

# **The Effect of Awareness-Raising Training in CSs on Students' Writing Performance(\*)**

**Supervisors:**

**Prof. Salwa Kamel  
Prof. Amani Badawy**

**Asma A. Salem,**

Department of English, Taiz University

## ***Abstract***

This study examined the effect of communication strategy (CS) training on subjects' writing performance during a period of seven-week extensive English course, as part of the *Interchange* Series, at the Language & Translation Center. The study targeted 89 intermediate Egyptian English foreign language (EFL) learners. The experimental group (n = 51) received the regular English course plus an extra eight-hour training on the use of two communication strategies (CSs), namely approximation and circumlocution. On the other hand, the control group (n = 38) received only the regular English course. The effects of the training were assessed by a pretest and a posttest to measure subjects writing performance in four different tasks. During the treatment, the experimental group was trained to use CSs, namely approximation and circumlocution to describe, explain or define pictures, objects and define abstract nouns whether they possess the correct lexical name of the target items or not. The objective of the training of such strategies is to give the participants tools to use when their lexical repertoire is insufficient to reserve the communicative goal. The findings showed that there were no statistically significant differences in the pretest in both groups writing performance. On the contrary, in the posttest, the experimental group outperformed the control group. The training program affected the experimental group in becoming aware of when and how to use CSs, to be more risk takers and use these strategies as a remedy to their limited linguistic resources to overcome their lexical difficulties during writing tasks.

---

(\*) The Effect of Awareness-Raising Training in CSs on Students' Writing Performance, Vol. 9, 2020 Issue No.(31,32,33,34).

### **Keywords**

Communication Strategies, Raising awareness, Vocabulary repertoire, Message conveyance

### **المخلص**

يلجأ دارسو اللغة الإنجليزية - كلغة أجنبية- إلى استخدام استراتيجيات التنحي أو الاختصار بشكل كبير عندما يواجهون صعوبات لغوية سواء في الأداء الشفهي أو الكتابي. لذلك من الأهمية أن يتم تدريب الطلاب على استخدام استراتيجيات التعويض حتى يتمكنوا من مواجهة الصعوبات اللغوية بالذات في المفردات الصعبة أو الجديدة بالنسبة لهم؛ وبذلك يصبحون أكثر قدرة على مواجهة أي صعوبات مستقبلية؛ مما يؤدي إلى تحسين أدائهم ومن ثم اكتسابهم اللغة بشكل أفضل عن طريق التفاوض وتوصيل المعلومة إلى المتحدث أو القارئ بشكل واضح وصحيح. لذلك هدفت في هذه الدراسة إلى توعية وتدريب طلاب اللغة الإنجليزية - في مركز اللغات والترجمة جامعة القاهرة- من ذوي الكفاءة المتوسطة على استخدام استراتيجيات التعويض (استراتيجيات الالتفاف والتقريب) على مهارة الكتابة. أعددت مجموعتين لهذه الدراسة؛ المجموعة الأولى هي المجموعة الضابطة (عدد الطلبة ٣٨) والأخرى هي المجموعة التجريبية (٥١ عدد الطلبة). أولاً أعطيت المجموعتين (الضابطة والتجريبية) اختباراً قبل التدريب لمعرفة مدى قدرتهم على توصيل المعلومات الصحيحة أثناء الكتابة. وثانياً أعطيت الطلاب (المجموعة التجريبية) أنشطة وتدريباً في استخدام استراتيجيات التعويض وبالذات استراتيجية التقريب والالتفاف أثناء الكتابة. وأخيراً وبعد انتهاء برنامج التدريب خضع طلاب المجموعتين الضابطة والتجريبية لامتحان بعدي لمعرفة تأثير برنامج التدريب على استخدام استراتيجيات التعويض في مقابل استراتيجية التجنب على مهارة الكتابة. أتت النتيجة مؤيدة لفرضية سؤال البحث؛ حيث إن أداء المجموعتين في الاختبار القبلي لم يكن دالاً إحصائياً حيث لم توجد فروق تذكر بينهما. أما بالمقارنة بين الاختبار البعدي فقد كان أداء المجموعة التجريبية عالياً ودالاً إحصائياً كتأثير مباشر للبرنامج.

