The Effect of Speaking Strategies on Iraqi EFL College Students

Dr. Elaf Riyadh Khalil

University of Baghdad - College of Education for Human Sciences
(Ibn-Rush) - English Department
dr.elafriyadh@gmail.com

Abstract

The present study deals with the effect of teaching speaking Strategies (SS) on EFL Iraqi College students. The use of speaking strategies not only solves learners' communication problems, but also enhances the learner's interaction in target language, and improves their oral proficiency .The aim of the study is to find out the effect of teaching SS used by EFL College students .The learner of the first stage is population of the study at the Department of English, College of Education /Ibn-Rushd .The sample consists of (60) students distributed on experimental group(A) as well as control group(B) each group contains (30) students . In order to achieve the aim of the study, questionnaire has been constructed to be taught on the experimental group and a test. The questionnaire and the test have covered reduction strategies, achievement strategies, modified- interaction strategies and social-interaction strategies (table 1).The face validity of the test is proved by exposing it to a jury of specialists. For reliability, Alpha Cronbach reliability coefficient has been used. The results indicate that the SS strategies are useful in improving the students' conversation. Accordingly, recommendation and suggestions for further studies are put forward.

Key Words*:* Speaking strategies, language teaching, communication proficiency and learners' performance.

اثر استراتيجيات الكلام لطلبة الكلية الدارسي اللغة الإنجليزية ـ لغة أجنبية

م. د. ايلاف رياض خليل
جامعة بغداد / كلية التربية للعلوم الانسانية ابن رشد
قسم اللغة الانكليزية
dr.elafriyadh@gmail.com

الخلاصة

تتناول الدراسة الحالية تأثير تدريس استراتيجيات الكلام على الطلبة في قسم اللغة الإنجليزية. إن استخدام استراتيجيات الكلام لا يحل مشاكل التواصل لدى المتعلمين فحسب ، بل يحسن أيضاً تفاعل المتعلم في اللغة الانكليزية وتطوير مهارة الكلام .تهدف الدراسة الى تطوير استراتجيات الكلام عند الطلبة الجامعيين في اللغة الإنجليزية ـ لغة أجنبية,تتكون عينة الدراسة (60) طالباً في المرحلة الأولى بقسم اللغة الإنجليزية ، الدراسات الصباحية ، كلية التربية / ابن رشد .موزعين على مجموعة تجريبية (أ) تضم (30) طالباً ، و (30)الطلاب كمجموعة ضابطة (ب). من أجل تحقيق الهدف من الدراسة ، تم إعداد استبيان إستراتيجي كطريقة تدريس على المجموعة التجريبية واختبار التحصيلي .وقد شمل الاستبيان و الاختبار استراتيجيات التقليل ، استراتيجيات التحصيل ، استراتيجيات التفاعل واستراتيجيات التفاعل الاجتماعي وكما موضح في (الجدول 1). ولغرض التحقق من صحة ثبات الاختبار تم عرضها على عدد من الخبراء من ذوي الاختصاص.اما بالنسبة المصداقية فقد تم استخدم الاختبار طريقة اللفا كرونباخ، على كل المجموعتين (المجموعة التجريبية والضابطة) (الملحق). أظهرت النتائج فروقات ذات دلالة احصائية لصالح المجموعة التجريبية حيث وجدوا ان ووجدوا هذه الاستراتيجيات مفيدة لتحسين مهارة االكلام لديهم.

الكلمات المفتاحية: استراتيجيات الكلام ، تدريس اللغة ، إتقان الاتصالات وأداء المتعلمي

1. Introduction
1.1 The Problem and Its Significance

Speaking strategies have been center of attention of growing variety number of second language studies. Some pedagogically-oriented studies indicate that instructing would be extra high quality if it is primarily based on, what learners actually do. While learning a given language, including their use of SS. The first to use the term SS for one of the processes affecting L2 learning is Selinker (1972 cited in Dörnyei and Scott 1997). SS are claimed to be important for the process of learning L2. In her report, Savignon (1972:78) recognizes the importance of SS as a component of language teaching in that she refers to SS as 'coping strategies'. Researchers such as Dörnyei and Scott (1997), Færch and Kasper (1983), Tarone (1980) and Nakatani (2010) argue that the use of fluency strategies not solely solves learners' communication problems, but also enhances the learner's interaction in target language (TL), which in turn, develops their oral proficiency.

