Adab Al-Rafidayn Journal

A refereed quarterly scientific journal
Issued by the College of Arts - University of Mosul
Supplement
Vol. Eighty-seven / year Fifty- one

Jumada al-awwal - 1443 AH / December 30/12/2021 AD

To communicate:

radab.mosuljournals@gmail.com

URL: https://radab.mosuljournals.com

Adab Al-Rafidayn Journal

Publishing instructions rules

1. A researcher who wants to publish in Adab Al-Rafidayn journal should enter the platform of the journal and register by an official or personal activated email via the following link:

https://radab.mosuljournals.com/contacts?_action=signup

2. After registration, the platform will send to your mail that you registered on the site and a password will be sent for use in entering the journal by writing your email with the password on the following link:

https://radab.mosuljournals.com/contacts?_action=login

3- The platform (the site) will grant the status of the researcher to those who registered to be able in this capacity to submit their research with a set of steps that begin by filling out data related to them and their research and they can view it when downloading their research.

4-File formats for submission to peer review are as follows:

• Fonts: a "standard" type size is as follows: (Title: at 16point / content : at 14point / Margins: at 10 point), and the number of lines per page: (27) lines under the page heading line with the title, writer name, journal name, number and year of publishing, in that the number of pages does not exceed 25 in the latest edition in the journal free of illustrations, maps, tables, translation work, and text verification, and (30) pages for research containing the things referred to.

- Margins are arranged in numbers for each page. The source and reference are defined in the margin glossary at the first mentioned word. List of references is canceled, and only the reference is mentioned in the first mentioning place, in case the source is repeated use (ibid.)

• The research is referred to the test of similarity report to determine the percentage of originality then if it pass the test it is referred to two referees who nominate it for publication after checking its scientific sobriety, and confirming its safety from plagiarism , and if the two experts disagree –it is referred to a

C

third referee for the last peer review and to decide on the acceptance or rejection of the research .

5- The researcher (author) is committed to provide the following information about the research:

 •The research submitted for evaluation to the journal must not include the name of the researcher, i.e. sent without a name.

 •A clear and complete title for the research in Arabic and English should be installed on the body of the research, with a brief title for the research in both languages: Arabic and English.

 •The full address of the researcher must be confirmed in two languages: Arabic and English, indicating: (the scientific department / college or institute / university / country) with the inclusion of an effective email of the researcher.

• The researcher must formulate two scientific abstracts for the research in two languages: Arabic and English, not less than (150) and not more than (250) words.

 •presenting at least three key words that are more likely to be repeated and differentiated in the research.

6-The researcher must observe the following scientific conditions in writing his research, as it is the basis for evaluation, otherwise the referees will hold him responsible. The scientific conditions are shown in the following:

 •There should be a clear definition of the research problem in a special paragraph entitled: (research problem) or (problem of research).

  •The researcher must take into account the formulation of research questions or hypotheses that express the problem of research and work to achieve and solve or scientifically refute it in the body of the research.

• The researcher works to determine the importance of his research and the goals that he seeks to achieve, and to determine the purpose of its application.

 •There must be a clear definition of the limits of the research and its population that the researcher is working on in his research.

•The researcher must consider choosing the correct methodology that is appropriate to the subject of his research, and must also consider the data collection tools that are appropriate for his research and the approach followed in it.

- Consideration should be given to the design of the research, its final output, and the logical sequence of its ideas and paragraphs.

•The researcher should take into consideration the choice of references or sources of information on which the research depends, and choose what is appropriate for his research taking into account the modernity in it, and the accuracy in documenting , quoting form these sources.

•The researcher should consider taking note of the results that the researcher reached, and make sure of their topics and their rate of correlation with research questions or hypotheses that the researcher has put in his research.

7- The researcher should be aware that the judgment on the research will be according to a peer review form that includes the above details, then it will be sent to the referee and on the basis of which the research will be judged and weights will be given to its paragraphs and according to what is decided by those weights the research will be accepted or rejected. Therefore; the researcher must take that into account in preparing his research.

Editor-in-chief

CONTENTS

The Effect of Explicit Strategy Instruction on Developing Iraqi EFL Learners' Oral Fluency and Communication Strategy Use

Omar Muhammed Abdel-Ali Al-Obeidi ∗
Khaled Ibrahim∗

Abstract

This study aims at investigating the effect that the explicit strategy instruction (henceforth ESI) may have on developing the oral fluency and communication strategy use of Iraqi EFL learners. This study is conducted to present a new technique of teaching that focuses on teaching the learners explicitly certain communication strategies (henceforth CSs), by which, learners can have the ability to manipulate the use of language to compensate for their lack of linguistic knowledge and to be able to manage a conversation and deliver their message.

٤٠ Iraqi EFL university students were distributed into two groups: experimental group and controlled group. The experimental group was taught certain CSs following the explicit strategy instruction, whereas the controlled group was taught according to the communicative approach without any focus on CSs. The students were pre- and post-tested to measure their use of CSs and oral fluency development. A stimulated recall interviews were also held soon after the pre- and post-tests to double check the validity of the CSs identification. They were also asked to fill a self-reported questionnaire twice: at the beginning of the study and at the end of it in order to compensate for any shortage and limitation of data provided by the two methods mentioned above. The self-reported questionnaire gives the opportunity to assess a wider range of CSs.