### **الكلمات الدالة**

زياده الوعي - مخزون المفردات - نقل الرسالة - استراتيجيات التواصل

## **Introduction and Review of Literature**

When foreign language (FL) learners attempt to convey information they encounter linguistic problems, for instance, unfamiliarity with a vocabulary or grammatical structure. Thus, a gap is created between what they want to say and their immediate available linguistic repertoire. However, there are techniques that help learners deal with these communication problems in order to convey the intended meaning and at the same time help in solving future communicative problems. These techniques are known as Communication Strategies.

Communication strategies can be defined as the techniques one uses when facing problems in the process of achieving a communicative goal. No individual's linguistic repertoire or mastery of a given language is perfect and even native speakers when attempting to communicate their meaning would sometimes find themselves struggling to find the appropriate expression or grammatical construction. CSs are the means by which a speaker fills this gap between what is intended and the immediate available linguistic resources.

The term *communication strategies* was first coined by Selinker (1972) in his articles *Interlanguage*. Savignon (1972) refers to CSs as "coping strategies" and emphasizes their importance in the use of the TL. The two studies provided the background for the subsequent studies on CSs. Varadi (1973) conducted a small-scale study on a group of Hungarian learners of English where their use of CSs was examined when they had a gap in their interlanguage repertoire. This study was considered the first systematic analysis of SL learners' strategic behavior. Tarone, Cohen and Dumas (1983) developed the concept of CS and provided a framework for CS terminology and definition. Corder (1983) defined communication strategies as being systematic techniques that a speaker employs to express his/her meaning when faced with some difficulty. Subsequently, the framework and terminology of CSs provided by Tarone, et al, (1983) have

been used as a starting point for later research on CSs.

Due to the communicative competence framework of Canale and Swain in the 1980s, the role of CSs was widely spread in the field of second language learning. One of the communicative competences is strategic competence. This competence involved the ability to use problem-solving devices to overcome communication problems that arose from the imperfect linguistic knowledge of the TL. These problem-solving devices or “strategic competence” are also referred to as communication strategies. Canale and Swain (1980) even suggested teaching CSs in classrooms. Many researchers, in the 1980s, attempted to define, identify and classify CSs. They discussed the factors that influenced SL learners’ use of CSs and the issue of teaching CSs in second language classrooms proposing various taxonomies of CSs in their research.

Communication strategies are divided into two types: reduction and achievement strategies. Firstly, reduction strategies are subdivided into avoidance and message abandonment. In the present study, the subjects were discouraged to use reduction strategies because it only leads to communication breakdown when the students leave the task unanswered. Secondly, achievement strategies are also subdivided into two types: L1-based strategies and IL-based strategies. Again, students were discouraged to use L1-based strategies such as code-switching and literal translation because such strategies depend on the students’ first language, Arabic in this case, and when using them they stop using the target language, English. The main purpose of the communication strategy training in the present study is to help students expand the use of their existing linguistic knowledge when facing a communication problem. This can be achieved when students are trained to use the IL-based strategies especially approximation and most importantly circumlocution to describe the unknown words.

In the 1990s, many researchers started investigating the relationship

between different proficiency levels and the use of CSs (e.g., Yule & Tarone, 1990; Chen, 1990; Marrie & Netten, 1991; Badawy, 1998) and the teachability issue of CSs (e.g., Dörnyei & Thurrell, 1991; Dörnyei, 1995; Widger, 2000; Nakatani, 2005; Maleki, 2007; Dong & Fang-peng, 2010; Ahmed & Pawar, 2018).