The essential priority for many gaining knowledge a second/foreign language is to communicate effectively in the TL. Communication can be defined as the process by which human negotiate, send and receive messages

In the current research, SSs are described as methods taken via by students to answer verbal exchange difficulties. Learners use SSs to "face the difficult problem, the majority of students are neither fluent nor confident English speakers. Some may attribute this deficiency to the limited time for oral practice in classrooms and the lack of conversational opportunities outside of them, especially in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) settings. However, it may, in fact, stem from the myths that students hold regarding communication in a foreign language, such as the necessary possession of excellent pronunciation, a good accent, a large vocabulary size, and an in-depth knowledge of grammar. Moreover, some learners who perform well in English classes still find themselves at a loss when interacting with native speakers in everyday life (Tarone, 2005:488).

This dichotomy arises from the somewhat unreal and comparatively safe context of the

classroom, since teacher-student and peer interactions are often restricted to basic patterns and prefabricated situations or topics (Bialystok, 1990:56).Real-life interactions, a major factor for second language acquisition and the development of communicative competence, "demand a great deal of spontaneity and the ability to cope with the unexpected" (Rubin and Thomson, 1994:48). In authentic communicative situations, language learners are often unable to retrieve a word, to use or comprehend an idiomatic expression, or to grasp a topic; consequently, communication breaks down (Willems, 1987). Therefore, they must develop specific SS that enable them to compensate for their target language deficiencies, enhance interaction in the target language, and eventually develop communicative competence (Faerch & Kasper, 1983:78; Bialystok, 1990:90; Dornyei, 2002:76).

Students use SS for different reasons. As showed by Bialystok (1990:125) students has paid attention to use SS to solve verbal exchange problems in L2/FL. According to O'Malley and Chamot (1990: 43) speaking strategy is essential in interacting in semantics where either in syntactic or discourse, they are not showed between a learner and a speaker of the target language''. Thus, EFL learners may apply SS to negotiate meaning and they should be encouraged to practice language skills in order to lessen the shy which might arise from lack of linguistic knowledge.

The teaching SSs are normally described as strategies used to overcome problems resulting from an insufficient knowledge of the second/target language. (Rubin and Thomson, 1994: 89). Communication strategies play an integral role in language acquisition.

Dornyei, (2002:99) argues that introducing SSs allows weaker learners to "develop a feeling of being able to do *something* with the language" and thus derive language learning motivation. A review of the relevant literature showed that studies regarding the use of communication strategies by college students are quite few and these say little either about their use in authentic communication with native English speakers or about the factors other than language proficiency that affect their selection. (O'Malley and Chamot ,1990: 77).

     This study investigates the use of SSs by Iraqi college students. It seeks to identify what is common in the communication approaches of these students in authentic interactions. Furthermore, based on the data collected, it examines whether such oral proficiency, the frequency of speaking English outside the classroom, and motivation in speaking English influence the use of oral communication strategies. It is hoped that this study will encourage a more serious reflection on the oral proficiency of college students. At the same time, teachers, by better understanding their students' strategy use, will more effectively develop their communicative competence.

1.2 Aim of the Study

The main aim of this study is to find out the effect of teaching SS on Iraqi EFL College students` performance in conversation.

1.3 Hypothesis

There are no statistically significant differences between the mean score of control group and the mean score of experimental one` in students' performance od SSs in conversation test.

1.4 Limits

This study is limited to:

1.First year students of English department at college of Education (Ibn-Rushd).

2. Teaching students SSs in Conversation class (the textbook).

3. for the academic year 2016-2017.

1.5 Procedures

In order to achieve the aim of this study, the following procedures will be adopted:

1. The sample will be selected purposely as first year /morning studies of English department and then select randomly from them the experimental and control groups.

2. Speaking strategies will be selected from different studies and classified according to teach reduction strategies, achievement strategies, modified- interaction strategies and social-interaction strategies to the experimental design group.

3. Teaching students SSs on the experimental group through questionnaire rather than the control group.

4. Conducting an instrument as a test to find out the effect of SSs on EFL Iraqi College students.

6. The test has given to the jury members to verify their face validity.

7. The students in both the experimental and control groups will be pre-test for verifying the equivalence between the two groups.

8. The students in experimental group will be taught according to the SSs.

9. The students in both the experimental and control groups will be post-test for finding out the differences between two groups.

10. The results will be analyzed and interpreted statistically and then stating results, conclusions, recommendations, and suggestions.

1.6 Definition of Basic Term

Speaking Strategies define SSs from the *inter-individual*, *interactional* view, regarding SSs as the "mutual attempts of two interlocutors to agree on a meaning in a situation where the requisite meaning structures do not seem to be shared", i.e. they involve an interactional perspective, in which two interlocutors attempt to agree on 'a

communicative goal'.
(Tarone, 1980:420).