The results showed that the experimental group has significantly developed their use of CSs and this development led to

Master student/Dept. of English Language/College of Education for Human Sciences/University of Mosul.
Lect/Dept. of English Language/College of Education for Human Sciences/University of Mosul.

noticeable improvement in their oral fluency. However, the controlled group did not show a significant improvement neither in their use of the CSs nor in their oral fluency.

Keywords: experimental, controlled, communication strategies, explicit instruction**.**

1. Introduction

It is widely accepted that the ability to communicate in a language is the ultimate aim of any language teaching curriculum, because through communication we can reach out to the whole world. In other words, using English as a foreign language *(Henceforth EFL)* or as a second language in communication is probably the most important, but highly complex task that needs to be taken into account in teaching English. Principally because "we live at a time when the ability to speak English fluently has become a must, especially for those who want to advance in certain fields of human endeavor"(Al-Sibai, 2004, p.3).

Moreover, speaking fluently is one of the targeted skills that most learners of English as a foreign language would like to master and achieve. However, being able to speak fluently in a foreign language is not a task that can be easily managed. It requires developing not only knowledge about why, how, and when to communicate, but also the complex skills for producing and managing interaction (Pawlak, 2015, p. 4).

Furthermore, to develop the use of CSs and the learners' oral fluency, the researcher followed the explicit strategy instruction *(henceforth EI)* in executing his teaching plans. So, in order to communicate in a foreign language and speak it fluently, and because the Iraqi EFL learners are incompetent English language speakers as they cannot express themselves fluently when they communicate with friends (Abu Ghazala, 2006), they must be taught certain CSs that would enable them to manipulate and use the language in a way that would lead them to be more efficient and more fluent in the target language.

It has been proved through studies that native as well as non-native speakers of English often apply and use communication strategies in communicating with others. Thus, the difficulties that learners face

during communicating with others can be overcome by using certain strategies and techniques. Such communication strategies include: appeal for help, approximation, time-gaining, clarification request, self-repair and circumlocution (Ellis 1985; Rabab'ah 2001; Dörnyei & Scott, 1997; Tarone, 2005).

Research has found that CSs can be effectively taught through EI. To achieve the aim of enhancing the students' learning in a foreign or second language, educators and researchers often found that explicit instruction is one of the most effective means to use because it is a planned, orderly, and effective methodology for teaching (Archer & Hughes, 2011). It is called explicit because it involves an approach of teaching that is clear and straightforward. However, the effect of explicit strategy instruction on developing Iraqi EFL learners' oral fluency and strategy use has not been investigated yet.

- **Hypotheses of the Research**
- **H1:** There will be a significant difference between the mean scores of the experimental group and the controlled group in CSs use of the post-test.
- **H2:** There will be a significant difference between the mean scores of the experimental group and the controlled group in oral fluency of the post-test.

2. Definitions of the Critical Terms
2.1   Explicit Instruction
Instruction is explicit when information about rules is presented to learners underlying the input (Ellis, 1994; Norris & Ortega, 2000). EI involves 'some sort of rule being thought about during the learning process' (DeKeyser, 1995). According to (Ellis & Shintani, 2014), the EI focuses on raising the learners' awareness or drawing their attention toward the item or the rule being discussed. Rosenshine (1987) described this form of instruction as "a systematic method of teaching with emphasis on proceeding in small steps, checking student understanding, and achieving active and successful participation by all students" (p. 34).

2.2   Communication Strategies
The concept or the notion of CSs was first presented in a paper entitled "Interlanguage" submitted by Selinker (1972). In his paper,

Selinker claimed that when learners try to deliver the message and communicate with others, and because they have a limited knowledge about the target language, they are forced to use certain CSs to fill in the gap and to have a successful conversation and communication. The term communication indicates a procedure where a speaker passes on a message to the listener. Tarone (1981, p. 288) defines CS as "a mutual attempt of two interlocutors to agree on a meaning in situations where requisite meaning structures do not seem to be shared". CSs help learners achieve their communication in L2 and consequently could develop their oral fluency. Further, Bialystok (1990, p. 35) puts plainly and clearly that the reason behind employing CSs while communicating with others is to "overcome obstacles in communication by providing the speaker with an alternative form of expression for the intended meaning".

Furthermore, researchers often dealt with CSs from two different perspectives or approaches: Psycholinguistic & Interactional. The psycholinguistic or the internal approach conceptualizes CSs as those processes that underlie the learner's performance in a communicative task. These strategies can be operationalized when the speaker is having difficulty to formalize his idea or concept due to shortage in their linguistic resources (Bialystok, 1983; Poulisse, 1993). The interactional or external perspective of CSs on the other hand, defines them as those strategies that require cooperation between both the speaker and the listener. Such strategies may include appeal for help, asking for repetition, clarification request and so on. In fact, these different conceptualizations of CSs are the result of the way CSs have been perceived and investigated. Some scholars perceived and defined CSs following the interactional point of view, and others perceived them following the psycholinguistic or the cognitive point of view. To refer to them in an easier way, Yule and Tarone (1997) proposed two terms for both perspectives, namely: "the pros" referring to the interactional group, and "the cons" referring to the psycholinguistic group.