### **The Teachability of CSs**

The issue of teaching CSs has been controversial over the past decades. Researchers continue to suggest that further studies should be done with a view to investigating the teachability of CSs. As early as the 80s the research on CSs began and still continues until the present time. Faerch & Kasper (1983) argue that the question of whether to teach CSs depends on the purpose of teaching. L2 learners already have implicit knowledge of CSs and they do apply them in both their L1 and L2. Thus, the question is, if the teaching is merely for passing information only, then it is unnecessary to teach CSs to L2 learners. On the other hand, if teaching CSs to L2 learners in order to make them conscious about aspects of their already existing strategies then it is necessary to teach them about strategies, and most importantly how to use them appropriately. This way, learners will be able to bridge the gap between pedagogical and non-pedagogical communicative situations.

Willems (1987) argues that “our first task is to train [learners] ‘not for perfection but for communication,’ (p.361). He also discusses two important aspects of CS training or teaching. First, learners use CSs in their L1 automatically and are not always aware of their preference or limitations and thus it is necessary to spend some time in training them on CSs use. Second, more time should be devoted to practicing CS use with the aim of raising conscious awareness of a variety of possible CSs.

Dörnyei & Thurrell (1991) assume that CS training can lead to the development of students’ competence and classroom activities and tasks can

facilitate and develop their abilities in language performance. It seems as though communication strategy training would develop students' language use and learning.

Manchon (2000) states that L2 learners should be aware that they do not always have to use the exact word in order to be communicatively effective, and that there are alternative means to convey their meaning in order not to give up the communication partially or totally. These alternative means could lead to the expansion of learners' linguistic resources which is another reason to "foster the learners' strategic competence" (p. 21).

### **Research on CS Training**

Savignon (1972) trained students in CSs (or, as she termed them, coping strategies) in a language teaching experiment. However, far less attention has been paid to the question of the teachability of CSs in FL/SL classrooms. In the 1980s and as a result of the growing interest in studying CSs, the discussion of these strategies' teachability was the focus of several papers. The body of work to date suggests a possible relationship between strategy use and second language learning success. It also provides some evidence that learners can be helped to use strategies more effectively if they have the opportunity to practice them in the classrooms. Accordingly, the area has received the attention of many applied linguists and researchers especially within the general framework of second language acquisition.

In the early years of research on the teachability of CSs, Tarone et al (1983) suggested that students should be provided with communicative exercises which address their ability to convey successful information and elevate their ability to use CSs when the process of conveying information encounters a problem. In the same year, Savignon designed a research project to assess the effectiveness of CS training in communicative skills as part of the second language (SL) courses. Since then, few studies have continued to investigate this effectiveness in SL classrooms.

Widger (2000) at the AUC in Egypt focused on teaching CSs for oral production. She investigated the usefulness and effectiveness of CS instruction in building the students' communicative competence. The experimental group (11 participants) and control group (12 participants) were intermediate and upper intermediate level students of English. Eight activities were used in explicit instruction for a period of two-to-three weeks. In the pretest and the posttest, Widger used two task types. In the first task, she provided the subjects with abstract nouns along with their Arabic translation. In the second task, pictures of concrete objects were provided to the learners along with their identifications in English. Learners were asked not to use the exact words that have been given to them instead, they were asked to use CSs in their description. The results indicated that the only improvement was in the use of less avoidance strategies and more time-gaining strategies after the treatment. Nevertheless, there was no improvement in the use of achievement strategies. The author concluded that "it is possible that the effect of the instruction will be more dramatic with a more substantial period of training" (Widger, 2000, p. 60).

Nakatani (2005) investigated the relationship between awareness-raising training of oral CS use and EFL learners' oral proficiency. Sixty-two female students were divided into two groups; 28 students received training on CS use and 34 students served as the control group for a period of 12 weeks. Different tasks were used for the pretest and the posttest to avoid improvement of scores through familiarizing with the test content and the two tests were examined in a pilot study where no differences were found. The interaction was recorded on videotape. The findings revealed that the experimental group's oral proficiency test scores improved significantly. The retrospective data analysis confirmed that participants' success was due to the general awareness-raising of oral CSs and the use of specific oral CSs (for examples negotiation of meaning with an interlocutor and using pauses and filler).

