The Impact of Speaking Tasks on the Speaking Proficiency of Iranian Cabin Crew Members in the Safety Emergency Procedure Course

Sepideh Asgari
Department of English Language, Islamic Azad University, Shahr-e-Qods Branch
Tehran, **Iran**

Mahnaz Azad
(Correspondent Author)
Department of English Language, Islamic Azad University, East Tehran Branch
Tehran, Iran

ABSTRACT

English for Specific Purposes (ESP) has always been a source of concern for ESP scholars in developing the learners' professional skills one which is their speaking proficiency. Inspired by implementation of ESP speaking tasks, the current study investigated the impact of speaking tasks on the speaking proficiency of Iranian cabin crew members in the safety emergency procedure course. The participants in the current study were 60 Iranian male and female cabin crew members selected from 100 cabin crew members at Mahan Airline. The took Oxford Placement Test (OPT) to homogenize their proficiency level as intermediate ESP learners, and they were randomly assigned into the experimental group and the control group with 30 participants in each group. In the course of the study, the participants in the control group were taught via traditional method of Mahan Airline curriculum while the participants in the experimental group were taught through in-flight group discussion as their treatment. To compare the speaking performances of the two groups, a pre-test prior to the treatment and a post-test after the treatment were administered. The results of the study revealed that using speaking tasks, which were applied through in-flight discussions on safety measures during the flight, could pave the way for the cabin crew members to improve their ESP speaking proficiency.

Keywords: *Cabin Crew Members, ESP, Speaking Tasks, Speaking Proficiency, Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT)*

1. Introduction

In a short period of time, ESP has displaced other languages and become the leading means of communication worldwide, and speaking, as a productive skill, seems intuitively the most important of all the four-macro skills. Speaking can distinctly show the correctness and language errors that a language-learner makes. Because of the significant role of speaking, many researchers like Bailey (2005) and Goh (2007) have proposed methods to enhance speaking skill that can also be applied within the context of ESP by means of syllabus design, teaching principles, types of tasks and materials, and speaking assessment. According to Brown and Yule (1983, cited in Ghaffari & Fatemi, 2015), many language learners view speaking as the criteria for knowing a language and one's progress is assessed in terms of his/her achievement in spoken communication.

According to Hams (2005), communication within the ESP context should be considered a personal responsibility since it leads to reducing the possibility of committing errors. Furthermore, it gives one the opportunity to interact socially and interpersonally with others. When someone has a good communication skill, he or she can effectively fulfill his or her communicative goals. Communication skill, according to Wiemann (1977, cited in Vieira & Santos, 2010) is "the ability of choosing between different available communicative behaviors, those that successfully fulfill their own interpersonal goals" (p. 362).

Communication for specific purposes plays an integral part in aviation and air travel, from the perspective of an individual

passenger (as the above incident illustrates) from the perspective of airlines as organizations, from the perspective of the airplane crew as an organizational unit, and from a systems view of aviation safety in general. Consequently, communication is a crucial factor in aviation safety (Young, 1994). Young made this connection when she indicated that: "The overall objective is to prevent accidents through improved communication in air carrier operations, and keep safety at the highest possible level" (p. 14). The importance of communication for cabin crew is emphasized by Chute and Wiener (1995), who feel that flight attendants can help prevent accidents by forwarding information about possible dangerous situations to the flight deck, and if an accident cannot be prevented, to use effective communication to maximize survivability. Kanki and Palmer (1993) highlighted the importance of communication in aviation safety when they stated that "we would like to underscore the importance of communication for efficiency and safety in aviation" (p. 99).

Accidents due to communication failures have been common over the history of aviation. Vieira and Santos (2010) believed that it is estimated by the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), human error accounts for 60-80% of accidents and incidents of flight (FAA, 2004). Furthermore, the lack of proper functioning concerning human communication constitutes a significant part of the causes highlighted by the Aviation Safety Reporting System (ASRS). Krifka, Martens, and Schwarz (2003) postulated that "factors related to interpersonal communication have been implicated in up to 80% of aviation accidents in the last 20 years" (p. 1). These accidents and failures in communication accentuate the need for crew members' learning of English.

There are so many situations where crew members have to communicate effectively so that disasters can be prevented. During flights, many abnormal situations can occur. According to Johnston (2003), "emergencies are rare; however, abnormal situations are common in aviation. An abnormal situation, if not properly addressed, can become an emergency situation". Failure to communicate effectively can make decision making a very difficult task (p. 2). Those with good communication skills in English are considered more efficient crew members. A study by Segrin and Flora (2000) showed

that having communication skills can contribute to benefit to people's life. They indicated that those with good communication skills in English cope with stress in a more productive way and are more flexible when a dangerous situation arises, whereas those with low communication skills in English deteriorate the situation.