In addition, CSs have been categorized and classified into various ways by different scholars (Surapa & Channarong, 2011). Actually,

up to this date, researchers have not agreed over the classification of CSs. The current section will carry out information about the classifications of the different types of CSs that are proposed and developed by many researchers in the field of CSs. To begin with, CSs are mainly sorted and classified into two major types, and each one has its own advocates and followers. The first one is advocated by (Tarone, 1977; Faerch and Kasper, 1983), who adopt the traditional approach (or the product-oriented approach). This approach gives prominence to the interactive and external aspects of CSs, whereas the second type (the process-oriented approach), is advocated by (Bialystok, 1990; the Nijmegen group), who are mainly concerned with the internal psychological aspect of CSs. Dornyei (1995) and Dornyei and Scott (1997) expanded the classifications of CSs by further adding new CSs to the already mentioned classifications. The variety in CSs classification proposed by those scholars resulted from their different theatrical viewpoints about what language tools can be considered as CSs. Thus, different researches and studies may not give the same classifications of CSs. (for more details about the classifications/taxonomies of CSs see Tarone, 1977; Bialystok, 1983; Faerch &Kasper, 1983; Dornyei, 1995; Dornyei & Scott, 1997).

Furthermore, this study chooses to adopt certain strategies to be taught and not all of them because not all CSs are worthy to be taught. According to Russell & Loschky (1998), teachers should teach only the second language-based strategies because such strategies will lead learners to develop in that language. It is also affirmed by Rabab'ah (2004) that such strategies "should be encouraged the most, because they most likely lead to successful communications" (p. 156). In addition, Alahmed (2017) concluded that "CSs are teachable, particularly interactional CSs, positive self-solving CSs, and time-gaining CSs" (p. 188). Thus, this study adopts those strategies that are teachable and best serve the aim of this study. Thus, the following table will present the adopted classification of CSs:

Table 1: The adopted classification of CSs

Dimension	The focus of CSs
"Positive Self-solving Strategies"	Approximation
	All-purpose words
	Circumlocution
Interactional Strategies or Meaning Negotiation strategies	Clarification Request
	Appeal for Help
	Confirmation Check
	Asking for Repetition
	Comprehension Check
Time-gaining Strategies	Lexical Time-gaining

2.3   Oral Fluency

Speaking fluently is considered to be one of the most difficult skills to be mastered by the majority of English learners who are still incompetent to communicate orally in English (Zhang, 1995). Generally, fluency is "smooth, rapid, effortless use of language" (Crystal, 1987, p. 427). Fluency is also defined by Skehan (2009) as a "successful performance in task-based contexts...containing the capacity to produce speech at a normal rate and without interruption" (p. 510). Moreover, Derwing & Munro (2009) claimed that fluency "refers to listeners' perceptions of the flow of the speakers' language output, for example, whether there are frequent pauses, false starts, or other dysfluencies" (p. 534).

Further fluency definitions were presented by Baker-Smemoe, Dewey, Bown, & Martinsen (2014) who claimed that "fluency can refer to language that is produced fluently and smoothly as one combines words and sentences in speech" (p. 708). By examining the earlier mentioned definitions of fluency, it is clear that fluency is

a challenging term to define. One can neither reckon on only one definition nor combine them all into one definition. Nevertheless, to provide illustrations and definitions about the elements or the constituents of fluency may help to form a practical definition of fluency that subsequent studies may rely on and use. The following section is devoted to present these constituents of fluency and how they can be used to measure speakers' oral fluency.

Actually, fluency consists of certain elements by which researchers can measure and assess speakers' oral fluency. The upcoming features are adopted by Götz (2013), they are: mean length of run, phonation time ratio, unfilled pauses and speech rate. Another research by Zechner, Williamson, Higgins, & Xi (2009) also suggested the following features as constituents of fluency: articulation rate, number of pauses, duration of pauses, and response duration. Moreover, other researchers concentrated on only one feature of fluency, for instance, the feature of speech rate along with its different types, which were explored by Sato (2014). In her study, Sato discovered that speech rate is the most significant and important feature of oral fluency. In contrast with Sato (2014), Christensen (2012) conducted a study in which he examined a number of fluency features, namely: phonation time, articulation rate, a number of pauses and a number of syllables, speech rate, and average syllable duration. All the previous researches concluded that "fluency ratings are strongly affected by rate of speech, articulation rate, phonation/time ratio, number of silent pauses, total duration of pauses, and mean (the word "mean" here is correct as it is a measure of fluency adopted in this research) length of run" (Cucchiarini et al., 2000, p. 996). These features were found to be the best means for measuring and assessing oral fluency by Cucchiarini, Boves & Strik (2000), Kormos & Dénes (2004), and Polyakov & Tormyshova (2014). Table 2 clarifies the adopted fluency measures in this study.

