

Approaches to Develop Speaking Skills in FL Classroom through Creative Activities

Rano A. Halilova

Teacher

Gulistan State University

Gulistan, Syrdarya Region

Uzbekistan

Abstract

The main focus of early foreign language learning should be on the development of oral skills. In the classroom, speaking is usually reproductive and imitative and activities aim at the production of closely supported accurate output. Opportunities for learners to experiment with the language and to use it productively outside of fixed dialogues are often rare. However, developing fluency and basic speaking competencies requires more than just producing memorized chunks of language. In order to progress in their acquisition of the target language and to become truly communicatively competent, learners also need to be able to use language spontaneously and creatively. This paper proposes an approach to creative speaking activities. It discusses communicative tasks and improvisation activities in relation to their potential to initiate language use that transcends formulae and reproduction. Finally, it develops a model of creative speaking that illustrates how learners can be supported in gradually developing the skills for a more independent language use.

Keywords: creativity, creative approach, creative activities, FL (foreign language), Russian, language acquisition, speaking, model of creative speaking.

1.0. Introduction and Literature Review

Throughout Europe, the main goal of foreign language learning in schools is the development of communicative competence, with an emphasis on the oral skills of listening and speaking (Enever 2011). In the classroom, learners should be supported in developing a repertoire of vocabulary and fixed expressions to be used in role play and topic-based situations and that serve as a basis for further learning and language use. Especially at the beginning, speaking in this context is usually reproductive and imitative, giving learners the possibility to practise language patterns and to master basic communicative situations such as, for example, presenting themselves with the help of simple rote-learned phrases. This goal is also reflected in English textbooks for these learners, in which the majority of speaking activities aim at the production of guided accurate output (e.g. Becker, Gerngross and Puchta 2013; Hollbrügge and Kraaz 2006). Such an activity may take the form of a dialogue, for instance, for which the learners are provided with questions and answers that they can modify by inserting different lexical material into open slots in the given sentence structures. These types of activities can be very motivating, because they allow learners to actively participate in the lesson and to interact successfully in the target language at an early point in the learning process.

Although it is generally accepted that interaction in the target language can facilitate the acquisition process, and there is increasing evidence that this is also the case for children's language learning (Mackey, Kaganas and Oliver 2007, 288), opportunities for learners to creatively experiment with the language and to go beyond the fixed dialogues are rare in the early foreign language classroom. This is also confirmed by Mitchell and Lee (2003), who compared learning cultures in British and Korean early foreign language classrooms. They came to the conclusion that learner interaction in both contexts was restricted to the use of prefabricated expressions, and that creativity "involved either selection of prefabricated exponents from material already practised, or oral 'gap-filling' (inserting one's own lexical choice into a prefabricated grammar pattern)" (Mitchell and Lee 2003, 55). As a consequence, the learners' chances to set up and test hypotheses and to gain first insights into the target language system are often limited. Research on the development of learners' spoken skills in the school context shows that the learners' target language production is often limited to the use of formulaic sequences. In an extensive study of German school learners of English, Engel and Groot-Wilken (2007) found that after 2 years of instruction, the children could use prefabricated expressions in conversational interaction, but that they often had difficulties in constructing their own sentences (cf. also Engel 2009). In a combined cross-sectional and longitudinal study that examined the oral performance of German learners of English at school, Lenzing (2013) comes to similar conclusions. Here, the children's speech production was also characterised by the use of single words and formulaic sequences (cf. also Roos 2007). However, in her study, Lenzing was also able to show that a slow but gradual development towards less formulaic speech and more productive utterances took place after two years of instruction (Lenzing 2013, 362; cf. also Lenzing 2015). Referring to similar findings in their review of research on early foreign language learning in Europe, Edelenbos, Johnstone and Kubanek (2006) highlight "the value of helping children progress beyond prefabricated utterances" (Edelenbos, Johnstone and Kubanek 2006, 9).