Maleki (2007) conducted a study in Iran on two 30-members' groups, one serving as the experimental group and the other as the control group. The subjects were students majoring in different fields of humanities, social and basic sciences. The CS training program took four months as the experimental group was trained in six strategies: approximation, circumlocution, word coinage, appeal for assistance, foreignizing and time-stalling devices. The results showed that the experimental group's scores on the oral and written tests and achievement tests were generally higher than those of the control group. CS training is supported by the results and the researcher argues that teaching CSs is pedagogically effective and that such training enables FL students to become better learners because it encourages independence which accordingly leads to "learning, achievement and accomplishment" (Maleki, 2007, p. 592). The author also confirms that lack of strategies in teaching materials would result in ineffective use of language.

Dong & Fang-peng (2010) conducted a survey of Chinese learners' CSs where they used a questionnaire on CSs for 89 Chinese students of English at Shandong Jiaotong University. The objective of the survey was to examine learners' differences in attitudes toward CSs and investigate the frequency of Chinese use of CSs in English. A questionnaire was used in surveying the subjects' attitude and frequency of using CSs in English. A second tool for gathering data was an in-depth interview with ten students. The interview focused on students' responses in the questionnaire regarding their attitude toward different CSs and the frequency of using them. The researchers concluded that CSs have an impact on students' second language acquisition (SLA) and listed some factors that affect the use of CSs among learners such as language proficiency, personality and task type. Communication strategies are important because they "encourage risk-taking and individual initiative and this is certainly a step toward linguistic and cognitive autonomy" (Dong & Fang-peng, 2010: 73).

Almost all the studies that investigate the teachability of CSs in the literature agree on the positive effect and importance of circumlocution and approximation because of their usefulness in the expansion of the use of the TL by FL learners. Therefore, in the present study, approximation and circumlocution were the two communication strategies selected for training subjects to define/ identify or explain any unfamiliar vocabulary item they encounter in writing tasks. The purpose of the present study is to investigate whether training Egyptian EFL learners in using specific CSs, such as approximation and circumlocution, would affect their writing performance.

## **Method**

### **Research Design**

The present study is a quasi-experimental design that investigated how intermediate learners of English changed their strategic behavior in written tasks after the CS training program. These changes were related to participants' improvement in writing performance after the CS training program. The research question is:

1. What is the effect of the awareness-raising training on specific CSs on learners' message conveyance in their writing performance?

### **Participants**

In order to explore the impact of CS training on students' message conveyance in the writing skill performance, there were two groups in the study: an experimental group which received CS training and a control group which did not receive any treatment. For the purpose of the present study, the subjects were all intermediate level students enrolled at the Center of Translation and Languages, Cairo University. All students had to undergo a placement test before being enrolled in their classes in order to assign them to their proficiency levels. A sample of six classes was divided into two groups, three of which served as the experimental group (51

students) and the other three served as the control group (38 students). All subjects were native speakers of Arabic and ranged in age between 18-30 years in both groups. All of the subjects had never been or studied abroad. Some of the subjects were students majoring in different fields such as English Language and Literature, Tourism, Commerce, Law and Archaeology and the others were graduates of the same fields.

### Instruments and Procedures

Participants were offered explicit instruction involving defining and naming strategies they used in written tasks to evaluate their choice of strategies and their appropriateness in each task. The strategy training consisted of four phases: *introduce CSs, provide examples to identify CSs, practice the use of CSs, review participants' use of CSs*. In the introduction phase, participants were provided with the list of CSs for explanation and discussion as a warm-up for the new task. Participants then were provided with examples, written on the board, of strategy use and their appropriateness and usefulness. In the practice phase, participants were provided with sheets/photocopies with a variety of tasks to stimulate their usage of approximation and circumlocution. During this stage, participants were asked to discuss their choice of CSs by writing examples from their work on the board for evaluation of the usefulness and appropriateness of their strategic behavior. Participants were asked to use CSs intentionally during each task.