Omar Muhammed Abdel-Ali Al-Obeidi & Khaled Ibrahim

Table 2: Measures of Oral Fluency

Dimension	Measure	Definition
Holistic	Pruned speech rate	"Total number of syllables minus self-corrections, self-repetitions, false starts, non-lexical filled and pauses divided by total time"
Speed fluency	Speech rate	"Total number of syllables divided by total time"
	Articulation rate	"Total number of syllables divided by phonation time, i.e. total time minus unfilled pauses"
Breakdown fluency	Pauses per minute	"Total number of pauses including filled as well as unfilled pauses, divided by total time"
	Average pause duration	"Total pause duration, including filled as well as unfilled pauses, divided by the total number of pauses, including filled as well as unfilled pauses"
		"Total number of syllables minus filled pauses divided by the number of pauses, including filled as well as unfilled pauses."
Repair fluency	Repairs per minute	"Total number of self-corrections, self-repetitions and false starts divided by phonation time"

3. Methodology

This section is devoted to explain in detail the experimental work and the procedures which have been followed to fulfill the aim of research and answer its questions. As stated in the section chapter, the aim of this research is to investigate the effect of explicit strategy instruction on the learners' use of CSs and developing their oral fluency.

3.1   Research Strategy

The researcher used a mixed-method approach, a mixture or a combination of qualitative and quantitative method for collecting data (Cohen et al., 1998; Kongson, 2009; Lam, 2006). The researcher used interaction activities and a self-reported

questionnaire (quantitative method) and stimulated recall interviews (qualitative method) to test the learners' use of CSs. The motivation for using such an approach was to have data that is accurate and valid. In fact, to use one method (i.e. qualitative or quantitative) often proved to produce a bias and limited data. Using a single method "will inevitably yield biased and limited results", (Greene et al., 1989, p. 256). Thus, adopting an approach that comprises a mixture of both methods to assess the learners' use of CSs is vindicated because in this way, each method will complete and compensate for the limitation of the other.

To assess the learners' actual use of readily identified strategies, direct observation to the performance of learners would be suitable. Nevertheless, some CSs are not easy to identify via direct observation only because the learners' strategic behaviour could contain strategies that are difficult to recognize as they lie beneath the surface of speech production (Chamot, 2005; Gass & Mackey, 2000). In other words, CSs such as asking for repetition, comprehension checks, and appeals for help are detected effortlessly whereas CSs like approximation or circumlocution are difficult to detect. For instance, the language speaker may use the word animal instead of peacock, or machine instead of blender. Therefore, the researcher finds it essential to investigate the learners' underlying thoughts by applying the students to stimulated recall interviews to have a valid and accurate data. However, some CSs cannot be elicited or identified even with the observation activities and stimulated recall interviews, then the data will be jeopardized for not being accurate and valid. Thus, the researcher conducted a self-reported questionnaire in order to compensate for any shortage and limitation of data provided by the two methods mentioned above. The self-reported questionnaire gives the opportunity to assess a wider range of CSs. In addition to that, generalization can be made to the collected data through using the self-reported questionnaire (Lam, 2006; Oxford, 1996).

3.2 The Experimental Design

This research adopts the **"Experimental-Control Group Design: the Pre-test- Post-test Design" (see Cohen et al, 2007: 276 and Mackey and Gass, 2005:148).** Two groups, each consists of 20 students will be randomly selected from The University of Mosul, College of Education, Department of English, second stage. The first group will be the experimental group *(hereafter EG)* which will be taught communication strategies explicitly; the second group will be the control group *(hereafter CG)* which will be taught the same curriculum without referring to CSs. Both groups will be submitted to pre-tests in fluency and strategy use. As far as the CG is concerned, the plans for teaching will be set according to communicative language teaching (without referring to CSs). After teaching the groups for 6 to 8 weeks, a post-test is submitted to check whether the learners have developed their oral fluency or not, and whether they have used the CSs being taught in the past two months. Their scores of the post-test will be compared to see whether there is any significant difference between both groups or not.

Moreover, the researcher conducted two parallel versions of each test (i.e., oral interview and picture-cued story-telling pictures) in order to avoid the effect of familiarity being transferred from the pre-test to the post-test (Haslam & McGarty, 2014; Marsden & Torgerson, 2012). Furthermore, the researcher designed the tests with a difficulty that is slightly above the targeted students' level of proficiency. The reason for doing so is to encourage the learners to use as many CSs as possible while performing the pre-and post-tests.

Table 3.1: The Experimental Design

Group	Pre-test	Treatment	Post-test
EG	Oral fluency and use of CSs.	taught CSs explicitly	Oral fluency and use of CSs.
CG		without teaching CSs explicitly.	

3.3 The Sample of the Research

The population of the study covers second stage students in the University of Mosul, College of Education; Department of English of the academic year 2019-2020. The total number is 40 (Male and female students) students, divided equivalently (according to their scores in conversation in the final exam) into two groups, EG and CG. The participants are distributed equally according to their achievement scores in Conversation. The number of students in each group is 20.