As the development of fluency and basic speaking competencies requires more than just producing memorized chunks of language, learners need opportunities to use language spontaneously under what Thornbury (2005a, 13) calls 'real operating conditions', in order to progress in their acquisition of the target language and to become truly communicatively competent. In this context, Engel and Groot-Wilken (2007, 27) also point out that using the target language creatively may be an important motivational factor for the children: "In order to keep the joy, enthusiasm and ambition of learners alive, it is important to provide them with more opportunities to discover and experiment with the language (...) (and) to give more attention to the creative and productive learning processes." A key question is therefore how it is possible to integrate such opportunities into lessons for learners. Here, the use of more open communicative activities seems to be a promising approach. Appropriate activities could include communicative tasks and improvisation activities, as they have the potential to initiate language use that transcends formulae and reproduction.

2.0. Using communicative tasks

A task-based approach has great potential when the goal is to engage learners in conversational interaction that allows them to creatively construct their own utterances. One definition of a 'communicative task' that summarises the main characteristics commonly attributed to tasks is the one offered by Ellis (2009, 223). He basically describes a communicative task as a meaning-focused activity, which involves a need to convey information and enables learners to use the linguistic means available to them in order to work towards a clearly defined outcome (Ellis 2003, 2009, 223). Thus, communicative tasks promote negotiation of meaning and communicative interaction in situations in which the focus is on task completion. Learners can benefit from the interaction that results from task-based work, because they are exposed to meaningful input and receive feedback on the language they produce as well as opportunities for producing modified output (Long 1996; Mackey 1999; Swain 1993).

3.0. Research on learners' task-based interaction

While the use of communicative tasks in language pedagogy and second language acquisition has been widely researched with older learners (for an overview see e.g. Ellis 2003; Lightbown and Spada 2013), there have been comparatively few studies with learners (Pinter 2006). One reason may be that communicative tasks that create contexts for spontaneous speech are often thought to be too difficult for beginning learners. However, research has shown that using tasks with children can be beneficial to their language development in many ways. Based on the observation that language practice in school contexts is often centred on pattern practice or memorizing prefabricated expressions, Pinter (2007) examined Hungarian learners of Russian who repeatedly worked with information-gap tasks. These tasks allowed the learners to "express their own meanings in a less restricted manner" (Pinter 2007, 189). The aim of the study was to observe changes in the learners' performance and the gains task-based interaction with this age group can lead to. The repeated use of tasks not only resulted in a more fluent language use, it also led learners to respond to and to assist each other in the interaction, whereas initially they simply displayed their knowledge of English. These results provide evidence for the positive effects of using tasks with learners. However, when comparing the task-based interactions of learners to those of adults, Pinter (2006) also found that older learners handled the demands of a picture-differences task more effectively. They focused on problem-solving and completing the task, whereas learners who were observed mainly seemed to name items in their pictures, which did not prove equally effective. These differences may be attributed to the learners' cognitive development, but Pinter also points out the possibility that the children's approach is an effect of familiar classroom practices, namely "the dominant classroom discourse of naming things that the children are so used to" (Pinter 2006, 626). Mackey, Kaganas and Oliver (2007) also examined the benefits of task-based work with learners. Based on the assumption that the feedback learners receive and pay attention to in task-based interaction can facilitate the acquisition process, they studied the relationship between task familiarity and the interactional feedback provided to learners. Mackey, Kaganas and Oliver (2007, 288) themselves point out that in the existing studies on child interaction, contextual differences or individual learner variables may have led to mixed results. However, they nevertheless emphasize "the increasing evidence that interaction does play a role in children's second language learning," which is a key aspect that is shared by the different studies referred to here.