Like other countries in the world, Iran has experienced many flight accidents. Although the number of accidents is dramatically low compared with road accidents, many have lost their lives due to flight defects. Therefore, Iran has also experienced abnormal situations where the crew members were expected to benefit from good communication skills in English. In this regard, Barkow and Rutenberg (2002) cite other challenges to effective communication in safety briefings, including the emotional context regarding information about potential life threatening situations, varied flying experience and motivation of passengers, and language differences that may exist among them. Though related to language differences, cultural differences among passengers can also have an effect on their comprehension of safety briefings. Therefore, the main objective of this study was to explore the impact of speaking tasks on the speaking proficiency of Iranian cabin crew in the safety emergency procedure course.

2. Literature Review
2.1 Communication ESP Skills in Aviation Safety

Aviation English can be a subdivision of ESP, in the same rank as English for Business and Economy, English for Science and Technology, and English for Social Sciences. Consequently, while radiotelephony English (RTFE) is the core of Aviation English, It can be subdivision of English for occupational purposes (EOP). It can be considered as a kind of special or a restricted language as Mackay and Mountford (1978, as cited in Aiguo, 2008), clearly illustrated that the language of international air-traffic control could be regarded as 'special', in the sense that the repertoire required by the controller is strictly limited and can be accurately determined situationally, as might be the linguistic needs of a dining-room waiter or air-hostess. However, such restricted repertoires are not languages, just as a tourist phrase book is not grammar. Knowing a restricted 'language' would not allow the speaker to communicate

effectively in a novel situation, or in contexts outside the vocational environment. Thus, Aviation English contains two meanings with regard to the time and depth of language study: (a) Aviation English (such as RTFE) for occupational purposes (5 months); (b) Aviation English for general use (1-2 years); (c) Aviation English for language skills and linguistic study (2 years). However, in non-English speaking countries, the prerequisite of learning Aviation English is an intermediate or higher English level (Murphy, 2001).

According to Hutchin and Nomura (2007), spoken language appears in conversations among the crew, between the crew and Air Traffic Control (ATC), in aural alerts to the pilots generated by on-board systems, between the crew and a variety of company personnel (dispatchers, mechanics, etc.), and in public address messages to the passengers. Hutchin and Nomura claimed that written language appears in the labels on cockpit controls and indicators, on displays and communication screens, in dispatch and other paperwork, on navigation charts, checklists, airplane operations manuals, personally made annotations on other documents, and notes of ATC clearances.

Aiguo (2008) asserted that there are persuading reasons why Aviation English course should be incorporated into the claim to fame, with the goal that understudies (counting potential pilots who are endowed to flight schools and additionally colleges via aircrafts) can ace the English dialect before they go to English talking nations to get their flying permit. These understudies are chosen either from secondary schools or from schools and colleges in China. They all learnt English in this way or as a piece of mandatory instruction, however their English capability changes a great deal because of various foundations. Similarly critical is the need of rebuilding the English dialect claim to fame with quite a while accentuation on general use. Incredible advance has been made in the examination of Aviation English for ESP. One reason is the quick development of the flying business on the planet, particularly in a creating nation like China. Another reason is maybe the advancement and impact of ESP hypothesis in English dialect educating.

The safety culture is usually defined as a combination of attitudes and open communication. According to the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA, 2004, as cited in Viera, Santoz, & Renato, 2014), human errors are responsible for 60–80% of flight accidents and incidents. These numbers give a real dimension to the relevance of developing effective communication skills and positive attitude. It is universally accepted that human beings will inevitably make mistakes, and that the psychological barrier between error and accident is the ability to recognize, to capture and to correct failures before they spill all over. Thus, so-called ability of learning lessons comes with experience and mainly with experience sharing, which increases critical knowledge on risky or tragic situations without individuals having to experience those situations. However, it is usual that companies highlight more the errors than the lessons learned from a bad experience. This management style, which is focused on error and punishment, gradually strengthens a culture averse to risk situations, a culture in which workers choose to hide their mistakes, exposing them to the same type of error again (Viera et al., 2014). The communication process in aviation should be treated professionally. An example of the culture based on risk and error omission, which gained the headlines of an important national newspaper, can be seen in the contents of an e-mail sent to the crew of a Brazilian airline. In this communication, the leader of flight attendants justifies the action saying that the formula for achieving success in the airline operations was "keeping the mouth shut". This memorandum aims to inhibit the crew to report technical airlines situations of any kind. This sort of communication reveals a total lack of social skills and interferes with flight safety because it restricts the reporting of important and hazard information, which is the basis of the aviation Safety Management System (SMS) especially designed to assist air transport to achieve better safety indicators through risk analysis and establishment of preventive measures. The SMS concept is based on a productive operational safety culture, which promotes free flow of information to improve the flight safety system. The workforce must rely on their leaders to carry out prevention reports, without fear of reprisal or embarrassment. Leaders must show that all reports concerning safety procedures and situations are considered valuable, respected, appreciated and rewarded.