3.4 Training Material

The training material for EG and CG will be based on the Communicative Language Teaching Approach. Hence, communicative interactive activities are prepared and presented to the students to practice the use of the targeted communication strategies, and ultimately to develop the learners' oral fluency. The researcher used activities invented by himself, and he also added other communicative activities to them consulting (Klippel, 1991) book to best serve the research aim. The training materials were presented and taught to the participants by a professional Ph.D. lecturer in the Department of English.

3.4.1 Elicitation Activities

Two oral tests are used in this study to assess the participants' use of communication strategies and to measure their oral fluency. The tests are picture-cued story-telling and oral interview. The rationale for using two types of oral tests is that the type of activity "may bias the learner to select particular strategies" (Bialystok & Frohlich, 1980, p. 5). For instance, circumlocution, use of all-purpose words, and approximation are considered as self-solving strategies and might probably be used in picture description test. In contrast, confirmation checks, comprehension checks, appeal for help and asking for repetition are interactive strategies, and could be elicited through the interaction with the interlocutor (i.e. interviewer).

3.4.2 A Self-reported Questionnaire

In this study, the researcher developed a strategy use questionnaire that is based on Alahmed's (2017) questionnaire to measure the learners' use of communication strategies. The questionnaire consists of **(27)** statements. The statements cover different

communication strategies that EFL learners might use to help overcome their communication difficulties in conversation. Moreover, the questionnaire comprises (27) items, which fall into three major categories with sub-categories. The main categories are: meaning negotiation strategies or interactional strategies which include: clarification requests, comprehension checks, confirmation checks, asking for repetition, and appeal for help; positive self-solving strategies which include: circumlocution, approximation, and use of all-purpose words; and time-gaining strategies which include only the lexical time-gaining strategy.

3.5   Procedure of Oral Fluency Analysis

The speech analysis software PRAAT (Boersma and Weenink, 2017) is used in analyzing and calculating some of the measures, namely: speech rate, holistic, and mean length of run. While the other measures (breakdown and repair fluency), they were measured manually because they require personal identification. It is worth mentioning that for the purpose of ensuring the validity and reliability of the results, the researcher asked for the help of another professional English teacher to double check the results and avoid any bias. After recording the speech of the participants in the pre-test, the researcher analyzed the recordings of each participant applying the measures mentioned in Table: 2. The results of the pre-test are shown in frequencies and will be compared to those of the post-test to check whether the learners' oral fluency have developed or not. For instance, if the frequencies (scores) of the first scale (i.e. holistic measure) have risen in the post-test, this means that the learners have improved and vice versa. The same principle can be applied to the measures of 'speed fluency', that is the higher frequencies (scores) in post-test the better the results are. To the contrary, if the frequencies in the post-test are lower than those in the pre-test the better the result. This principle includes the measures of 'breakdown fluency' and 'repair fluency'.

4. The Findings

The results shown below will be compared to the hypotheses of the research. Starting with the first hypothesis:

- **H1: There will be a significant difference between the mean scores of the experimental group and the controlled group in CSs use of the post-test**.
  - **Table 4.1: The Mean, Standard Deviation, T-Test Value of both**
- **groups in CSs use**

Group	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	t _ test		Sig.
				t Cal.	t Tab.	
Exp.	20	4.6000	2.74149	5.504	2.025 (0.05)(38)	Exp.
Con.	20	0.5500	1.82021			

Now, after checking the results of both groups, the researcher compared the results of both groups to check whether there is a significant difference or not. The mean scores obtained by the learners of both groups on the post-test indicate a significant difference between them favouring the experimental group. The mean score in CSs use of the experimental group in the post-test is found to be 4.6000, whereas the mean score of controlled group is found to be 0.5500. The T-test formula for paired samples is used to show if there is any significant difference between the scores of the experimental group and the controlled group. The T-test value is found to be 5.504 at 0.05 level of significance, under 38, the degree of freedom, which indicates that there is a statistical significant difference between the two test scores. This means that the learners in the experimental group have developed their use of CSs better than those of the controlled group.

- **H2: There will be a significant difference between the mean scores of the experimental group and the controlled group in the oral fluency of the post-test.**

From the first look on the results of both groups, it is quite evident that this hypothesis is true because the mean scores obtained by the learners of both groups on the post-tests indicate a significant difference between them favouring the experimental group in all the measures of oral fluency. However, a thorough explanation will be presented about each measure of fluency along with a table that shows the scores of both groups.

Table 4.2: The Mean, Standard Deviation, T-Test Value of the post-tests of both groups in oral fluency

Item	Group	N	X	S	T _ value		Sig.
					t. cal.	t. tab.	
Pruned Speech Rate	Exp.	20	0.3075	0.23142	2.378	2.025 (0.05)(38)	Exp.
	Con.	20	0.1140	0.28089			
Speech Rate	Exp.	20	0.3310	0.30950	2.938	2.025 (0.05)(38)	Exp.
	Con.	20	0.0845	0.21217			
Articu. Rate	Exp.	20	0.3795	0.28367	2.129	2.025 (0.05)(38)	Exp.
	Con.	20	0.1465	0.39896			
Pauses Per Minute	Exp.	20	0.0365	0.03117	2.213	2.025 (0.05)(38)	Exp.
	Con.	20	0.0075	0.04962			
Pause Duration	Exp.	20	0.4525	0.38520	2.048	2.025 (0.05)(38)	Exp.
	Con.	20	0.1535	0.52724			
Mean Length of Run	Exp.	20	7.9520	9.78484	2.108	2.025 (0.05)(38)	Exp.
	Con.	20	1.4425	9.74088			
Repair per Minute	Exp.	20	0.0905	0.16618	2.124	2.025 (0.05)(38)	Exp.
	Con.	20	0.0040	0.07458			

