular language use". Henceforth, he asserts that the point of fluency movement is to rehearse an example of language connection, inside the study hall, which is near the language utilized, in actuality. Brumfit (1984) records a lot of criteria important for creating fluency movement which is given beneath.

- \* Learners ought to be engaged with translating significance from the info they get in the homeroom. They ought not to depend on the educator or course book to support them.
- \* The substance of the errand ought to be controlled by students.
- \* Learners must have the option to modify his/her discourse as per the requests of the circumstance, either by rebuilding or redesigning.
- \* The emphasis ought to be on meaning and not on form.
- \* Teachers ought to work in such a manner in this way, that the students don't know about educator's intercession. Mistake remedy ought to be insignificant as this diverts away from the consideration from the message.

Nation and Newton (2009) add to Brumfit's proposal by saying that there ought to be an abundant open door for students both inside and outside the study hall to utilize L2. They prescribe three conditions, following which fluency can be created in a study hall. They are as per the following:

1. Since students need to convey, they ought to be put under "continuous" (Brumfit, 1984) pressures. It will bring about the importance of centered communication. Students should participate in such errands/exercises where all the language things are inside their experience/information. Students ought to be given 'natural points' in an errand and they ought to have the option to finish the undertaking by utilizing their known jargon and sentence structures. Since this kind of assignment requires information on what students are as of now acquainted with, they are called 'experience undertakings'.
3. There ought to be backing and consolation for students to perform at a more significant level than their current levels.



Given the given criteria, a portion of the undertakings that are generally utilized for creating fluency are reiteration, unconstrained talk, ask and answer, concurring/dissenting, sharing individual encounters, talk with, pretend, short production and so forth. These undertakings/exercises are maybe best actualized through assignment based language educating since task-based language instructing accentuates fluency with correspondence and encourages students by giving chance to concentrate on the trade of significance in reality circumstances (Shehadeh, 2005). Assignment based language educating has been very well known for as long as twenty years or so among educators, scientists, coaches and educational plan planners all through the world (Branden: 2008).

The study attempted to enhance the fluency of the first stage students of Arabian Gulf Academy for Maritime Studies at Basrah, Iraq. The tasks that been selected were imagined situations of a ship in the high seas where the students have to play varied roles to communicate with the radio on shores or with other ships in the fairways of oceans as well as among them in their imagined ship. Firstly, as a pre-test level, the teacher asked the students to practice speaking of their ideas about the circumstances that they might face in their work on their ships. Then, the teacher presented common maritime terms and navigational expressions were taught to the given students. Next, the learners were exposed to selected scenarios that are designed according to highly common situations where maritime officers face in their work. For any of those scenarios, the English language is the medium of communication according to the International Maritime Organization (IMO) regulations.

After that, as the post-test step, the teacher motivates the learners to play their proposed roles to involve in communicating their ideas and needs. Their dialogues had been recorded for analyzing purposes.

## CONCLUSION

When contrasted and the oral exhibitions of the students' in the Pre-test and exhibitions of the subjects of the control bunch in the Post-test, subjects of the exploratory gathering had not just indicated stamped improvement in their expressed fluency yet besides their certainty level had expanded. The nature of their talking in English improved regarding sentence structure, jargon, linguistic accuracy and manageability of discourse.

This asserts Nation and Newton's (2009) guarantee that as fluency builds, accuracy is additionally upgraded at the same time. In the present examination, the students of the trial bunch at first centered around passing on importance, for example, to impart. At the point when they turned into somewhat certain and familiar, they moved their concentration to sentence structure, jargon, and syntax. This was very recognizable. Be that as it may, there might not have been an enormous improvement in students' general exhibitions however they started to appear probably some improvement in both the amount and nature of their discussion.