Operational one SSs are utilized to bridge the gap between the linguistic knowledge of the foreign language students and that of the target language interlocutor in real communication situations so as to avoid communication disruptions. For the purpose of this study, the term SS is defined as devices employed by learners in an interactive situation, to gain a communicative task.

2. Theoretical Background and Related Previous Studies
2.1 Theoretical Background
2.1.1 Speaking Strategies

Speaking strategies (SS) are indicated as the methods apply by the students when there is misunderstanding between students 'background of the language and their verbal exchange. (Wenden, 1986:87). Savignon (1972:113) stated on a pioneering language instruction experiment involving a communicative approach, which, for the first time, included students training in SS. Palmer (1981:45) observed that the materials with not clear enough syntactic and morphemes to clarify the situation of their diagnoses test, in terms of how difficult or ease they are. These materials shows up to apply SS and not focus on the subjects of the situations and interacting about the nonverbal visual (the lines and shapes) used to represent them. Since related researches have been accomplished to apply and categories SS; not much interest to fill the gap of investigated explicit teachability of communication strategies.

Concerning the factors that have an effect on learners' preference of SS, Wenden (1986:82) observed language use genius to be the essential element. His learn about additionally printed a range of variety elements which have an effect on such elements, one is the language use thought materials have request to reach the semantics goal. He shows that the limited kinds of SS as the highest frequency in using in semantics. Another element is the verbal exchange exercises in different situations. In his learn about was in a position to manipulate the verbal exchange assignment to a giant diploma and verbal exchange scenario was formal. These elements leads the authors, to the learners' not to use of SS. Final element showed that the writer is the decidedness of the materials. This, the writer shows the end of the well-done of the verbal exchange mission showed to every situation (Ibid: 87).

Most literature on SS embodies same and classifications, which can include avoidance or reduction strategies and achievement or compensatory ones (e.g. Tarone, 2005; Faerch & Kasper, 1983; Dornyei & Scott, 1997). Using the avoidance or reduction strategies (e.g. topic avoidance, message abandonment, meaning replacement), students veer far from unknown titles, keep away from fixing verbal exchange problems, and decrease focusing meaning of the messages convey. These exchanges can interact effect of students' materials. Using the fulfillment or compensatory strategies, learners manage verbal exchange troubles with the aid of a choice graph for reaching their unique goals. The fulfillment or compensatory techniques include cooperative techniques (e.g. enchantment for help) and non-cooperative ones (e.g. L1-bases strategies, such as code switching, foreignizing, and literal translation; interlanguage-based strategies, such as substitution, generalization, exemplification, word-coinage, and restructuring; non-verbal strategies, such as mime and imitation). Other strategies, such as time- gaining strategies (using fillers to gain time to think), prefabricated patterns (using memorized stock phrases, usually for survival purposes) additionally belong to the category of achievement or compensatory strategies. By SS techniques assist students go on an oral conversation and is regarded as accurate learners' behavior.

2.1.2 Speaking Strategies Targeted for Teaching and Learning

In the current study, four SS has been chosen from the four typologies of Tarone (1980), Dörnyei (1995) and Bejarano et al. (1997): reduction strategies, achievement strategies, explanation techniques and social-interaction strategies (table1). Bejarano et al. (1997: 211) includes implementing a wide range of sorts of SS in a study, to provide natural discussions settings in L2/LF. Researchers such as Tarone (1981), Dörnyei (1995) and Bejarano et al. (1997) have established that the strategies beneath are the most usually used. The reduction strategies consisted of 'topic avoidance' and 'message abandonment'. Also, another three non-taught strategies, 'responding', 'translation' and non-linguistic had been regarded in this study because it was predicted that English language learners would resort to them while attempting to talk in English. Therefore, the complete range of strategies investigated was 20.