The results in Table 4.2 indicate the following:
1. **Pruned speech rate**: the difference mean scores obtained from the post-tests are 0.3075 for the EG; and 0.0845 for the CG. "T-test value is found to be 2.378 at 0.05 level of significance, under 38, the degree of freedom, which indicates that there is a statistically significant difference between the scores of the two groups favouring the EG."

2. **Speech rate:** the difference mean scores obtained from the post-tests are 0.3310 for the EG; and 0.1140 for the CG. "T-test value is found to be 2.938 at 0.05 level of significance, under 38, the degree of freedom, which indicates that there is a statistically significant difference between the scores of the two groups favouring the EG.""

3. **Articulation rate:** the difference mean scores obtained from the post-tests are 0.3795 for the EG; and 0.1465 for the CG. "T-test value is found to be 2.129 at 0.05 level of significance, under 38, the degree of freedom, which indicates that there is a statistically significant difference between the scores of the two groups favouring the EG.""

4. **Pauses per minute:** the difference mean scores obtained from the post-tests are 0.0365 for the EG; and 0.0075 for the CG. "T-test value is found to be 2.213 at 0.05 level of significance, under 38, the degree of freedom, which indicates that there is a statistically significant difference between the scores of the two groups favouring the EG."

5. **Pause duration:** the difference mean scores obtained from the post-tests are 0.4525 for the EG; and 0.1535 for the CG. "T-test value is found to be 2.048 at 0.05 level of significance, under 38, the degree of freedom, which indicates that there is a statistically significant difference between the scores of the two groups favouring the EG.""

6. **Mean length of run:** the difference mean scores obtained from the post-tests are 7.9520 for the EG; and 1.4425 for the CG. "T-test value is found to be 2.108 at 0.05 level of significance, under 38, the degree of freedom, which indicates that there is a statistically significant difference between the scores of the two groups favouring the EG.""

7. **Repair per minute:** the difference mean scores obtained from the post-tests are 0.0905 for the EG; and 0.0040 for the CG. "T-test value is found to be 2.124 at 0.05 level of significance, under 38, the degree of freedom, which indicates that there is a statistically significant difference between the scores of the two groups favouring the EG."

The results of this study are similar and in accordance to those of (Alahmed, 2017; Dornyei 1995; Kong, 2004; Maleki, 2007; Nakatani, 2005; Tian and Zhang 2005; Wang Jin-an, 2008), which confirmed that teaching CSs explicitly leads to an increase in using them and consequently will lead to an improvement in the learners' oral fluency. This improvement is due to the raising of awareness on the learners' part about the use of CSs and their role in evolving and enhancing their oral communicative skill. The results also showed that students liked and had a positive attitude toward learning the use of CSs and gained more confidence in oral communication and eventually became more efficient in English spoken tasks. This study also confirms that CSs are in fact teachable. Learners can be taught explicitly (as the results of this study confirm) certain CSs when raising learners' awareness toward them. "Making learners conscious about the range of L2 communication strategies at their disposal explicitly can aid language learning (Grenfell & Harris, 1999) so that they are able to develop more effective strategic behavior (Cohen & Macaro, 2007)."

5. Conclusion
In the light of the findings of the current research, it can be concluded that:
1. The explicit strategy instruction has proved to be an efficient and successful method of teaching for developing the oral fluency of Iraqi EFL learners.
2. It has also been proved that explicit strategy instruction is a successful method for developing the Iraqi EFL learners' use of CSs.
3. It has been proved that the proper use of CSs leads to improvements in oral fluency. CSs are great tools for the EFL speakers that can aid them when facing communication difficulties. They provide alternative ways for delivering the same message.
4. It has also been proved that CSs are teachable through the explicit strategy instruction.

References:

1. Abu Ghazala, I. (2006). The effect of using a comprehensive approach for teaching high frequency words on developing the writing skills of seventh graders in Gaza. Islamic University of Gaza, Gaza.

2. Alahmed, Kh. I. (2017). Developing Strategic Competence through Task-Based Language Teaching: A Comparison of Implicit and Explicit Instruction. University of York.

3. Al-Sibai, D.(2004). Promoting oral fluency of second language learners: Educational linguistics. Department of English. King Saud University. , p.3

4. Archer, A., & Hughes, C. (2011). Explicit Instruction: Effective and Efficient Teaching. NY: Guilford Publications.

5. Baker, W., et al, (2014). Does Measuring L2 Utterance Fluency Equal Measuring Overall L2 Proficiency? Evidence From Five Languages. 4, 707-728.