For the purpose of the present study, subjects were encouraged to take risk and use specific CSs and manipulate their available linguistic knowledge without fear of making mistakes. To do so, subjects were provided with pictures and materials representing activities for explaining, and objects in pictures for describing. During the CS training program, participants were also asked to use monolingual dictionaries to define and explain abstract nouns. They were also asked to compare dictionary definitions and prepare better definitions for the words in question by

editing/compiling the dictionary definitions. As in the pre and posttests, the Arabic translation of the abstract nouns was provided.

Different types of activities were used in the pre and posttests in order to engage learners in lifelike activities which they faced as learners of English. Activities involved: (1) object description 1 (isolated pictures) and object description 2 (items in a context) (2) abstract noun explanation and (3) picture story-telling or narration. The writing tasks used in the present study served as an instrument to elicit participants' employment of the specific CSs under study, i.e., approximation and circumlocution.

### ***Writing Tasks***

Different tasks were used for the pretest and the posttest to avoid improvement of performance through familiarization with the test content. The difficulty of these two tests was examined in the pilot study and no significant difference was found between them. All subjects were asked to complete writing tasks on both a pretest and a posttest to determine whether they were able to improve their ability to convey comprehensible messages over 7 weeks. The tasks were familiar to daily classroom activities. Subjects were provided with photocopies of pictures of objects or places to identify/described as well as abstract nouns to define and explain in writing in order to transmit comprehensible messages when they lacked the appropriate or exact vocabulary item. Four different tasks were used in the pretest and the posttest: *object description*, *picture description*, *abstract nouns* and *story-telling*. In the first two tasks, participants described the items by using CSs. In the abstract noun task, participants defined and explained three different abstract nouns. In the last task, picture story-telling participants had series of pictures where they wrote a story about. As part of the training participants were specifically instructed to use approximation and circumlocution to describe/ identify objects or define/explain abstract nouns even if they knew the name of an object or correct lexical item. In other words, the participants were asked to explain, describe the target items and not to name them as a

practice of using CSs as a means of remedy for any lexical problem they may face during any future communication situations.

For approximation participants used an alternative lexical term such as a superordinate or a related term that expresses the closest meaning to the target word. For example, participants wrote 'raft' for 'sailboat' and 'chair' for 'armchair'.

As for circumlocution, participants described the function, characteristics, purpose or example of the action or object instead of using the appropriate target language item or structure. For example, 'big rock but smaller than the mountain near the sea' for 'cliff' or 'It is something that pours water to take shower' for 'showerhead'.

As for the control group, they were not informed of the rationale of the study. An explanation of the purpose of the pre and posttests was provided to them after the posttest was taken upon their request. The control group studied the same English course as the experimental.

### **Assessment Scale**

I used an assessment scale (see Appendix B) for assessing the use of communication strategies in passing information and conveying comprehensible messages in the writing performance. The scale was established from collective Cambridge communication assessment scales but only those measures relating to my study in the employment of approximation and circumlocution to convey comprehensible messages when defining or explaining lexical items and abstract nouns. Other areas of grammar and syntax were not taken into consideration as they were beyond the scope of this study. The scale consists of three levels and focuses on learners' ability to convey messages comprehensibly when using the two CSs. Two independent assessors, who were native speakers of English, did the assessment. They were not involved in the tests. The raters were provided with the student's papers of the writing tests.

**Results**

*The effect of awareness-raising training on CSs on intermediate participants' writing performance*

As shown in Table 1, an independent *t* test was used to examine whether there was a significant difference in the writing performance between the control and experimental groups. The improvement in the participants' message conveyance in the writing tasks was significant in the experimental group.