2.2 Speaking Tasks

Task Based Language Teaching (TBLT) is an approach that supplies a natural context of language use to learners through communicative tasks (Pham Ho, 2014). The goal of the tasks is to stimulate real communications in the target language. In the TBLT, the learners prepare for the task, report the task and then they learn the language that arises naturally in the task cycle (Willis, 1996). The Task Based Speaking Activities (TBSA) are offspring of the TBLT. They are activities that are designed for students to practice speaking in the classroom (Pham Ho, 2014). Prabhu (1987) mentions basic types of tasks: jigsaw tasks, Information gap tasks, reasoning gap and opinion exchange gap.

Richards and Rodgers (2001) further explain that specific tasks can be designed to facilitate using and learning of particular aspects of language. More difficult, cognitively demanding tasks reduce the amount of attention the learner can give to the formal features of message, something that is thought to be necessary for accuracy and grammatical development. Sometimes, it is necessary to make tasks difficult deliberately to shift learners' attention from accuracy to fluency so as to develop fluency.

The role of learner, teacher and instructional materials are among the basic components of an approach. Completing the given task is the main role of students in TBLT .In fact, through this process, the learner plays a number of specific roles such as group participant, monitor, risk-taker and innovator, strategy user, goal-setter and self-evaluator (Oxford, 2006; Richards & Rodgers, 2001). The instructor also plays several roles. These include selector and sequencer of tasks, preparer of learners for task, pre-task conscious-raiser, guide, strategy instructor and assistance provider (Scarcella & Oxford, 1992; Richards & Rodgers, 2001).

Awang and Pendidikan (2011) used a research to explore the perception of electrical engineering students on task-based speaking activity (TBSA) in fostering students' communication in English. The aims of the research were to find out (1) whether TBSA promoted students' communication in English language classroom; and (2) what type of TBSA encouraged students to communicate in English. The results points out that the task-based learning was an appropriate method employed to improve oral interaction in large groups. The students' role changed from being interrogated to the interrogator.

They were able to ask for help to overcome the difficulties being faced and finally to express the ideas, and comment on the question. TBSA improved students' communication in English by giving them opportunities to practice the language in classes. The tasks reactivated their knowledge of English vocabulary and structures. The studies exposed gaps such as: the researchers did not (1) investigate the impacts of activating background knowledge; (2) measure the oral skill before and after the treatment; (3) explore class atmosphere in speaking time; (4) experiment on the English-major freshmen; (5) fully apply the six tasks released by Willis (1996).

2.3 Empirical Research Studies

Kukovec (2008) studied teaching aviation English and radio telephony communication in line with the newly established International Civil Aviation Organization language proficiency requirements for pilots. It aimed to define teaching strategies in line with new requirements from the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) that mandate acceptable English language levels for pilots and other licensed aviation staff. It showed how the teaching of Aviation English combined with the teaching of standard phraseology can work together for the purpose of training students in their interaction and communication skills. This teaching model served as a tool for managing classroom processes used for initiation students as well as in refresher courses in airlines and flight schools. The paper described the use of teaching materials to encourage the development of interaction and communication.

Vieira and Cristina (2010) conducted a study on communication skills. They examined a mandatory competence for ground and airplane crew to reduce tension in extreme situations. Communication skills have been considered a strategic asset for any kind of organization. This paper aimed to discuss communication skills development beyond technical communication in a high technology and technical-based operation, such as ground and flight operations. To do so, this article described some tragic-ending cases in commercial aviation in which the poor quality of interpersonal communication was identified as the one of the most influential causes of the aircraft, or at least that was seen as a compelling force for creating the perfect backdrop for a disaster involving civilian aircrafts. Methodological procedures

were basically addressed to a qualitative approach, supported by a documental research considering some of the most documented cases of aircraft accidents reported by the Aviation System Safety Report, issued by Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), USA, as well as reports of accidents provided by The National Transportation Safety Board (NTSB), USA, and by the Centerior Aircraft Research and Prevention (Cenipa), Brazil.

Douglas (2014) conducted a study on enhancing assessment and training in aviation English. In 2003 the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) strengthened the provisions that English be made available for international radiotelephone communication. ICAO also developed standards for English proficiency for international pilots and air traffic controllers. However, these standards are applied variably from country to country and in no country are native speakers of English tested for their ability to employ what has been termed 'interaction competence' when using English for intercultural communication. Problems with this situation are reviewed and suggestions made for improving English assessment and training.

Lin and Wang (2017) conducted a study on integrating curriculum design theory into ESP course construction. They examined the role of aviation English for aircraft engineering. This paper considers the arguments for the construction of courses in ESP (English for Specific Purposes) focusing on the integration of curriculum design theory into an English course for air-craft engineering at the Civil Aviation University of China. For teacher-researchers interested in designing and implementing an aviation English instruction program, this paper offers an example framework of how this might be done and evaluates the framework within an action research model. A needs analysis is made and a curriculum presented for an integrated course in aviation English for aircraft engineers in the Chinese context, so that learners of ESP can learn the target language more effectively and put the learning to practical use.