6. Bialystok, E. & Frohlich, M. (1980). Oral Communication Strategies for Lexical Difficulties. 5(1), pp. 3-30

7. Bialystok, E. (1983). Some factors in the selection and implementation of communication strategies. In C. Farch & G. Kasper (Eds.), Strategies in interlanguage communication (pp. 100-118). New York: Longman Group Limited.

8. Bialystok, E. (1990). Communication strategies. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

9. Chamot, A. (2005). Language learning strategy instruction: current issues and research. Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 25, 112–130.

10. Christensen, Carl (2012). Fluency features and elicited imitation as oral proficiency measurement. Brigham Young University-Provo, 2012.

11. Cohen, A. D., Macaro, E. (2007). Language Learning Strategies: thirty years of research and practice. Oxford;. Oxford University Press.

12. Cohen, A. D., Weaver, S. J., & Li, T.-Y. (1998). The impact of strategies-based instruction on speaking a foreign language. In A. D. Cohen (Ed.), Strategies in learning and using a second language (pp. 107-156). England: Addison Wesley.

13. Cucchiarini, Catia, Helmer Strik, and Lou Boves. (2000). Quantitative assessment of second language learners' fluency by means of automatic speech recognition technology. Journal of the Acoustical Society of America 107. 989–999.

14. DeKeyser, R. (1995). Learning second language grammar rules: An experiment with a miniature linguistic system. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 17*(3), 379-410.

15. Dekeyser, R. (2008). Implicit and explicit learning. The handbook of second language acquisition. John Wiley & Sons.

16. Derwing, TM, Munro, MJ, Thomson, RI and Rossiter, MJ (2009). The relationship between L1 fluency and L2 fluency development. Studies in Second Language Acquisition. P.534

17. Dörnyei, Z. & Scott, M. L. (1997). Communication strategies in a second language: Definitions and taxonomies. *Language learning, 47*(1), 173-210.

18. Dörnyei, Z. (1995). On the teachability of communication strategies. TESOL Quarterly, 29(1), 55-58. Doi: 10. 2307/3587805.

19. Ellis, R. (1985). *Understanding second language acquisition*: Oxford: Oxford University Press.

20. Ellis, R. (1994). *The study of second language acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

21. Ellis, R., Shintani, N. (2014). *Exploring Language Pedagogy through second language acquisition research.* New York, NY: Routledge.

22. Færch, C. & Kasper, G. (1983). Strategies in interlanguage communication. New York: Longman.

23. Fillmore, Charles. (1979). On fluency. In Charles Fillmore, Daniel Kempler & William Wang (eds.), Individual differences in language ability and language behavior, 85–102. New York: Academic Press.

24. Gass, S., Mackey, A., & Feldman, L. (2005). Task-based interactions in classroom and laboratory settings. Language Learning, 55(4), 148–312.

25. Gotz, S. (2013). Fluency in Native and Nonnative English Speech. John Benjamins Publishing Company. Amsterdam: Philadelphia.

26. Greene, J., Caracelli, V., & Graham, W. (1989). Toward a conceptual framework for mixed-method evaluation designs. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 11(3), 255-274.

27. Grenfell, M., & Harris, V., (1999). Modern Languages and Learning Strategies: In theory and practice. London: Routledge.

28. Haslam, S. & McGarty, C. (2014). Research methods and statistics in psychology. Los Angeles: SAGE

29. Klippel, F., (1991). Keep Talking: Communicative fluency activities for language teaching. Cambridge University Press. New York: Port Chester.

30. Kongson, T. (2009). The effects of teaching communication strategies to Thai learners in English. Doctoral dissertation. University of Southampton. Southampton, UK.

31. Kormos, J., & Denes, M. (2004). Exploring measures and perceptions of fluency in the speech of second language learners. System, 32, 145–164. doi:10.1016/j.system.2004.01.001

32. Lam, W. (2006). Gauging the effects of ESL oral communication strategy teaching: A multi-method approach. Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching, 3(2), 142-157.

33. Marsden, E. & Torgerson, C. (2012). Single group, pre- and post-test research designs: Some methodological concerns. Oxford Review of Education, 38(5), 583–616.

34. Norris, J. & Ortega, L. (2000). Effectiveness of L2 instruction: A research synthesis and quantitative meta-analysis. *Language Learning, 50*(3), 417-528.

35. Oxford, R. L. (1996). Employing a questionnaire to assess the use of language learning strategies. 7(1), 28.

36. Pawlak, M. (2015). Advanced learners' use of communication strategies in spontaneous language performance. In M. Pawlak and E. Waniek-Klimczak (Eds.), *Issues in teaching, learning and testing speaking in a second language* (pp. 121-142). Berlin, Germany: Springer-Verlag.