Table (1) Typology of SS Adopted in this Study

Name of Strategy	Definition of Strategy Time
Reduction Strategies	
1. Topic avoidance:	The learner attempts not to talk about aspects in the target language he/she
2. Message abandonment:	The learner abandons the topic due to language difficulties.
Achievement Strategies	
3. Circumlocution:	The learner describes the characteristics of the objects instead of using the appropriate target item
4. Using fillers:	Using filler phrase such as 'well', 'actually', 'you know' etc. as a stalling device to achieve time to think of 'what to say' or 'how to say
5. Repetition:	'To ask the speaker to repeat what he/she has just said as a stalling device to gain time to think of 'what to say' or 'how to say it', (Lam 2006)'.
6. Approximation:	using an alternative lexical item which shares semantic features with the target word
7. Use of all-purpose words	extending a general, 'empty' lexical item to contexts where specific words
8. Appeal for help:	asking for aid from the interlocutor either directly or indirectly
9. Word coinage	creating non-existing L2 word by applying a supposed L2 rule to and
10. Use of non-linguistic means:	mime, gesture, facial expression, or sound imitation
11. Literal translation:	translating literally a lexical item, idiom, compound word, or structure from L1 to L2
12. Foreignizing:	using a L1 word by adjusting it to L2 phonology
13. Code switching:	using a L1 word with L1 pronunciation or a L3 word with L3 pronunciation while speaking in L2
Social-Interaction Strategies	
14. Paraphrasing:	Using alternative expressions with similar meanings to clarify the previous speaker's contribution.
15. Facilitating:	A participant uses 'promoters' words that encourage continuation of the conversation, (Bejarano et al. 1997)'.
16. Seeking an opinion:	A participant asks for the speaker's opinion or seeks relevant or more detailed information, (Bejarano et al. 1997)'.
Modified - Interaction Strategies	
17. Asking for clarification:	Asking the interlocutor to clarify the meaning of what he/she has just said to facilitate comprehension.
18. Repairing:	This enables participants to correct grammatical or lexical errors in the target language that were made by themselves or other members of the

19. Giving assistance:	This enables participants to help other members of the group who have difficulty expressing themselves in the target language and appeal for
20. Retrieval strategies:	the learner attempts to retrieve, or remember, the optimal form

2.2. Related Previous Study
2.2.1 Chen's study (1990)

This study empirically tests the effectiveness of L2 learners' target language proficiency and their strategic competence. I t examines the oral communication strategies used by college English majors in Taiwan, maintains that although speaking proficiency is related to the use of oral communication strategies, no direct relationship exists between them. Groups of students in speaking course are compared with and without SSs available (N=52, 46, respectively).The instrument for gaining information about SSs is an interview of students at the end of the course, after teaching the students SSs. The study aims to evaluate the effectiveness of the students' strategic competence. Results reveal that high proficiency learners were prone to choose linguistic-based and low proficiency learners knowledge-based and repetition CSs. In addition, high proficiency learners employed their CSs more efficiently. Generally speaking, high language proficiency students are more likely to resort to linguistic knowledge to convey meaning and they are able to select appropriate and effective strategies for interaction. In comparison, low language proficiency students tend to rely on knowledge-based or conceptual-based strategies and to call on abandonment strategies.

2.2.2. Discussion

The comparison of the present study with the previous study is clarified in Table (2)

Table (2) the Comparison between the Present Study and the Previous Study

	The Present Study	The Previous Study
Aim	to find out the effect of teaching SS on Iraqi EFL College students` performance in conversation classes.	to evaluate the effectiveness of the students' strategic competence.
Sample	(60) college students	(98) college students
Design	Experimental study	Experimental study
Instrument	Test	Interview
Results	The results indicate that the students have a good development towards the teaching of SS and found these strategies are useful in improving their conversation.	Results reveal that high proficiency learners were prone to choose linguistic-based and their CSs more efficiently, and low proficiency learners knowledge-based and repetition CSs.

3. Procedures
3.1. Type of Experimental Design

The type of experimental design followed in the present study is nonrandomized control group pretest-posttest is used to investigate the hypotheses of the study see Table (3). Two sections are selected randomly as an experimental and control groups.

Table (3) the Experimental Design

The Groups	Independent Variable	Dependent Variable
Experimental	Teaching SSs	College students
Control	Conventional teaching	

3.2. Population and Sample of Study

The population of the study is represented by first year college students in department of English, morning studies at College of Education /Ibn- Rushd at Baghdad University. The total number population of the study is (120) distributed into four sections. The sample of the study consists of (60) students, section (A) is chosen randomly to represent the experimental group and section (B) as the control group.

Table (4) Study Sample

Group	Section	No. of Students
Exp.	A	30
CG	B	30
Total		60

3.3 Equalization

The two groups are equalized according to the following variables: the academic level of the mother, the academic level of the father, students` age and pre-test results .The two groups are equalized in all variables ; as show in Table (5) for The X2 Statistics of the Equalization of the two Groups at the Academic Level of the Mother and father Variables , in Table (5) the T-Test statistical of equalization between two groups in the age , and Table (6) the T-Test statistical of equalization between two groups in pre-test variables.