**Table 1**

Results of *t* test between the two groups in the pretest and posttest

	Experimental Group		Control Group		<i>T</i>	<i>P</i>
	<i>(n = 51)</i>		<i>(n = 38)</i>			
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>		
Pretest	4.95	<b>0.47</b>	4.98	<b>0.48</b>	.312	0.75 <i>ns</i>
Posttest	7.72	<b>0.61</b>	4.98	<b>0.10</b>	11.580	.01*

\* Significance at  $p < .05$

\*\* Highly Significance at  $p < .01$

As shown in Table 2, a paired-sample *t* test (two tailed) was used to examine whether there was a significant difference in the writing performance within each group. The improvement in the message conveyance in the writing tasks was significant in the experimental group. By contrast, there was no significant change in the control group's writing performance.

**Table 2**

Experimental group pre and posttests (Paired- sample *t* test)

Tasks	Pretest		Posttest		t value	p-value	Result
	Mean ± (Std.)	Mean ± (Std.)	Mean ± (Std.)	Mean ± (Std.)			
Object description.	1.01 ± 0.09	1.96 ± 0.57	11.973	0.01**	H.Sig.		
Picture description	1.80 ± 0.33	2.15 ± 0.21	7.316	0.01**	H.Sig.		
Abstract noun	1.05 ± 0.15	1.83 ± 0.48	11.822	0.01**	H.Sig.		
Story-telling	1.09 ± 0.14	1.77 ± 0.61	7.887	0.01**	H.Sig.		
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>4.95 ± 0.47</b>	<b>7.72 ± 1.37</b>	<b>15.609</b>	<b>0.01**</b>	<b>H.Sig</b>		

\*\* Highly significant at  $p < 0.01$

\*\* Significance at  $p < .05$

As shown in Table 3, a paired-sample *t* test (two tailed) was used to examine whether there was a significant difference in the writing performance within the control group in the pre and posttests. The results showed that there was no significant change in the control group's writing performance.

**Table 3**Control group pre and posttests (Paired-sample *t* test)

Tasks	Pretest		Posttest		t value	p-value	Result
	Mean (Std.)	±	Mean (Std.)	±			
Object description	1.01	± 0.08	1.09	± 0.25	1.781	0.08	N.S.
Picture description	1.81	± 0.34	1.76	± 0.36	1.471	0.15	N.S.
Abstract noun	1.11	± 0.22	1.07	± 0.19	1.708	0.09	N.S.
Story-telling	1.04	± 0.09	1.06	± 0.10	1.001	0.32	N.S.
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>4.98</b>	<b>±0.48</b>	<b>4.99</b>	<b>±0.54</b>	<b>0.095</b>	<b>0.92</b>	<b>N.S.</b>

### Discussion

The results of the present study supported the research hypothesis: CS training program has a positive effect on student's writing performance. The effect of CS training program on student's writing performance means that participants were able to circumvent their limited linguistic resources with the help and use of approximation and circumlocution to solve the communicative problem they face, the difficult or unfamiliar lexical item, and to be able to convey comprehensible and meaningful messages. According to the results of the pretest, it can be said that there was no statistically significant difference between the two groups to begin with. As

for the posttest, there was a statistically significant difference between the two groups in message conveyance in the writing performance due to the impact of the CS training program on the experimental group. Maleki's (2007) results in CS instruction study concur with the present study's result where his findings showed that the experimental group outperformed the control group in oral and written tests. Additionally, Lam (2006) supports the value and the teachability of CSs in FL classrooms as the findings showed that the experimental group task effectiveness improved significantly in the posttest as a result of CS training. In the same line, Nakatani (2005) supports the OCST (Oral Communication Strategy Training), as the findings revealed that the experimental group's oral proficiency test scores improved significantly.

The findings of the present study suggest that EFL learners who are not aware of their strategic behavior need to consciously use their interlanguage system to control their performance and to maintain communication. In order to reach their communicative goals, learners' strategic competence can be developed through awareness-raising of CS employment, usefulness and appropriateness. This view is in line with Dörnyei (1995) who suggests that special attention should be given to develop and enhance participants' strategic awareness on the use of CSs in EFL classrooms. Through intensive practice, given exercises and photocopies of objects or situations where participants have to explain / identify or narrate any given target communication goal. The writing tasks showed that the explicit teaching of communication strategies raised participants' awareness of strategy use and improved the effective use of the taught strategies. Apparently, training learners on the use of CSs involves making them aware that successful communication through CSs is a temporary solution to the communication problems and that the permanent solution needs further efforts from their side to expand language resources. Therefore, the best way to develop learners' communicative competence is

the combination of these two aspects.