Hazrati (2017) conducted a study on intercultural communication and discourse analysis. The study focused on the case of aviation English. Intercultural communication as a field of study has gained its position through asking how people from different cultures communicate and how misunderstanding can be prevented. Within the domain of English for Specific Purposes (ESP) Aviation English has become a matter of concentration worldwide. The requirements introduced by International Civil Aviation Organization encompass both technical language and plain English applicable to both native and non-native English speakers. However, based on cultural differences, related conventions, and diverse communication styles, air traffic controllers and pilots sometimes use English in a way that may cause confusion and misunderstanding, which in turn can result in aviation accidents or incidents. This paper aimed to consider cultural dimensions as introduced by Hofstede (1980) and their involvement in aviation context.

In a similar study, Karimi, Lotfi, and Biria (2019) investigated the efficiency of a communicative-based language program on Aviation students' English language learning and their motivation toward communication in English. There were 40 Aviation students who were divided into experimental and control groups. The experimental group underwent the instruction known as Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL), while the control group received the conventional instruction. Findings revealed the students' significant improvement in learning English and their motivation toward communication in English. Findings strongly recommended the needs for pedagogic tasks in ESP courses in order to fulfill the communicative needs of students in various ESP fields.

In sum, the role of ESP in aviation safety measures is demanding for cabin crew members who need to benefit from suitable ESP language, which has to meet their communicative needs. Creating such purposeful communication demands speaking tasks in order to help cabin crew members to enhance their knowledge of safety emergency procedure. In doing so, the present study aims to answer the following research question:

1. Do speaking tasks have any statistically significant impact on speaking proficiency of Iranian cabin crew members in the safety emergency procedure course?

3. Methodology

3.1 Participants

The participants of this research were chosen from the cabin crew members of Iranian Mahan Air airline. All of the 60 out of 100 chosen cabin crew participants of the

study included male and female individuals who were between the ages of 18 to 25. OPT was administered to homogenize the participants and select intermediate participants. It should be mention that the participants were chosen from the learners who participated in English classes of Mahan Airline curriculum.

3.2 Instruments and Materials

Oxford Placement Test (OPT):

OPT (version 1.1, 2001) was administered to determine whether the participants were homogeneous in terms of their language proficiency. It consisted of 60 items with different question formats comprising grammar, vocabulary, and five paragraphs of reading texts. There are multiple choice, item matching, and cloze test type items in the test. In each item, there is a blank word for which there are four options. Participants should find the correct item among these options. The reason why the researcher of the study decided to utilize OPT as the learners' measure of proficiency was due to the fact that the test is a standard test of proficiency, and its validity and reliability are examined to be satisfactory. After administering the test, 60 learners whose scores were between one standard deviation above and below the mean were selected as the participants of the study.

Safety Language Test (Pre-Test and Post-Test):

A test including 25 items (see Appendix A) was constructed as the pre-test and the post-test. It was adopted from the Mahan Airline notebook. The test included words, collocations, and the useful expressions related to aviation safety and emergency. Also, the test included oral parts related to aviation safety. In fact, it was used to gauge the learners' development in terms of safety knowledge throughout the treatment. It should be mention that the validity of the pre-test and the post-test were confirmed by three experts.

The readings and multiple-choice parts of these tests were omitted and just the speaking part was carried out. The reliability of the test was calculated through KR-21 formula. In fact, to meet the reliability issues, a pilot study was done with the participation of 30 learners with the same characteristics as the study participants. Three expert raters examined the participants' speaking ability concerning their knowledge of safety emergency measures. The reliability coefficient of the test was found to be .90, acknowledging

acceptable measure of reliability (Gass & Mackey, 2005).

Similarly, the reliability of the pre- and post-test of speaking was calculated by rating the participants' speaking performance through KR-21 formula. The reliability value was found to be .94 and .92 for the pre- and post-test of speaking, respectively, which verifies the reasonable consistency scores.

3.3 Procedure

Initially, the participants were homogenized based on the results extracted from OPT. Then, 60 participants were selected. When the homogeneity was assured, the participants were divided into two groups according to simple random sampling: the experimental group and the control group. There were 30 participants in each group. Then, a pilot study was done in order to measure the reliability of the pre- and post-test of speaking for cabin crew members. After ensuring the reliability issue, the safety speaking pre-test was taken by cabin crew members to determine their speaking ability prior to the treatment.

It is noteworthy that all of the cabin and cockpit crew must study SEPM BOOK (Safety Emergency Procedure Manual) during their education at Mahan Airline, so both groups had to study this book. The experimental group had to learn speaking through in-flight group discussion as their treatment. The study for both groups was carried out in 10 sessions. Each session lasted for 60 minutes, which is identical to the time allotted to English learning in classes of Mahan Airline curriculum.