Table (5) for the X2 Statistics of the Equalization of the two Groups at the Academic Level of the Mother and father Variables

Group	Variable	No.	Primary and Less Interme-diate	Preparatory	Institute University	Computed X^2 – value	Tabulated X^2 - value	d.f	Level of Significance 0.05
Exp.	Mother	30	13	10	7				
CG		30	11	9	10	1.715	6.57	2	Not Significant
Total		60	24	19	17				
Exp.	Father	30	10	9	11	1.981			Not Significant
CG		30	12	8	10				
Total		60	22	17	21				

Table (6) the T-Test Statistical of Equalization between two Groups in the Age

Groups	No. of Students	Mean	S.D.	Df	T-test		Level of Significance 0.05
Exp.	30	3.246	6.76	2	Computed T-Valued	Tabulated T-value	Not Significant
CG	30	2.46	4.87	2	0.87	4.89	

Table (7) the T-Test Statistical of Equalization of SSs between two Groups in Pre-Test Variables.

Groups	No. of Students	Mean	S.D.	Df	T-test		Level of Significance 0.05
Exp.	30	10.46	2.86	2	Computed T-Valued	Tabulated T-value	Not Significant
CG	30	9.78	2.37	2	0.35	2.76	

3.4 Instruments of the Study

The instruments of the study are questionnaire and MCQ test. A questionnaire has been constructed by the researcher herself to identify and teach the SSs used by the students. The test built by the researcher herself to suit the aim of the study. The test has been conducted relying on the related textbook at first year English Department is "Real listening-speaking with answers published by Sally Long and Caring Thaine". It includes (20) MCQ items, they have selected according to the four SSs (Reduction Strategies, Achievement Strategies, Social strategies, Modified – Interaction Strategies).

3.5 Validity

Cohen et al. (2001) pointed out that reliability and validity are multi-faceted. These ideas apply to the analysis of information as well as the data collection. A test is valid when it measures what it ought to measure. Face validity of the test has been proved by exposing them to a jury of specialists in the fields of ELT.

3.6 Reliability

Reliability has to do with the stability of scores in measuring whatever they measure for the same individuals from time to time or from test to test (Ebel, 1972:56).The objective test has been consistent of (20) MCQ items .They have been administered to the second semester of the year, The reliability coefficient of the posttest has been computed by using Alpha – Cronbach formula, the test reliability of the objective test is 0.98 which is considered high coefficient.

3.7 Item Difficulty Level

The aim of the pilot study is to determine the difficulty level and item discrimination power of the test items. In other words, level of difficulty has to do with the percentage of learners who answered the item correctly (Wood, 1960:87 and Ebel, 1972:35).

As for the item difficulty analysis of the post-test, it has been found out that the difficulty level is acceptable.

3.8 Item Discriminating Power

It means the degree at which the test item discriminates between students with high and low achievement (Gronlund, 1971:259). According to Stanely and Hopkins (1972:450), DP refers to a measure of the extent to which an item distinguishes the more able or good testees from the less able or poor testees.

Table (8)
Items Difficulty and Items Discrimination Power of the
Achievement Post Test

No. of Item/Question	Difficulty Level	Discrimination Power
1	0.45	0.46
2	0.41	0.43
3	0.50	0.51
4	0.55	0.54
5	0.59	0.38
6	0.41	0.42
7	0.50	0.45
8	0.36	0.50
9	0.64	0.53
10	0.59	0.45
11	0.68	0.50
12	0.50	0.40
13	0.45	0.53
14	0.68	0.38
15	0.41	0.54
16	0.50	0.51
17	0.64	0.40
18	0.55	0.54
19	0.64	0.45
20	0.45	0.48

3.9 The Process of the Experimental Work

The experimental period starts at the second course of the academic year (2016-2017).The whole duration is (15) weeks, two hours for each week. Both the experimental and control groups are pretested teaching the same way of traditional speaking to see their equalization in all variables.

However, the experimental group students will be taught by giving the questionnaire of SSs at the end of each week. A questionnaire has been constructed by the researcher herself to identify and teach the SSs used by the students. It includes of four SSs (Reduction Strategies, Achievement Strategies, Social strategies, Modified – Interaction Strategies), the items of the questionnaire are depending on the studies of Bejarano et at. (1997:211) and Lam`s (2000:20) questionnaire.

On the other hand the control group students teaching them conventional way, without giving and teaching them the questionnaire of SSs. At the end of the second course, both groups are posttest by SSs of their learning speaking.