4.0. Tasks as opportunities for creative speaking

The following activities and excerpts from transcripts illustrate how a guided speaking activity can be modified and how turning it into a communicative task increases the learners' possibilities of using the language more flexibly and creatively. It shows a speaking activity from a textbook published in 2003 (Gerngross and Puchta 2003, 246). Here, learners look at a picture of a monster and have to describe it by using the given phrase "My monster has got" The learners are supposed to complete the sentence by filling different lexical material into the empty slot at the end, for example, "My monster has got three arms." Thus, the learners can vary the language they use within narrowly defined limits. Ten years later, in 2013, a modified version of this activity was published in the edited version of the same textbook (Becker, Gerngross and Puchta 2013, 49). As illustrated, the learners are still supposed to describe a monster and to do so by using the same sentence pattern as before. What is different, however, is that the activity has now turned into an information-gap task. Two learners have to work together and use the target language to exchange information in order to be able to

find five differences. While the learners are still told how to describe the monster, they do more than simply reproduce a specific pattern and display language, as was the case in the first version of the activity. They now use the language in order to come to a shared understanding and a common solution, which adds a focus on meaning to the resulting interaction. This modification of the activity may reflect a general tendency in the ongoing development of Russian language education, namely to provide learners with more opportunities to interact in meaningful communicative situations (Engel 2009).

In their research on learners' language development, Roos (2007) and Lenzing (2013) used a modified and even more open version of the task presented above in order to elicit spontaneous speech data from German learners of Russian. This kind of data reflects "the learners' capacity to utilise their interlanguage (IL) grammar under the time constraints of spontaneous oral language production" (Pienemann 1998, xvi). Therefore, it naturally contains errors and thus provides insights into the learners' current stage of interlanguage development. In the studies, the format of an information-gap task was maintained, as the learners were each given a picture of a monster and had to find five differences between the pictures by talking to each other. In contrast to the previously described textbook activities, however, no predetermined language was given. Rather, the task allowed the children to rely entirely on their own linguistic repertoire. The study showed that the learners support each other when solving the task.

The learners' performances in this task demonstrate that more open communicative activities may push learners to work at the limit of their oral skills, but that, at the same time, this contributes to their creativity in finding new ways of expressing meaning. By making the most of the language that is available to them, they can explore the new language and extend their communicative competence. Another way to stimulate this kind of creative use of the target language in the learners' classroom is the use of more open-ended improvisation activities.

After examining the data on creative speaking tasks and identifying its potential for language development in the learners' classroom, open-ended creative drama activities were explored through classroom observations. The main purpose of those observations was to examine whether improvisation activities stimulated a creative use of the target language and whether they also had any potential for developing the learners' speaking skills.

5.0. *Improvisation activities*

Stinson and Winston (2011, 481) define improvisations as involving "spontaneous, active interactions that often simulate real-life events." According to Phillips (1999, 6), improvisation and drama activities have a number of advantages for foreign language learning. One of the most important factors is that make-believe as a form of playful drama and dramatization is part of "children's lives from an early age." Phillips (1999, 6) notes that learners begin naturally imagining and playing 'being adults' in concrete everyday situations at the age of three. Learners play different roles, "they rehearse the language and the 'script' of the situation and experience the emotions involved, knowing that they can switch back to reality." The natural desire to play and act can provide a springboard for speaking in the early language classroom. Thornbury (2005b, 96) stresses that real-life situations can be simulated through improvisations and a wider range of registers "practised than normally available in classroom talk as, for example, in situations involving interactions with total strangers." Additionally, Zafeiriadou (2009, 6) emphasizes that learners who are an active part of an imaginative play situation and interact with each other usually use language communicatively. By regularly engaging in playful interactions in their first language, children have developed the competence to communicate verbally even with limited language. Therefore early foreign language learners already have a general competence in turn-taking but also in using non-verbal communication such as body movements, gestures and facial expressions, which can easily be transferred when engaging in drama activities in the foreign language, making drama activities a powerful tool for giving children the opportunity for communication and interaction in the early foreign language classroom (Phillips 1999, 6). Research has also shown that engaging in drama activities can have a considerable positive impact on language acquisition. Stinson and Winston (2011, 499) report that drama in foreign language classrooms can contribute "to a range of positive results including improved spontaneity, fluency, articulation and vocabulary." They see the advantage of using drama activities as having a high impact on affective factors such as increasing student motivation and confidence (Stinson and Winston 2011, 482). Phillips (1999, 6) emphasizes that open-ended improvisation activities allow learners to freely interpret a certain role and use the language repertoire available to them. Therefore "the same activity can be done at different levels at the same time, which means that all children can do it successfully and experience a high degree of autonomy which may increase the learners' self-efficacy and motivation" (Phillips 1999, 6). Moreover, working towards a performance as a clear goal can have a very positive impact on the motivation of the learners (Phillips 1999, 6).