As to the experimental group, the teacher gave a full explanation about the course and its expected process. In addition, the expected tasks were explained and the learners' questions about the course and whatever they were expected to do were answered. It was preferred that the participants did not know anything about the current study. The researcher tried to increase learners' speaking ability by using speaking tasks. The researcher used in-flight group discussion task as treatment. For teaching speaking, the 30 learners were divided into small groups, during the course in that each group was given a topic to discuss every session. Meanwhile, the teacher was available for the learners to ask for clarification and answer any questions about the topic they might have. The teacher monitored the working of these groups, taught some points related to this topic and participants' problems, spoke topic details

and kind of topics. Of course, in this study, all the topics were related to flight safety emergency such as: dangerous goods in aircraft, hijack, bomb threat, firefighting, fire extinguisher, decompression, different types of emergency such as crash-land, ditching, and first aid treatment. For example, when the topic was about emergency, the teacher spoke about the kind of emergencies (crash-land, ditching, etc.) and explained details, and then the participants had to speak in the public.

However, the participants in the control group received the instruction through the previously used traditional method in accordance with the Mahan Airline's syllabus. They had to study SEPM BOOK (Safety Emergency Procedure Manual) during their education at Mahan Airline regardless of using any specific speaking tasks of in-flight discussions focusing on safety emergency measures.

After the treatment, the post-test of Safety language Test was carried by the two groups to collect data on their speaking performance.

3.4 Data Analysis

In order to answer the research question of the study, both descriptive and inferential statistics are presented to sort, display and interpret the data. The descriptive analysis of the study consists of a discussion of the mean, standard deviation and the standard error of measurement of the experimental group and the control group. Similarly, the inferential analysis of the data involves calculating the paired samples t-test between the pre-test and the post-test of the experimental group. A one-way analysis of variance (one-way ANOVA) was also conducted to significantly compare the mean scores of the post-test of the experimental group and the control group in comparison with the total number of the participants (N=60) in order to have a precise investigation of the effectiveness of speaking tasks in the safety emergency procedure course on the ESP participants of cabin crew members' speaking proficiency.

4. Results: Investigating the Research Question

In order to answer the research question of the study through quantitative measures, internally, normal distribution of data should be checked. Table 1 shows the normal distribution of data for the participants of the study in the experimental group as well as the control group.

It is noteworthy that Shapiro-Wilk test was used to examine the normality assumption of data for the study. As to investigating the normal distribution, if p-value is found to be more than .05, data is normally distributed.

Table 1: Normal distribution of data

	type	Shapiro-Wilk Statistic	df	Sig.
SCORE.PRE	Control	0.95	30	0.19
	Experimental	0.97	30	0.58
SCORE.POST	Control	0.95	30	0.18
	Experimental	0.97	30	0.65

Table 1 shows that the p-values for the participants' scores for the experimental and control groups on the two occasions of the speaking pre- and post-tests are more than .05, which reveals that the assumption of normality is fully met. Descriptive statistics of the experimental, control, and total groups of learners are provided in Table 2.

Table 2: Descriptive statistics for the participants' pre- and post-test scores

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean Lower Bound	95% Confidence Interval for Mean Upper Bound	Minimum	Maximum
SCORE. PRE	Control	30	12.94	1.45	0.26	12.40	13.49	9.00	15.33
	Experimental	30	12.68	1.82	0.33	12.00	13.36	9.00	16.33
	Total	60	12.81	1.64	0.21	12.39	13.23	9.00	16.33
SCORE. POST	Control	30	12.53	1.25	0.23	12.07	13.00	9.67	14.33
	Experimental	30	15.41	1.47	0.27	14.86	15.96	12.67	19.00
	Total	60	13.97	1.99	0.26	13.46	14.49	9.67	19.00

As to Table 2, the participants in each group were 30 cabin crew members. The mean score of the control groups' pre-test scores is 12.94 and the same group's post-test score equals 12.53. However, the mean scores in the pre- and post-test of experimental group were 12.68 and 15.41, respectively. Descriptive data shows that the experiment group could perform better than the pre-test of speaking. However, the significance of such increase should be taken into account.

In order to examine whether there was a statistically significant difference between the pre- and post-tests of experimental and control groups compared to the total number of participants (N=60) – which shows that three scores should be measured – one-way ANOVA was run. Before conducting this test, the homogeneity of variance among the groups should be examined. Levene's test was run to check the homogeneity of variance as in Table 3.

Table 3: Test of homogeneity of variances

	Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
Score- control	.132	1	58	.718
Score- experimental	1.694	1	58	.198

Table 3 shows that the variance of the experimental and the control group's scores on the two occasions of the pre- and post-tests is homogeneous since the sig values are more than .05 for the experimental (.198) and the control (.718). Therefore, one-way ANOVA can be run to find the significance of difference between groups. The result of one-way ANOVA is shown in Table 4.

Table 4: One-way ANOVA for the experimental, control, and total groups of participants' pre- and post-test scores

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Score-Control	Between Groups	2.534	1	2.534	1.377	.245
	Within Groups	106.713	58	1.840		
	Total	109.247	59			
Score-Experimental	Between Groups	112.121	1	112.121	40.991	.000
	Within Groups	158.646	58	2.735		
	Total	270.767	59			

Comparison of the groups demonstrates that the significance level for the control group is more than .05 (p=.245), indicating that there was not a significant difference between the pre- and post-test of the control group. However, as Table 4.5 shows, significant difference was observed in the pre-and post-test scores of the participants in the experimental group (p=.00) since the level of significance is less than .005), and the experimental group was found to outperform the control group in their speaking proficiency. To highlight such difference individually between the pre- and post-test of the experimental group, Table of descriptive statistics is initially provided in Table 5.