4. **Results, Conclusions, Recommendations and Suggestions.**

4.1. Results

4.1.1 Date Analysis

To find out the effect of teaching (SSs) on EFL Iraqi College students, the following hypothesis is investigating: there are no statistically significant differences the mean score of control group and the mean score of experimental one` in students' performance in conversation test. In order to achieve the aim, posttest has been administered and presented to the sample of the students (30) in each group. By using two independent –samples t-test the results are found to be as shown in table (8), that the mean score of the experimental group is(8.60) which is higher than control (6.0) , the SD in the experimental group is (2.86) whereas in control group is(2.37), for the computed t-test value which is (4.77) higher than tabulated t-test value(3.76) ,at the level of significance of (0.05) ,at the degree of freedom (58). This indicates that there are statistically significant differences in SSs between two groups. Accordingly, the null hypothesis is rejected. As shown in table (9)

Table (9) The Results of the Two Independent –Samples T- Test between (Control/Experimental Groups) SSs

Groups	No. of Students	Mean	S.D.	Df	T-test		Level of Significance 0.05
Exp.	30	8.60	2.86	58	Computed T-Valued	Tabulated T-value	Significant
CG	30	6,0	2.37	58	4.77	3.76	

4.1.2. Comparison of Results of the Control and Experimental Groups in each SS.

To check the statistical significant differences between the mean scores of the control and experimental group's S S s usage, an independent t-test for related means was applied. The results revealed that there were statistically significant differences in the mean scores in only two strategies, 'Responding', and 'Seeking an opinion'. Students' mean scores were higher in the control group in these strategies Table (10).Their reliance on such strategies in this early stage might be attributed to a lack of target language, or a lack confidence and fear of making mistakes.

Table (10):

The Result of Two Independent –Samples T-Test (Control/Experimental Groups) in each SS

Strategies	Test	Me	SD	t - test	Sig
1. Repetition	Experimental	2.685	0.161	1.584	0.132
	Control	1.20	0.282		
2. Repairing	Experimen	2.19	0.281	1.458	.163
	Control	1.31	0.311		
3. Circumlocution	Experimen	1.58	0.278	0.121	0.905
	Control	1.25	0.296		
4. Message Abandonment	Experimen	1.27	0.300	1.571	0.135
	Control	1.23	0.290		
5. Topic Avoidance	Experimen	2.60	0.614	1.226	0.237
	Control	0.18	0.232		
6. Non-linguistic Strategies	Experimen	1.24	0.293	1.054	0.307
	Control	1.09	0.305		
7. Responding	Experimen	1.88	0.303	*2.024	0.042
	Control	2.53	0.220		
8. Facilitating	Experimen	1.10	0.261	0.275	0.786
	Control	1.04	0.294		
9. Asking for clarification	Experimen	1.94	0.245	1.638	0.120
	Control	1.32	0.313		
10. Seeking an opinion	Experimen	1.53	0.361	*2.465	0.025
	Control	1.07	0.254		
11. Giving assistance	Experimen	1.61	0.381	0.959	0.351
	Control	1.11	0.403		
12. Paraphrasing	Experimen	2.64	0.623	1.334	0.200
	Control	1.16	0.273		
13. Using fillers	Experimen	1.39	0.324	1.214	0.241
	Control	1.01	0.380		
14. Translation	Experimen	1.437	0.338	0.121	0.902
	Control	1.227	0.289		
15. Word coinage	Experimen	1.182	0.272	0.122	0.925
	Control	1.052	0.292		
16. Seeking an opinion	Experimen	1.274	0.300	1.574	0.134
	Control	1.031	0.290		
17. Use of non-linguistic	Experimen	2.602	0.612	1.223	0.233
	Control	0.382	0.233		
18. Foreign zing	Experimen	1.241	0.291	1.053	0.305
	Control	1.093	0.301		
19. Code switching	Experimen	1.284	0.301	*2.021	0.041
	Control	0.035	0.220		
20. Retrieval strategies	Experimen	1.704	0.260	0.271	0.783
	Control	1.246	0.291		

There are also significant differences in the mean scores of use of the SS, After the instruction, leaners in the experimental group utilized more S S than learners in the

control group. The teaching of SS resulted in a measurable impact on learners' linguistic competence knowledge and their usage of these strategies in English conversation. In particular, table (10) above shows that learners in the experimental group employed fourteen communicative strategies, 'Filler', 'Asking for clarification', 'Seeking opinion' and 'Giving assistance' more than the other strategies. Students might have found that these CSs were more important than others while communicating in the TL.

4.1.3. Discussion

The results show that the participants in this study used *message reduction strategies*, as in the finding in line with Chen's study (2009) in that the English major students in Taiwan most frequently employed *message reduction and alternation strategies*. More specifically, students tended to use well-known words or simple expressions to communicate, rather than give up when they have difficulties conveying meaning in authentic discourse. They attempted to make a good impression and try to enjoy the process of SSs. In addition, the students often utilized gestures to help get meaning across and eye contact to attract the attention of their listeners.