The classroom observations suggest that improvisation activities share common features with communicative tasks as defined by Ellis (2003, 2009, 223). In improvisation activities as well as in tasks, learners need to focus on meaning; they convey information by using their individual linguistic repertoire and work towards a clearly defined outcome by spontaneously interacting with peers. In improvisations learners have a choice of what to say and how to say it. From a beginning level on, learners are therefore provided with opportunities for creative as well as productive language use and talk management as in turn-taking (cf. Thornbury 2005b, Zafeiriadou 2009). The classroom observations also seem to

support Sağlamel and Kayaoğlu's (2013) findings regarding anxiety levels. Putting oneself in an imaginary situation and speaking while pretending to be someone else as required in improvisations also seems to lower general inhibitions toward speaking. Of course, the activities that are selected always need to be adjusted to the individual learners' needs and abilities. Since the observations do not reveal any use of repair strategies in improvisation activities, more data need to be collected and analysed to examine their potential for self-monitoring.

6.0. An approach to creative speaking activities – a model

In order to become truly communicatively competent, learners should be provided with manifold opportunities to become autonomous language users through activities that support their natural desire to interact with peers and allow them to make use of their “rich resources of imagination, creativity, curiosity, and playfulness” (Zafeiriadou 2009, 6). On the basis of the findings discussed above, a creative speaking approach was developed with the aim to promote productive language use in the learners' classroom. It is illustrated in the model and is described in the following sections.

Level I: Reproductive language use

The model is organized across three levels. At the first level, reproductive language use, it integrates activities that foster reproductive language use, which is considered an important foundation of creative speaking. At this level, the learners use fixed expressions in order to be able to communicate successfully. Activities are guided as well as closely linked to the input given in class. They mainly promote imitation and therefore include saying rhymes and chants, singing songs and retelling stories or parts of stories and scripted acting and speaking of dialogues, role plays and sketches. They also include other speaking activities such as guided information-gap activities, where the language to be used is fully supplied. Guided activities are very motivating because they allow beginning learners to speak imitatively and to actively participate from a beginning level on. At the same time the imitative and repetitive character of the activities minimises the possibility of making mistakes, which may strengthen the learners' self-confidence. Furthermore, the activities at the first level provide learners with a “means of gaining articulatory control over language” (Thornbury 2005b, 64), including pronunciation, intonation and sentence stress.

Activities that foster reproductive language use, foster noticing and help learners memorise vocabulary and chunks of language as well as structures and discourse gambits. Thornbury (2015b, 64) stresses that a combination of reproductive activities helps learners to increase their ‘fluency store’ by developing ‘islands of reliability’.

Level II: Creative language use

The next level, Creative Language Use, allows learners to ‘practise control’ (Thornbury 2005b, 63) over their individual language repertoires. Thornbury (2005b, 63) describes “practised control” as “demonstrating progressive control of a skill where the possibility of making mistakes is ever-present, but where support is always at hand.” The main goal of practising control is to support appropriation of the target language. According to Thornbury (2005b, 63), “[...] learning a skill is not simply a behaviour (like practice) or a mental process (like restructuring) [...]. Central to the notion of a transfer of control is the idea that aspects of the skill are appropriated. Appropriation has “connotations of taking over the ownership of something, of ‘making something one's own’” (Thornbury 2005b, 63).