Table 5: Descriptive statistics for the experimental group

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 1	Post-Experimental	15.41	30	1.47	0.269
	Pre-Experimental	12.68	30	1.82	0.33

Table 5 demonstrates that the experimental group's mean scores increased from the pre-test (M=12.68, SD=1.82) to the post-test (M=15.41, SD=1.47) with the mean difference of 2.73. In order to take into account such increase, the following Table should be considered to examine whether there was significant difference between the experimental groups' mean scores as in Table 6.

Table 6: Paired samples t-test for the experimental group

	Mean Difference	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference Lower	Upper	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Post-Experimental – Pre-Experimental	2.73	1.19	0.22	2.29	3.18	12.5	29	.000

Table 6 indicates that there was a significant difference in the learners' speaking proficiency from the pre-test to the post-test (p=.00<.005), which means that the speaking tasks could provide a suitable condition for the cabin crew members to improve their specific knowledge of the safety emergency procedure course. In other words, in-flight discussion concerning the participants' ESP knowledge about safety measures on the flight could pave the way for the participants of the study to gain improvement in their speaking ability regarding the safety emergency procedure course.

In sum, quantitative findings of the study highlighted the outperformance of experimental group in comparison with the control one regarding the speaking proficiency in the ESP field of the safety emergency procedure course. In fact, the treatment sessions of speaking tasks, which were held through in-flight discussions on safety measures during the flight, could pave the way for the cabin crew members to improve the ESP speaking proficiency.

5. Discussion

The present study was an attempt to investigate the effectiveness of ESP instruction through in-flight discussion on safety measures on the cabin crew members' knowledge of speaking concerning safety emergency measures. Based on the quantitative results of the pre- and post- test scores of the participants in the experimental and control group, it was revealed that the experimental group significantly outperformed the control group after the treatment (i.e. teaching ESP speaking though holding discussion on safety emergency procedure course), indicating that the instruction was quite successful in helping the participants to improve their speaking proficiency. Hence, the study, to a large extent, demonstrated that in-flight discussion on specific issues regarding aviation can be taken into account at the service of ESP courses to implicitly and interactively attract the participants' attention toward specific terms and practical issues concerning safety measures. The results support the fact that if participants undergo such ESP courses, they can surely benefit from such instruction, and their speaking proficiency will be improved in this regard. The present study found

empirical support to those of Kukovec (2008), Vieira and Cristina (2010), and Douglas (2014), who concluded that ESP courses and training should be taken into account as an effective tool to improve the employees' communication skills, which appear to help them get mastery over their specific knowledge of speaking proficiency and productive skills (Viera, Santoz, & Renato, 2014), resulting in its appropriate application of ESP training in the classroom environment based on the pedagogic needs of the participants (Hutchin & Nomura, 2007).

To add more value concerning the effectiveness of speaking tasks in aviation courses, Murphy (2001) assert there is an extreme need for aviation employee to keep their ESP knowledge up-to-date in order take best measures in critical situations, such as high jacking. He also adds that:

Today, a new category of unruly passengers or air rage causes much instability in the air travel performance. The flight attendants' first response is to calm an unruly passenger by using good customer service' as a method of crowd control. (Murphy, 2001, p. 42)

Moreover, as proved by Barkow and Rutenberg (2002), preparation courses for cabin crew members can lead to their better communication skills. Their main recommendations for improving the communication of messages in preflight briefings include:

a) Choose messages that are needed and avoid non-essential messages;
b) Use terms that are meaningful to the listener and take care to avoid the specialized language of the air travel professional;
c) Use short and simple sentences;
d) Establish favorable attitudes in listeners; and
e) Ensure that sight and sound variables are addressed. (Barkow & Rutenberg, 2002, p. 11)

In order to discuss the findings regarding TBLT, ESP teachers can benefit from speaking tasks to foster communicative skills (Pham Ho, 2014) and provide educational support for their participants during treatment course and create an opportunity for them to be able to track their own process of ESP requirements. When participants are involved with a task of speaking, they are practically required to carry out the task by active participation in classroom discussions, made intentionally

by the teacher to foster better communication for the purpose of better speaking proficiency (Awang & Pendidikan, 2011).

Findings of the present study strongly urge the need for holding ESP course for aviation employees to get mastery over language skills, one of which is speaking proficiency. Lin and Wang (2017) argue that the Cabin Crew Members' knowledge of speaking concerning specific phrases in aviation and safety measures should be improved by holding some special workshops and technical discussions to practically discuss the main issues regarding safety emergency course (Hazrati, 2017). It is also noteworthy that, merely discussions cannot be productive unless a productive speaking or other ESP tasks has to be provided in order to raise the participants' awareness of aviation ESP terms and phrases and provide an interactive atmosphere for the participants to improve their general as well as ESP knowledge of aviation (Karimi, et al., 2019), which finally might result in their improvement in speaking ability, particularly in ESP.

6.   Conclusion   and   Pedagogical Implications

Regarding the literature on ESP instruction and effective training through tasks, there were some research focusing solely on speaking tasks (e.g. Pham Ho, 2014) and its effectiveness in aviation organization (Lin & Wang, 2017)), highlighting the need for more studies to be carried out in terms of figuring out the effect of speaking tasks on the participants' speaking proficiency in the safety emergency procedure course. Following these suggestions, the present study was to answer this question that whether using the speaking tasks through exposing the cabin crew members to in-flight discussions on safety measures. The findings of the study can be summarized as follows:

1. The use of speaking tasks was significantly effective in improving the Iranian Cabin Crew Members' speaking proficiency.
2. Regarding ESP instruction by teaching speaking through in-flight discussions, the participants of the experimental group could outperform the control group in their speaking proficiency.
3. The participants in the experimental group showed to be significantly different before and after the treatment sessions of speaking

tasks since their speaking proficiency was improved by the use of speaking tasks..

4. Finally, TBLT was found to be effective in ESP training by providing an atmosphere for the participants to consciously take part in classroom discussion and improve their communicative skills, such as speaking.

Findings of the study are beneficial for ESP teachers to be aware of speaking tasks in ESP instruction in terms of safety measures in aviation, which may help them teach speaking proficiency as effectively as possible. Moreover, cabin crew members can appropriately use tasks in the improvement of their speaking proficiency since they are the active members of the group and are motivated enough to improve their speaking proficiency. Finally, since aviation organizations highly concentrate on the employees' speaking proficiency, teaching speaking through holding some useful discussions can be done to gradually pave the way for the participants to improve their ESP knowable of speaking concerning safety measures

References

Aiguo, W. (2008). Reassessing the position of aviation English: from a special language to English for specific purposes. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 15,* 151-164.

Awang, Z., &Pendidikan, H, (2011). Perception of electrical engineering UTM students on task-based speaking activities in fostering students communication in English. *Teacher Exploring Tasks in English Language Teaching*, 6(4), 18-25.

Bailey, K.M. (2005). *Practical English language teaching: Speaking*. New York: McGraw Hill.

Barkow, B. &Rutenberg, V. (2002). *Improving the effectiveness of aircraft cabin safety briefings*. Transportation Development Centre (TP13973E). Montreal, Canada.

Brown, G., & Yule, G. (1983). *Teaching the spoken language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Chute, R. D, & Wiener, E. L. (1994). Cockpit and cabin crews: Do conflicting mandates put them on a collision course? *Cabin Crew Safety, 29*(2), 1-8.

Douglas, D. (2014). Enhancing assessment and training in aviation English. *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research, 2*(2), 1-12.

Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) (2004), *Advisory circular Nr. 120-51E. Change description: Subject: Crew resource management training*. Federal Aviation Administration.

Ghaffari, S., &Fatemi, M. A. (2015).Theeffects of using instructional conversation method on speaking skill of Iranian intermediate EFL learners. *International Journal of Language Learning and Applied Linguistics World, 10*(4), 1-13.

Goh, C. (2007). *Teaching speaking in the language classroom.* Singapore: SEAMEO Regional Language Centre.

Hams, F. (2005). *Aviation safety newsletter*. Retrieved June 12, 2005, from http://www.rollanet.org

Hazrati, A. (2017). Intercultural communication and discourse analysis: The case of Aviation English. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 192,* 244-251.

Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Hutchin, E., & Nomura, S. (2007). The ecology of language practice in worldwide airline flight deck operations. Cognitive Science, 27, 195-225.

Johnston, N. (2003). *Responding to emergencies and abnormal events*. Dublin: Aerospace Psychology Research Group. Trinity College Dublin.

Kanki, B. G., & Palmer, M. T. (1993). Communication and crew, resource management. In E. Wiener, B. Kanki, & R. Helmreich (Eds.), *Cockpit resource management,* (pp. 99- 136). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Karimi, P., Lotfi, A. R., & Biria, R. (2019). Enhancing pilot's aviation English learning, attitude and motivation through the application of content and language integrated learning. *International Journal of Instruction, 12*(1), 751-766.

Krifka, M., Martens, S., & Schwarz, F. (2003). Group interaction in the cockpit: Some linguistic factors. In R. Dietrich (Ed.), *Communication in high risk environments*, (pp.75-101). Hamburg, Germany. Helmut BuskeVerlag.

Kukovec, A. (2008). Teaching aviation English and radiotelephony communication in line with the newly established international civil aviation organization language proficiency requirements for pilots. *SAGE Journals*, *1,* 127-137.