The findings imply that overall, the students' linguistic competence was insufficient, leading them to seek alternative ways to convey meaning. While struggling to cope with communication problems, they paid less attention to the problem of accuracy. However, it is worth noting that most of them did not abandon their attempts to communicate, indicating a strong intention to achieve communication goals and an impetus that favors their future progress.

Analysis of the data of the test provides firm evidence that learners actually put the taught strategies into practice, especially in the case of 'Pause Fillers'. Collecting data from the classroom increases the credibility of the evidence that the teaching of SS is feasible and effective. This provides a benefit addition to the knowledge base of effective language teaching practices.

Experimental group, there was important relationship between the teaching of SS and their use. Learners statistically increased their use of the targeted SS. These were 'repetition', 'repairing' 'circumlocution', 'seeking opinion', 'giving assistance' and 'fillers'. These were asking for 'clarification', 'seeking opinion', 'giving assessment' and 'pause fillers'. Learners decreased their use verbal exchanges strategies. These were 'responding', 'non-linguistic' and 'translation' (Table 10).

Learners in the control group increased their use of 'repetition', 'reduction' and 'circumlocution' strategy in the post-test analysis (Table 10), shows that the non-taught strategies 'responding', 'non-linguistic', and 'translation', increased. The difference in mean score results between the two groups show a statistically significant increase in usage of some targeted SS .These were 'Repetition', 'Repairing', 'Circumlocution', 'Asking for clarification', 'Seeking opinion', 'Giving assessments' and 'Pause fillers' (Tables 10). The data revealed students employed these strategies more effectively than the non-taught strategies. This is probably because the teaching strategies encouraged the students to use such strategies in conversation while speaking English. Students who acquire these strategies felt more confident in continuing the flow of the conversation. Such confidence could be a linking factor between the usage of SS and a broader language acquisition. In the case of on-taught strategies, results in the current research demonstrated that learners in the experimental group decreased their usage of the strategies 'Nonlinguistic', 'Translation', and 'Responding', after the instruction (Table 10). Learners may have found that some strategies were important and useful such as 'Asking for clarification', 'Seeking opinion', 'Giving assessment' and 'Pause fillers'. There is evidence that, in making this choice, learners felt that they became better English communicators, which a student expressed, 'These strategies help you to understand

English and speak it more clearly in daily life'. Responses of the questionnaires showed both increases and decreases in the use of particular SS after teaching. It is possible that these differences have many reasons, such as whether the strategies were taught or not, the learners' strategic competence, and their awareness of SS in TL conversation.

4.2 Conclusions

To investigate the effect of the educating and utilizing of SS on English language learners in the English department at college of Education, which lasted for fifteen weeks, was used. The current study determined evidence that the instruction of SS was a key element in increasing learners' strategic competence and confidence in communicating in English. Pedagogically, this study located that an enhancement of learners' pragmatic communication ability was an impact of teaching SS to English language learners. This is an endorsement of integrating strategy teaching and embedding the practice SS in classroom activity. As language, learners in the English department at Baghdad University receive too little on oral communication practice, because of traditional methodologies. Therefore, English language learners need to be exposed explicitly to the use of SS both inside and outside the classroom.

Furthermore, Practicing SS inside and outside the classroom and motivating students to take every opportunity to communicate the target language is considered as an essential elements for learning new skills and enhancing learners' communicative competence that foreign language learners lack the opportunity for constant interaction in the L2, they should be less likely to increase their perceived competence willingness to communicate and frequency of communication''. The current study has been provided evidence that there is a direct correlation between the instruction of SS, the frequent use of these strategies in learners' performance, raising learners' awareness is importance of such strategies in English conversation, the enhancement of learners' strategic competence and the development of their speaking abilities.

4.3 Recommendations

The findings recommendation that it is benefit to introduce these as important strategies. Teaching has to begin with the main and easier techniques for example pause fillers and repetition or repairing. Then, the more advanced strategies such as circumlocution, clarification, seeking opinion should be taught. The teacher may regulate the selection based on the actual context and task situations. Teachers should consider not teaching a large number of SS, because it hard for college students to take into account and employ too many in communicative interactional situations.

This study also find out the impact which SS instruction can have on the modernization of instructing techniques and classroom culture. For countries modernizing their teaching methodologies, the teaching of SS, with their associated awareness raising activities, is an essential change to the curriculum. It also showed that students were receptive to experiencing the new techniques. These facts suggest that the teaching of SS may have as much positive effect on the instructing culture of the college as it has for the communication of students.