In order to facilitate appropriation, the learners have to independently perform and creatively combine fixed expressions, but can still rely on support through the provision of partial scaffolding in form of phrases they are provided with. Examples of such activities include partly scripted guessing games and information-gap activities, story skeletons and gapped songs, chants or rhymes. In order to fill the gaps in the supportive framework, the learners will have to draw on their individual word store. This requirement adds challenge and an element of choice and self-determination, but is still highly predictable. It therefore encourages the learners' independence. Successfully carrying out an activity with a reduced supportive framework may also promote the learners' sense of self-efficacy and confidence (Puchta 2007, 1).

Level III: Creative and productive language use

Activities at Level III promote creative and productive language use and challenge learners to use the individual linguistic repertoire available to them in a meaningful context. This means that they are free to rely on rote-learned expressions, to creatively combine them or to use language totally creatively in order to find their own ways of expressing meaning. Possible activities include non-scripted information-gap activities such as picture differences tasks, opinion-gap tasks, non-scripted storytelling, role play and improvisation tasks. All activities at that level require that the learners “[...] marshal their newly acquired skills and deploy them unassisted” (Thornbury 2005b, 13). They also need to spontaneously interact with peers, retrieve appropriate language structures, cope with unpredictability, anticipate and plan ahead. Therefore, the learners are challenged to perform independently and can experience a very high degree of autonomy. Partly scripted activities from Level II can easily be modified by removing the support to make them suitable for Level

III. The speech bubbles from the picture differences task described above could, for example, be removed, which would allow the learners to operate independently.

The reduced support and freedom of language use at Level III inevitably leads to errors. In this context, however, it is important “to see errors as evidence of learners’ progress, in the sense that they show that learners are making creative attempts to use language beyond what they have been taught” (Nicholas, Lightbown and Spada 2001, 720). The tolerance for errors should therefore be high (Puchta 2007, 2). Thornbury (2015b, 111) emphasises that the learners need to be able to “experience autonomy” and experiment with language, but also need to be provided with effective and clear as well as discreet and sensitive feedback “for the improvement of the subsequent performance.” Feedback should therefore always be given after carrying out activities at the third level. Instead of an overt correction, which can be very demotivating and inhibiting, feedback that focuses on improvement may be very helpful. A feasible approach may be to record the learners while carrying out the task. In a feedback conference, learners and teacher watch the recording. The learners identify problems in the performance and areas they wish to improve. The teacher then makes suggestions for further improvement.

7.0. Conclusions

The language classroom offers various opportunities for learners to work with the target language creatively and productively. In order to exploit learners’ natural potential for the development of speaking, creating opportunities for an exploratory and independent language use should also be taken into account in textbook and curriculum development. The approach to creative speaking activities presented here illustrates how the way towards more autonomy in language use can be prepared and encouraged and how learners can be systematically guided from stages of reproductive language use towards creative and productive speaking. The research available shows that tasks and improvisation activities are not too difficult to master for learners, as it is often assumed, but have great potential to promote their communicative competence from the beginning on.