Lin, J. & Wang, A. (2017). Integrating curriculum design theory into ESP course construction: Aviation English for Aircraft Engineering. *Social Science and Humanities, 4*(2), 219-227.

Mackay, R., & Mountford, A. (Eds.). (1978). *English for specific pposes: A case study approach*. London, UK: Longman Press.

Mackey, A., & Gass, S. (2005). *Second language research, methodology and design.* Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Murphy, A. G. (2001). The flight attendant dilemma: An analysis of communication and sense making during in-flight emergencies. *Journal of Applied Communication Research, 29*, 30-53.

Oxford, R. L. (2006). Task-based learning in the Asian context. *Asian EFL Journal Press, 8*(3),   170-190.

Pham Ho, V. (2014). The Effects of communicative grammar teaching on students'   achievement of grammatical knowledge and oral production. *ERIC journal, 7*(6), 74-86.

Prabhu, N. S. (1987). *Second language pedagogy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

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

Scarcella, R.C., Oxford, R.L. (1992). The tapestry of language learning: The individual   in   the   communicative classroom. *The Electronic Journal for English as a Second Language, 1*(3), 45-67.

Segrin, C., & Flora, J. (2000). Poor social skills are   a   vulnerability   factor   in   the development of psychosocial problems. *Human   Communication   Research Journal, 26*, 489-514.

Vieira, A. M., &Cristina, I. C. (2010). Communication skills: A mandatory competence for ground and airplane crew to reduce tension in extreme situations. *Journal   of   Aerospace   Technology Management, 2*(3), 361-370.

Vieira, M. A., &Santos, I. C. (2010). Social skills training air flight schools: a proactive tool   for management threats and risks. *Journal of Air Transport Studies, 4*(1), 89-104.

Vieira, M. A., Santos, I. C., & Rento, P. (2014). Social skills training air flight schools: A proactive tool for management threats and risks. *Journal of Air Transport Studies, 4*(1), 89-104.

Wiemann, J. M. (1977). Explication and test of a model of communication competence, *Human Communication Research, 3*, 195-213.

Willis, J. (1996).*A flexible framework for task-based learning: An overview of a task-based framework for language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Young, L. B. (1994). Communications and pilot/flight attendant crew performance. *The CRM Advocate, 94*(1) 48-65.

Appendix A: Safety Language Test

Pre-Test
1. What is 'flight safety'?
2. What is safety equipment?
3. What are the commands for un-usable exit?
4. What is the aviation security?
5. What is 'Deportees' in general?
6. What are the dangerous goods in general?
7. What are the cabin crew duties in the case of pilot incapacitation?
8. What is the hijacking?
9. What is the Bomb threating?
10. What is the phase of flight? (Explain it in the situations of the taxi and climb)
11. In the event of illness when the condition of a passenger or a crewmember is critical, what is the duty of the crew?
12. In the event of death on board, what is the duty of the crew?
13. What is the First Aid?
14. What is the aim of the First Aid?
15. What is chocking and what is the duty of crew in this situation?
16. What are different types of fire extinguish?
17. What is the cabin crew attitude towards the Hijackers?
18. What are the cabin crew duties in case of window crack?
19. What are different types of handicapped passengers?
20. What is Diabetes?
21. What does CARE on abbreviation stand for?
22. What is asthma?
23. Facture cases and passengers with plaster cast are examples of:
24. Water can be used in fighting which type of fire?
25. Nausea, vomiting, abdominal pain, diarrhea are caused of what case?
Post-Test
26. What is the Notification to Commander (NOTOC)?
27. What is the categorization of safety of flight?
28. What is the safety Precautions Whilst Administering Oxygen?
29. What is the Baggage Classification?
30. What are the different types of deportee?
31. What is the checklist for Dangerous Goods Incidents?
32. What are the general rules of dangerous goods incident in-flight?
33. What is the categorization of Dangerous Goods?
34. Explaining and speaking about Least Risk bomb location (LRBL)
35. What is the different between Aircraft threat In-flight and Aircraft threat on-ground?
36. Imagine you are in the emergencies and time is limited, what is your reaction and what do you do in these situations?
37. What are the evacuation commands (after impact) in prepared emergency?
38. What is silent review?
39. What are the evacuation techniques of Non- Ambulatory passenger?
40. During "CAT" who will inform cabin crew to perform the assigned duties, what are cabin crew duties?
41. "Smoke and Fumes in Cabin" What are duties of cabin crew?
42. Lavatory firefighting (wall is cool), what are the duties of primary fire fighter?
43. during ditching: What are the primary crew vital actions for L2/ R2 exits in airbus 310?
44. How do you open doors 3L and R of Airbus 300-600 in a main gears collapsed situation?
45. What are the indications of emergency call from the cockpit to cabin in the Airbus 310?
46. How do you operate the total fire extinguisher?
47. What are cabin crew duties during slow decompression?
48. how do you operate the L' AIR LIQUIDE BPE?
49. What is the cabin crew duty during emergency alert for cancellation of evacuation?
50. What is the location and operation of Locator Beacon?