### **Implications and Applications**

The findings of the present study yield some implications and applications to the field of language teaching.

1. The present study can be a basis for studies in the writing tasks in other settings in EFL classrooms to test generalizability of the findings. The writing tasks and CS training materials can be adopted with flexible adjustment by researchers in a similar field.
2. The continuing uncertainty about the effectiveness of strategy instruction on strategy use and task performance provides further justification.
3. Apparently, CSs are part of language use and thus it is fair enough that learners should be taught CSs and their awareness to their value of CSs in enhancing the continuity of communicative goals should be raised. Obviously, when learners were made aware of the usefulness and effectiveness of achievement strategy use in reaching the communicative goal and had practice in such strategy use, they employed them appropriately and effectively in their posttest.
4. CS training is pedagogically effective and is supported by the results of the following CS instruction studies (Dörnyei, 1995; Nakatani, 2005, Maleki, 2007) where they argue that CSs improve subjects' interlanguage.

### **Limitation of the Study**

The present study was concerned with the written performance of Egyptian EFL learners. The lexical repertoire of Egyptian EFL learners was the main concern in this study. Two variables were examined, the effect of CS training program on learners' message conveyance in writing tasks. Generally speaking, the posttest tasks were slightly difficult in some of their items than the pretest and that was intentional so that the increase in the

frequency and messages conveyance in the posttest after the training would be noteworthy. There were grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in the subjects' output that the researcher left unquestioned as it was beyond the scope of the study. Measuring participants' oral performance was beyond the scope of this study.

### **Suggestions for Further Research in this Area:**

1. Comparing the use of CSs by Egyptian learners of English in the written and oral modes to see if there is any variation.
2. Further in-depth investigations should be pursued to add to the findings of the present study. In particular, the current study was conducted with a rather small number of participants (51 subjects) within a short period of time. The research was conducted in real classroom settings for seven-weeks, it was not possible to conduct a delayed posttest to measure the longitudinal effect of CS training on written tasks. It is important to examine whether CSs they learned are accessible for future target language study beyond the classroom.
3. In addition, the present study dealt with meaning rather than form of the participants' written responses. Further studies should include both and use a wide range of CSs to investigate any variation in the results.

### ***Bibliography***

- Ahmed, S., & Pawar, S. (2018). A study of communication strategies employed by Radfan College EFL students in their classroom interactions. *New Academia: An International Journal of English Language, Literature and Literary Theory*. Retrieved from <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/326534502>.
- Badawy, A. (1998). *Compensation Strategies in the Interlanguage of Egyptian Students Learning English*. Ph.D. Dissertation Cairo University.
- Canale, M., and Swain M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communication approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics*, 1, 1-47.
- Chen, S.Q. (1990). A study of communication strategies in interlanguage production by Chinese EFL learners. *Language Learning*, 40, 155-187.
- Corder, S.P. (1983) Strategies of Communication. In Faerch, C. and Kasper, G. (Eds.), *Strategies in interlanguage communication*, 15-19. New York: Longman.
- Dong, Y. and Fang-peng, G. (2010). Chinese learners' communication strategies research. *Cross-cultural Communication*, 6:1, 56-81.
- Dörnyei, Z. (1995). "On the teachability of communication strategies. *TESOL Quarterly*, 29, 55-85.
- Dörnyei, Z., and Thurrell, S. (1991). Strategic competence and how to teach it. *ELT Journal*, 45:1, 16-23.
- Faerch, C. and G. Kasper (1983). Plans and strategies in foreign language communication. In Faerch, C. and Kasper, G. (Eds.). *Strategies in interlanguage communication*, 20-60. New York: Longman.