37.   Poulisse, N. (1993). A theoretical account of lexical communication strategies. In R. Schreuder & B. Weltens (Eds.), The bilingual lexicon (pp. 157–89). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
38.   Rabab'ah, G. (2001). *An investigation into the strategic competence of Arab learners of English at Jordanian Universities.* Doctoral dissertation, University of Newcastle. Newcastle, UK.
39.   Rabab'ah, G. (2004). Strategic competence in an ELT syllabus. I.T.L Review of Applied Linguistics, 145-165.
40.   Rosenshine, B. (1987). Explicit Teaching and teacher training. Journal of teacher education, 38(3), 34-36.
41.   Russell, G. & Loschky, L. (1998). The need to teach communication strategies in the foreign language classroom. JALT Journal, 20(1), 100-114.
42.   Sato, K., et al, (2014). A study on the effect of speech rate on perception of spoken easy Japanese using speech synthesis. International Conference on Audio, Language Image Processing, 476-479, 2014.
43.   Selinker, L. (1972). Interlanguage. IRAL. 10: 209-231.
44.   Skehan, P. (2009). Modelling second language performance: Integrating complexity, accuracy, fluency, and lexis. Applied Linguistics, 30(4), 510-532.
45.   Surapa, S. & Channarong, I. (2011). Strategies with coping face to face oral communication problems employed by Thai university students majoring in English. GEMA Online Journal of Language Studies. 11(3), 83-96
46.   Tarone, E. (1977). Conscious communication strategies in interlanguage: A progress report. TESOL, 77, 194-203.
47.   Tarone, E. (1981). Some thoughts on the notion of communication strategy. TESOL quarterly, 15(3), 285-295.
48.   Tarone, E. (2005). Speaking in a second language. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 285-502). Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
49.   Yule, G. & Tarone, E. (1997). Investigating communication strategies in L2 reference: Pros and cons. W: G. Kasper, E.

Kellerman (red.), Communication strategies: Psycholinguistic and Sociolinguistic Perspectives. London: Longman.
50.   Zhang,H., Alex, H.,& Kortner, N. (1995).Oral language development across the curriculum,K12.ERIC Digest. ERIC Clearinghouse on Reading English and Communication, Bloomington, IN. ED389029.
.

تأثير الدراسة الظاهرية فى تطوير البلاغة اللفظيَّة واستخدام استراتيجيات التواصل لدى متعلمين اللغة الإنكليزية العراقيين بوصفها لغة أجنبية

عمر محمد عبد العالي* وخالد إبراهيم*

المستخلص:

إنَّ الهدف من البحث هو التحقق من أثر استخدام طريقة التدريس الظاهرية في تطوير البلاغة اللفظية، واستخدام استراتيجيات التواصل لدى المتعلمين العراقيين للغة الإنكليزية بوصفها لغة أجنبية، وقد اقترحت الدراسة التي من خلالها سيتم تقديم أُسلوب تدريس جديد يهدف لتدريس الطلبة وبطريقة ظاهرية بعض استراتيجيات التواصل الَّتي من خلالها سيمتلك الطالب القدرة على التلاعب بكيفية استخدام اللغة لتعويض النقص في المعرفة اللغوية لديه، وبهذا سيكون قادرًا على إدارة نقاش وإيصال رسالته للآخرين.

واختيار ٤٠ طالبًا عراقيًا ممَّن يتعلَّمون اللغة الإنكليزية (بوصفها لغة أجنبية) من جامعة الموصل كلية التربية للعلوم الإنسانية قسم اللغة الإنكليزية، وتم توزيعهم على مجموعتين: (مجموعة تجريبية، ومجموعة ضابطة)، (نعم المقصود هنا هو كلمة controlled) . تم تدريس المجموعة التجريبية بعض استراتيجيات التواصل باتباع طريقة التلقين الظاهري، بينما تم تدريس المجموعة الضابطة باتباع الطريقة التواصلية ومن دون اي تركيز او ذكر لاستراتيجيات التواصل. تم اختبار الطلاب قبليًا وبعديًا؛ وذلك لقياس مدى تطور استخدام استراتيجيات التواصل والبلاغة اللفظية لديهم، وحصلت مقابلات

طالب ماجستير/قسم اللغة الإنكليزية/كلية التربية للعلوم الإنسانية/جامعة الموصل.
مدرس/قسم اللغة الإنكليزية/كلية التربية للعلوم الإنسانية/جامعة الموصل.

استرجاعية مباشرة بعد كل امتحان لنسبة ٢٥% من الطلبة وذلك للتحقق ولضمان مصداقية استراتيجيات التواصل التي تم التعرف عليها خلال الاختبارات، وأكمل الطلاب ملء الاستبانة مرتين: مرة بعد الامتحان القبلي، وأُخرى بعد الامتحان البعدي وذلك لتعويض أي نقص محتمل في البيانات التي ستقدمها الطرائق المذكورة آنفًا، وفي الحقيقة إنَّ الاستبانة ستتيح الفرصة لتقييم مدى أوسع من استراتيجيات التواصل.

وأظهرت النتائج بشكل جليٍّ أنَّ المجموعة التجريبية قد طوَّرت استخدامها لاستراتيجيات التواصل، وهذا التطوّر قد انعكس وبشكل ملحوظ في تطوير البلاغة اللفظية لديهم، أمَّا بالنسبة للمجموعة الضابطة فالنتائج جاءت بصورة مغايرة؛ إذ إنَّ هذه المجموعة لم تظهر أي تطور ملحوظ لا في استراتيجيات التواصل ولا في البلاغة اللفظية لدى طلابها.

الكلمات المفتاحية: تجريبية، ضابطة، استراتيجيات التواصل، تدريس ظاهرية.