References

- Carmen Becker, Günter Gerngross, Herbert. Playway 3 & 4 (2013a; 2013 b); Innsbruck: Helbling and Klett.
- Lynne Cameron. Teaching languages to learners. (2001); Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Edelenbos Peter, Richard Johnstone, Angelika Kubanek. The main pedagogical principles underlying the teaching of languages to learners: Published research, good practice and main principles. 2006; European Commission. URL: <http://ec.europa.eu/languages/policy/language-policy/documents/en.pdf>
- Janet Enever, Janet Enever. Policy. ELLiE – Early language learning in Europe. (2011); British Council. 23–43. URL: www.teachingenglish.org.uk/publications/early-language-learning-europe
- Ellis Rod. Task-based language learning and teaching. (2003); Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ellis Rod. Task-based language teaching: sorting out the misunderstandings. International Journal of Applied Linguistics. 2009; 19(3): 221–246.
- Engel Gaby. EVENING – Konsequenzen für die Weiterentwicklung des Englischunterrichts in der Grundschule. Englisch in der Primarstufe – Chancen und Herausforderungen. (2009); Berlin: Cornelsen Scriptor. 197–215. Evaluation und Erfahrungen aus der Praxis, Gaby Engel, Bernd Groot-Wilken and Eike Thürmann (eds.).
- Engel Gaby, Groot Wilken, Bernd. English inschools in North Rhine-Westphalia (NRW). Cidree report – English in education in the Netherlands, North-Rhine Westphalia (NRW) and Norway. (2007). Gaby Engel, Bas Trimbos, Ion Drew and Bernd Groot-Wilken (eds.), URL: http://www.cidree.org/publications/reports_and_studies
- Hollbrügge Birgit, Ulrike Kraaz. Sunshine 4, pupil's book. (2006); Berlin: Cornelsen.
- Lenzing Anke. The development of the grammatical system in early second language acquisition – The multiple constraints hypothesis. (2013); Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Lenzing Anke. Exploring regularities and dynamic systems in L2 development. Language Learning. 2015; 65(1): 89–122.
- Lightbown Patsy M, Nina Spada. How languages are learned. (2013); Oxford: Oxford University Press. 4th ed.
- Long, Michael H, William Ritchie, Tej Bhatia. The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition. Handbook of second language acquisition. (1996); New York: Academic Press. 413–468.
- Mackey Alison. Input, interaction and second language development: an empirical study of question formation in Second Language Acquisition. 1999; 21: 557–587.
- Mackey Alison, Kanganas Alec Peter, Rhonda Oliver. Task familiarity and interactional feedback. Quarterly. (2007); 41(2): 285–312.
- Mitchell Rosamond, Jenny Hye-Won Lee. Sameness and difference in classroom learning cultures: interpretations of communicative pedagogy in the UK and Korea. Language Teaching Research. (2003); 7 (1): 35–63.
- Nicholas Howard, Patsy M Lightbown, Spada Nina. Recasts as feedback to language learners. Language Learning. (2001); 51(4): 719–758.

- Phillips Sarah. *Drama with children*. 1999; Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Pienemann Manfred. *Language processing and second language development. Processability theory*. 1998; Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Pinter Annamaria. Verbal evidence of task-related strategies: child versus adult interactions. *System*. 2006; 34: 615–630.
- Pinter Annamaria. Some benefits of peer-peer interaction. *Language Teaching Research*. 2007; 11(2): 189–207.
- Herbert Puchta. More than little parrots. Developing learners' speaking skills. (2007). URL: http://www.herbertpuchta.com/wp-content/files_mf/1337800529YL_Speaking.pdf
- Sağlamel Hasan, Kayaoğlu Mustafa N. Creative drama: a possible way to alleviate foreign language anxiety. *RELC Journal*. (2013); 44(3): 377–394.
- Roos Jana. *Spracherwerb und Sprachproduktion: Lernziele und Lernergebnisse im Englischunterricht der Grundschule*. 2007; Tübingen: Narr.
- Stinson Madonna, Winston Joe. Drama education and second language learning: a growing field of practice and research. *Research in Drama Education. Journal of Applied Theatre and Performance*. 2011; 16(4): 479–488.
- Swain Merrill. The output hypothesis: just speaking and writing aren't enough. *The Canadian Modern Languages Review*. 1993; 50(1): 33–39.
- Thornbury Scott. Awareness, appropriation and autonomy. *English Language Teaching Professional*. 2005a; 40: 11–13.
- Thornbury Scott. *How to teach speaking*. 2005b; Harlow: Pearson Education Limited.
- Zafeiriadou Nelly. Drama in language teaching: a challenge for creative development. *ISSUES*. 2009; 23: 4–9.