A couple of qualities of students' (of both control gathering and exploratory gathering) discourse as saw during the Post-test are outlined underneath through after focuses:

1. Amount of talk expanded: By drawing in students in a discussion through undertakings, the scientist raised the students' certainty level and their confidence in their capacity to utilize the language. It provoked them to talk more and for a more extended time range.
2. Loose, strong, and empowering condition in the study hall and dynamic commitment with the undertakings through talking exercises, during the exceptional instructing program.
3. Psychological Complexity. Undertakings include students in subjective procedures like fathoming, thinking, assessing, cooperating, creating, or controlling in the objective language. The present examination watched a general improvement in the students' verbally expressed fluency with English. It was comprehended that with adequate inspiration, introduction to the language and furthermore with a chance to utilize the language; students' could show



improvement in their oral capability. Furthermore, a task-based language encouraging system is a powerful instrument for fusing these three learning conditions inside the study hall. Instructors can utilize it as an academic device to build up students' oral capability in English so they are outfitted with this basic ability to succeed, both expertly and actually.

## REFERENCES

1. Branden, K. V. D. (2008). *Task Based Language Education: From Theory to Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
2. Brown, G., & Yule, G. (1983). *Teaching the spoken language: An approach based on the analysis of conversational English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
3. Brown, H. D. (2000). *Teaching by Principles: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy*. New York: Longman.
4. Brumfit, C. (1984). *Communicative Methodology in Language Teaching: The roles of fluency and accuracy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
5. Brumfit, C. (1984). *Communicative Methodology in Language Teaching: The roles of fluency and accuracy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
6. Chambers, F. (1997). What do we mean by fluency? *System*, 25(A), 535-544.
7. Fillmore, C. J. (1979). On Fluency. In C. J. Fillmore, D. Kempler, & W. S. -Y. Wang (Eds.), *Individual Differences in Language Ability and Language Behaviour* (pp. 85-102). New York: Academic Press.
8. Fulcher, G. (2003). *Testing Second Language Speaking*. Flarlow: Pearson Longman.
9. Fulcher, G. (2003). *Testing Second Language Speaking*. Flarlow: Pearson Longman.
10. Johnson, K., & Johnson, H. (1999). *Encyclopedic Dictionary of Applied Linguistics: A Handbook for Language Teaching*. Oxford: Blackwell.
11. Kormos, J., & Denes, M. (2004). Exploring measures and perceptions of fluency in the speech of second language learners. *System*, 32, 145-164.
12. Lazaraton, A. (2001). *Teaching Oral Skills*. In M. Celce-Murcia (Ed.), *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (pp. 103-116). Boston: Heinle&Heinle.
13. Lennon, P. (1990). Investigating fluency in EFL: A quantitative approach. *Language Learning*.
14. Nation, I. S. P., & Newton, J. (2009). *Teaching ESL/EFL Listening and Speaking*. New York: Routledge.
15. Nation, P. (1989). Improving speaking Fluency. *System*, 17(3), 377-384.
16. Richards, J. C., & Renandya, W. A. (2003). *Methodology in Language Teaching: an Anthology of Current Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
17. Richards, J. C., & Schmidt, R. (2002). *Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*. Malaysia: Pearson Education Limited.
18. Schmidt, R., 1992. Psychological mechanisms underlying second language fluency. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 14, 357-385.
19. Segalowitz, N. (2010). *Cognitive Bases of Second Language Fluency*. New York: Routledge.
20. Shehadeh, A. (2005). Task-based Language Learning and Teaching; Theories and Applications. In C. Edwards, & J. Willis (Eds.), *Teachers Exploring Tasks in English Language Teaching* (pp. 13-30). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
21. Thornbury, S. (2005). *How to Teach Speaking*. Essex: Pearson Longman.
22. Ur, P. (2009). *A Course in Language Teaching: Practice and Theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
23. Uso-Juan, E., & Martinez-Flor, A. (2006). Towards acquiring communicative competence through speaking. In E. Uso-Juan, & A. Martinez-Flor (Eds.), *Current Trends In The Development and Teaching of the Four Language Skills* (pp. 261-278). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
24. Willis, D. (2000). Fluency, Conformity and Accuracy: A Three Way Distinction. *English Language Teacher Education and Development*, 5(1), 37-46.