- Lam, W.Y.K. (2004). Teaching strategy use for oral communication tasks to ESL learners. Unpublished PhD thesis, School of Education, University of Leeds, United Kingdom.
- 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, 142-157.
- Maleki, A. (2007). Teachability of communication strategies: An Iranian experience. *System*, 35, 583–594.
- Marrie, B., and Netten, J., (1991). Communication strategies. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*. 47:3, 442-462.
- Manchon, R. (2000). Fostering the autonomous use of communication strategies in the foreign language classroom. *Links & Letters*, 7, 13-27.
- Nakatani, Y., (2005). The Effects of awareness-raising training on oral communication strategy use". *The Modern Language Journal*, 89, 76-91.
- Rossiter, M.J. (2003). It's like chicken but bigger: The effects of communication strategy instruction in the ESL classroom. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 60, 105-121.
- Savignon, SJ. (1972). *Communicative competence: An experiment in foreign language teaching*. Philadelphia: Center for Curriculum Development.
- Savignon, SJ. (1983). *Communicative Competence: Theory and classroom practice*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Selinker, L. (1972) Interlanguage. *IRAL* 10, 209-231.
- Tarone, E., Cohen, A. and Dumas, G. (1983). A closer look at some interlanguage terminology: A framework for communication

- strategies. In Faerch, C. and Kasper, G. (Eds.), 4-14. *Strategies in interlanguage communication*. New York: Longman.
- Varadi, T. (1973). Strategies of target language learner communication: message abandonment. *International Review of Applied Linguistics*, 18, 59-71.
- Widger, A. (2000). *Strategic Competence Training in the L2 Classroom: An Investigation into the Teachability of Communication Strategies*. An M.A. Thesis. The American University in Cairo.
- Willems, G. (1987). Communication strategies and their significance in foreign language teaching." *System*. 15: 3, 351-364.
- Yule, G., and Tarone, E. (1990). Eliciting the performance of strategic competence". In R. Scarcella, E. Andersen and S. Krashen. (Eds.), 56-73. *Developing communicative competence in a second language*. New York: Newburg House.

## APPENDIX A

<b>Communication Strategies</b>			
<b>Achievement Strategies</b> (Risk-taking strategies that learners use to expand and fulfill a communicative goal)		<b>Reduction Strategies</b> (Learners reduce his/her communicative goal totally or partially)	
<b>IL- Based Strategies</b> (involves using the target language)	<b>L1-Based Strategies</b> (involves using the mother tongue)	<b>Avoidance</b>	<b>Message Avoidance</b>
<b>Approximation</b> e.g., “chair” for “sofa”  <b>Circumlocution</b> e.g., “a wooden wall surrounding the house” for “fence”  <b>Word coinage</b> e.g., “fishzoo” for “aquarium”  <b>Smurfing</b> e.g., using empty single words like “thing” or “something” with no further explanation or description.	<b>Code-Switching</b> e.g., “abajora” for “lamp”  <b>Literal Translation</b> e.g., “the sport teacher” for “coach”	Totally avoids talking about a topic  In the case of writing students leave blank spaces for unanswered questions.	Learners leave out part of the message in an attempt to avoid the problem he/she is facing  e.g., “a boy is ...” For “a boy is hanging his shirt on the fishing net stick to signal for help.”

## APPENDIX B

### Assessment Scale

The assessment of the subject's writing performance was measured by using three –Likert Scale to evaluate students' writing performance. A quick evaluation of the three- Likert Scale used is as follows:

Scale	Interval
1 - 1.66	Weak
1.67 - 2.37	Fair
2.38 - 3.00	Good

Weak: 1. Content is totally irrelevant.

2. Blank spaces.

3. Code-switching was employed.

\* Therefore the target reader is not informed.

Fair: 1. the description and/ or explanation of target lexical items is generally acceptable and moderately effective in the task.

\* Therefore the target reader is partially informed.

Good: 1. the subjects almost always write effectively in the task.

2. the subjects' responses are comprehensible.

\* Therefore the target reader is clearly informed.