4.4 Suggestions for future research in SS

The findings suggest that future research would be benefit in the following areas:

1. The impact of explicit SS teaching on test results.

2. The effect of type of context on SS usage in multicultural groups and cultural differences in SS usage in these classes.

3. The investigating of SS teaching on wider measures of speaking proficiency levels .

4. The longitudinal impact of SS teaching, using larger samples and general sample size.

Although SSs are widely and implicitly present in testing criteria, they are still not explicitly taught at language schools and universities, or elsewhere. Since this study has

found that fluency and confidence improves with SS instruction, it would be interesting to research the effect of explicit teaching of SS on test results. This study showed that the teaching of SS improves their usage by learners, but future studies need to test their effect on overall speaking skills using a wider range of tests. The longitudinal aspect of the present research has attempted with a limited group of students, so this would be an area to investigate more fully in future research.

References
Bejarano, Y., Levine, T., Olshtain, E., and Steiner, J. (1997) "The skilled use of interaction strategies: creating a framework for improved small-group communicative interaction in the language classroom". **System**, 25 (2), 203-214

Bialystok, E. (1990) **Communication Strategies**. Oxford, UK: Basil Blackwell

Chen, H. W. (2009). Oral Communication Strategies Used by English Major College Students
in Taiwan. Master thesis, Chaoyang University of Technology, Taichung, Taiwan.

Cohen, L., Manion, L., and Morrison, K. (2011) **Research Methods in Education** (7th ed). London: Routledge Falmer

Dörnyei, Z. (1995) "On the Teachability of Communication Strategies". **TESOL Quarterly**, 29 (1), 55-58

Dörnyei, Z. and Scott, L. (1997) "Communication Strategies in a Second Language: Definition
and Taxonomies". **Language learning Journa**l, 47 (1), 173-210

Dörnyei, Z. (2002) "Communication Strategies in a Second Language: Definitions and Taxonomies". **Language Learning Journal**, 47, (1), 173-210

Ebel, K. M. (1972)."Building Theories from Case Study Research' Academy of Management Review" . *Educational Researcher*. *Vol.14*.No.(4) , pp:352-55.

Færch, C., and Kasper, G. (1983) On Identifying Communication Strategies in Interlanguage Production. In Færch, C and Kasper, G. (eds.), **Strategies in interlanguage communication** (210–238), London: Longman

Gronlund ,N.E. (1971). *Measurement and Evaluation in Teaching* .2nd.ed.New York: MaCmillan Company.

Lam, W.Y.K. (2006) "Gauging the Effects of ESL Oral Communication Strategy Teaching: A Multi-method Approach". **Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching**, 3 (2), 142157.

Lincoln, Y. S., and Guba, E. G. (1985) **Naturalistic inquiry**. Beverly Hills, CA:Sage

Nakatani, Y. (2010) "Identifying Strategies That Facilitate EFL Learners' Oral Communication: A Classroom Study Using Multiple Data Collection Procedures". **The Modern Language Journal**, 94 (1), 116-136

O'Malley, L., and Chamot, A. (1990) **Learning Strategies in Second Language Acquisition**. Cambridge: Cambridge University press.

Palmer, A. S. (1981). Measurements of reliability and validity in two pictures-description tests of oral communication' in A. S. Palmer, P. J. M. Groot, and G. A. **Language Testing Journal**, 4, pp.28-47.

Rubin, J. & Thompson, I.. 1994. **How to Be a More Successful Language Learner**[M]. New York: Heinle & Heinle.

Sally Long and Caring Thaine (2000) **Real listening-speaking with answers**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Savignon, S. J. (1972) Communicative Competence: An Experiment in Foreign-Language Teaching. Philadelphia, PA: The Centre for Curriculum Development

Selinker, L. (1972) Interlanguage. IRAL, 10 209-230

Stanley, J.C., & Hopkins, B.R. (1972). *Educational and Psychological Measurement and Evaluation* . Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Tarone, E. (1980) "Communication s t r a t e g i e s , f o r e i g n e r t a l k a n d r e p a i r in interlanguage". **Language Learning**, 30 (2), 417-431

Tarone, E. (1981) "Some Thoughts on the Notion of Communication Strategy". **TESOL Quarterly**, 15 (3), 285–295

Tarone, E. (2005) "Schools of Fish: English for Access to International Academic and Professional Communities". **The Journal of Asia TEFL**, 2 (1), 1-20.

Wenden, A. (1986). "Helping language learners think about learning". **ELT Journal**, 40, 3-12.

Wood, J.C. (1960). **Theories of Teaching in Language Teaching**. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge.