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ABSTRACT

The present investigation seeks to investigate the effect of the communicative competence training on enhancing EFL students’ strategic competence. It is hypothesized that the communicative competence training will enhance students’ strategic competence. In pursuance of this aim, third year LMD students at Larbi Ben M’Hidi University were selected as the target population of this study. Two of five pre-arranged groups were chosen randomly to form the experimental and control group. The quasi-experiment was conducted and was essentially the one in which both groups were pre- and post-tested with dissimilar period of treatment in the midst of the two test, particularly, students in the experimental group were provided by a series of strategic competence lessons and instructions about their application and use in any conversation. While the control group ones, had no lessons about this latter, nevertheless, they were studying traditionally. In addition to this quasi-experimental study, a questionnaire to oral expression teachers was administered to have teachers’ attitudes towards the implementation of those strategies. The result obtained from the quantitative examination and the questionnaire of the gathered data revealed that the integration of the communicative competence training had a significant impact on enhancing EFL students’ strategic competence. Finally, this research study, also, ended up with some significant pedagogical implications for language teachers and syllabus designers, accompanied by ideas for future research.
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General Introduction

Statement of the Problem

Learning a foreign language such as English is not an easy task especially for beginners. In Algeria, most of students consider English language as an important and a useful tool. What makes it so interesting is the fact that they will have the chance to communicate with other people all around the world. When it comes to learning English as a foreign language, there are many skills that should be taken into consideration and the most important one that must be stressed out is the “communicative skill”, since the common problem that most of English students face in the class, is the difficulties and embarrassment to interact orally with one another, also with the teacher. Some students enjoy classroom interaction but they feel that they have a limited linguistic accuracy, such as hesitation about using inappropriate vocabulary, grammar, pronunciation. When it comes to English teachers, some of them struggle with the way of presenting the information or how to deliver it, and they make their students more confused. Most of EFL students find it hard to interact in oral expression sessions, they feel that they are restricted in linguistically correct way, applied linguistics have suggested that communicative competence includes a major component that is called “strategic competence” which is widely neglected by course books and teachers, it is defined as “the capacity that relates the knowledge structures, and the features of the context in which communication and language learning takes place” (adapted from Bachman, 1990, p. 107). So the implementation of strategic competence in the EFL syllabus will develop learners’ conversational and interactional strategies.
Aims of the Study

This study will shed the light on the importance of teaching strategic competence in EFL classes. And also it aims to explore students’ abilities to use communication strategies in order to develop their strategic competence.

Research Questions

The research seeks to answer the following questions:

Q1: To what extent can strategic competence solve the communication problems that the EFL learners are suffering from?

Q2: Is it possible to implement communicative strategies in EFL syllabus?

Hypothesis

The communicative competence training will enhance students’ strategic competence.

Methodology

1. Choice of the method

The aim of this study is to investigate how communicative competence training can enhance students’ strategic competence; a mixed method will be conducted to confirm the hypothesis.

2. Data gathering tools

Data is collected through a quasi-experiment in which two groups, the control group and the experimental group were pre-tested and post-tested, with a set of lessons about strategic competence to be taught for the experimental group (treatment period). Also, a
questionnaire was delivered to oral expression teachers, to investigate their attitudes towards the use of strategic competence in their session.

3. Population and Sampling

The population targeted in this research is third year LMD Students in Larbi Ben M’hidi University. We will choose two groups in each there will be 20 students to work with, and for the questionnaire ten teachers of oral expression module will participate.

Significance of the study

The speaking skill is a significant area to be studied and it has a crucial importance in the process of teaching and learning the English Language. Students are supposed to speak and communicate with each other especially in oral session but because of the lack of some skills and strategies they avoid communication. This research is conducted to highlight the importance of the implementation of teaching strategic competence in order to make students able to make a healthy and correct conversation.

Structure of the study

This research is divided into two chapters. The first chapter is concerned with the literature review, and the second chapter is concerned with the practical part of the study. The first chapter is composed of two sections; the first one introduces definitions and related literature about communicative competence, its development, examples and some components. The second one; deals with the strategic competence. The second chapter includes the questionnaire and the quasi-experiment with the analysis and results.
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Introduction

Foreign language teachers and learners are seeking for having good communicative competencies and an appropriate oral performance. Teachers are already familiar with the basic elements of teaching a foreign language, such as, administer question-and-answer practice, presenting language structures and functions, besides learners have to go beyond the mastery of these structures, in order to perform appropriately in a real-life situations. Generally speaking, to be able to communicate properly in everyday matters, or situations with people from other countries, or to get around and have a normal life when visiting a foreign country, the most important focus should be on developing the oral skill rather than written down words.

This section will include an overview about the communicative language teaching approach, its development, the different examples of communicative exercises, and the component of communicative competence.

1.1.1. An Overview of the Communicative Approach in English as a Foreign Language

The communicative approach unfolded wider perspectives on both language and language learning (William Littlewood, 1981, p.1); on language in terms of looking not only on language forms, but also what people do with these language forms; and on language learning in the sense that teaching learners how to control and manipulate the language structures, but this is not adequate, rather learners have to build up strategies that relate these language structures to their communicative functions in everyday situations.

The communicative language teaching (CLT), includes both the structural and functional aspects of language, this systematic combination forms a fully communicative view of language Littlewood, pointed out that, the most efficient communicator in a foreign language is not always the person who is best in manipulating its structures. It is often the
person who is most skilled at processing the complete situation, involving himself and his hearer (Littlewood, 1981, p.4). Many linguists have discussed the concept communicative competence such as Canale & Swain (1979, 1980) in their review of the literature on communicative competence suggest three subcomponents: grammatical, discourse, and sociolinguistic competence. Grammatical competence is just that, a knowledge of lexical items and the rules of morphology, syntax, sentence-grammar semantics, and phonology (Canale & Swain, 1979, p.54). Discourse competence is “defined as the ability to produce and recognize coherent and cohesive text” (Canale & Swain, 1983, p.5), while sociolinguistic competence is “defined as the ability to produce and recognize socially appropriate language within a given sociocultural context” (p. 9).

1.1.2. The Development of Communicative Language Teaching Approach

Jack C. Richards (1996), said that in the last 50 years, language teaching has seen various changes in opinions about methodology and syllabus design, and communicative language teaching improvised a rethinking of methodologies, and syllabus design. Up to the late 1960’s, traditional approaches to language teaching paid more attention, and priority to grammatical competence as the starting point of language proficiency. He also added, “The approach to the teaching of grammar was a deductive one: students are presented with grammar rules and then given opportunities to practice using them.” (p.18). In this approach an immense focus on accurate mastery of grammar and pronunciation was stressed, and the techniques that were generally used included memorization of dialogues, repetitive practice and drillings.

Then in the 1970’s, the crucial interest on grammar in language teaching was questioned, since the grammatical competence is not enough for language learning, so a reaction to the traditional language teaching (grammar-based methodologies) started to spread.
all over the world, shifting the interest to the knowledge of skills and other language aspects. Jack C. Richards (1996) pointed out that:

While grammatical competence was needed to produce grammatically correct sentences, attention shifted to the knowledge and skills needed to use grammar and other aspects of language appropriately for different communicative purposes such as making requests, giving advice, making suggestions, describing wishes and needs and so on.

(p.8)

This led to the emergence of communicative competence which aims to use language appropriately. In other words, learners will know what to say and how to say appropriately according to the situation.

In the 1970’s and 1980’s, Jack C. Richards pointed out that the notion of communicative competence developed within the discipline of linguistics (more specifically a sub-discipline of sociolinguistics), communicative language teaching made a great interest and excitement as a new approach to language teaching, especially for teachers who started changing their ways of teaching, syllabuses, and classroom materials. Since 1990’s and until now, the communicative approach has been largely implemented, since the aim of second and foreign language teaching is the communicative competence, so the current communicative language teaching can be characterized by describing a set of core principles of language teaching and learning.

1.1.3. What are some Examples of Communicative Exercises and Activities

Since the aim of the communicative language teaching approach is to develop students’ communicative competence, in other words, to have a meaningful and effective communication with the partner, with regard to the production of acceptable language forms,
“the learner uses the linguistic repertoire he has learnt, in order to communicate specific meanings for specific purposes” (Littlewood, 1981, p.17). As the teacher is the one who is supposed to design the classroom activities, in which he will tend to provide his students the chances to use the linguistic forms, and the required associations between forms and meanings. So, in order to reflect the principles of the communicative language teaching, many teachers and course designers developed many classroom activities, the main types of these classroom activities will be discuss briefly below, as it is described in Jack C. Richard booklet in chapter 3.

1.1.3.1. Accuracy versus Fluency

Richard defined fluency as “fluency is natural language occurring when a speaker engage in meaningful interaction” (p.13), and in order to develop fluency, the different classroom activities should include activities in which students discuss meanings, avoiding communication breakdowns by using communication strategies. For the activities which focus on fluency basically are, activities which seek to relate language use to context, and which involve the use of communicative strategies, the meaningful use of language and which reflect the natural use of language.

In the other hand, accuracy activities are based on reflecting classroom language use, practicing language out of context, and controlling the choice of language.

1.1.3.1.1. An example of Fluency and Accuracy Task

1.1.3.1.1.1. Accuracy Task: adapted from (Jack C.Richards,p.15)

The teacher provides his students with cue cards from which they adopt the roles and personalities to carry out a role play, students are asked to react the role play preserving.
3.1.3.1.1.2. Fluency Task

A group work in which students need to accomplish a task, which involves grammatical items, for example, choosing the present or the present perfect, this grammatical item should be presented previously by the teacher, then students will read out their answers in front of their classmates.

It can be noticed that teachers are obliged to balance between the use of fluency tasks and accuracy tasks. Most of the time accuracy tasks take place after a fluency task, so that a teacher can observe the grammatical, vocabulary, or phonological problems when students are performing a fluency task.

1.1.3.2. Mechanical, Meaningful, and Communicative Practice

Classroom activities require different practices, and both teachers and students need to distinguish between the three kinds of practice during classroom activities which are, mechanical, meaningful, and communicative practice.

1.1.3.2.1. Mechanical Practice

“Refers to a controlled practice activity which students can successfully carry out without necessarily understanding the language they are using” (Jack C. Richards, 1990, p.15). This kind of practice requires the practicing use of grammatical items, e.g., the use of repetition drills activities.

1.1.3.2.2. Meaningful Practice

“It refers to an activity where language control is still provided but where students are required to make meaningful choices when carrying out practice” (Jack C. Richards,
1990,p.15). For example, students are asked to write sentences using superlatives from the adjectives given, to describe people they know.

1.1.3.2.3. Communication Practice

“It refers to activities where practice in using language within a real communicative context is the focus, where real information is exchanged, and where the language used is not totally predictable” (Jack C.Richards, 1990,p.15). For example, a group work in which students discuss (ask and answer) about the different locations in their city.

In the same way Littlewood (1981), he grouped the three kinds of practices in two groups:

The pre-communicative activities and communicative activities. In one hand, the pre-communicative activities includes the structural activities which Littlewood refers to “the learner’s focus was more on language forms to be learnt than on meaning to be communicated”(p.43). In other words, the aim of the structural activities is to produce correct language to communicate meanings comprehensibly. On the other hand, the communicative activities include, functional communication activities and social interaction activities. The functional communication activities are based on structuring situation in which students are supposed to solve problems, for instance, and this through sharing and processing information. The social interaction activities add an additional dimension to the previous communication activities, in the sense that, as Littlewood explained, “learners must pay greater attention to the social as well as the functional meanings that language conveys” (1981, p.43).

In other words, this kind of activities provide students with communication situations that are similar to situations outside the classroom, where language is not simply a functional tool, rather it is also a form of social behavior.
1.1.3.3. Information-gap Activities

In daily life people need to communicate with each other, so that they can exchange new ideas and convey new information. One example of this communication is similar to classroom activities, students will use their linguistic repertoires and their communicative resources to get the information they need, and this is what is called information-gap activities.

1.1.3.4. Jig-saw Activities

It is also based on the information-gap activities principles, since students are divided into groups, each group has a piece of information, and together they accomplish the task by gathering the pieces together, however, they need to use their own language to communicate meaningfully. An example for these activities is adapted from Jack C. Richard.

The teacher plays a recording in which three people with different points of view discuss their opinions on a topic of interest. The teacher prepares three different listening tasks, one focusing on each of the three speaker’s points of view. Students are divided into three groups, and each group listens and takes notes on one of the three speaker’s opinions. Students are then rearranged into groups containing a student from groups A, B and C. They now role-play the discussion using the information they obtained.

1.1.3.5. Other Activity Types of Communicative Language Teaching

- Task-completion activities
- Information gathering activities
- Opinion-sharing activities
- Information-transfer activities
- Reasoning-gap activities
Role plays

1.1.4. The Components of the Communicative Competence

Many changes were observed about understanding how languages are learnt over the last five decades, and from the different perspectives; the linguistic, psycholinguistic, the cognitive psychology, and sociolinguistics. Linguists shifted their attention to the new approach which is communicative language teaching, which aims to develop students’ communicative competence, i.e “Communicative competence is the social rules of language use” (Chomsky, 1968).

Since the goal of this approach is to enable learners use the linguistic system of the target language appropriately, and effectively in a specific situation, in first place the term ‘competence’ should be understood, which was explained by Chomsky as “competence refers to knowledge of grammar and of other aspects of language”. Then Hymes added to the notion ‘competence’, the concept ‘communicative competence’ which he defined it as “rules of use without which the rules of grammar would be useless” (Hymes, 1972, p.278). He added “it is not enough to include only the knowledge of the linguistic system or forms but also a knowledge of when, how and whom is appropriate to use these forms” (p.280).

So communicative competence has a crucial role in understanding social interactions, and it represents a challenge for teachers to be implemented in their teaching methodology, since the realization of the communicative competence is not an easy task, and teachers need to distinguish between its different components.

1.1.4.1. Linguistic Competence

The linguistic competence represents the central part of communication act, since it contains the language rules that buildup and describe the grammatical sentences of the
language, an individual cannot be communicatively competent, unless he/she is linguistically competent (as cited in Hamid H. Mohamed, 2010, p.162), the linguistic competence includes the following elements:

- Phonology pronunciation (including segmental phonemes and suprasegmental features)
- Orthographic rules-spelling of words
- Grammar
- Lexis (vocabulary of the language)

1.1.4.2. Pragmatic Competence

According to Bachman (1990), ‘pragmatics’ refers to how meaning in an utterance partly relates to the context in which it is spoken, but also in a degree to knowledge that is shared among the interlocutors. In other words, it is the study of the language use in communication contexts, and situations in which they are used. It includes the following:

1.1.4.2.1. Language Functions

- Expressive utterances: These involve the speaker’s attitude, opinion, feeling, interjection.
- Directive utterances: They focus on addressee, for example, when someone is being asked or told to do something.
- Referential function: This focuses on that setting, or that part of the context which is being talked about or referred to.
- Phatic function: This focuses on contact between participants. It serves to establish, maintain or discontinue communication. (As cited in Hamid H. Mohamed, 2010, p.162).
• Metalinguistic: When the focus on the code, the function of the utterance is metalinguistic. This function is also referred to as explanations and comments about speech acts, for example; what does this word mean?

• Poetic function; This covers all uses of language in which message form is of primary importance, for example aesthetic effects in poetry.

1.1.4.2.2. Speech Acts

Speech acts are grouped into three major types which are: Attitudinal, informative, and ritual.

• Attitudinal acts: it includes; Past Event such as (apologize, justify, excuse, reject, disagree, complain, forgive, congratulate…); and Future Events such as (intend, offer, promise, request, suggest, permit…).

• Informative acts: This state factual information, express opinions, expresses emotional attitudes, explain, report, recommend, regret…

• Ritual acts: These are classified on the basis of how they related to the opening and closing of a communicative event, greeting and taking leave.

1.1.4.2.3. Discourse Strategy

It refers to a structured text that constitutes sequences of speech acts, it includes the following aspects:

• Coherence: This is a way in which structure is created in texts as in the sequential characteristic of speech acts.

• Cohesion: This is the creation of ties between sentences, by lexical and grammatical means.
• Gambits: These are words and expressions that help regulate conversation, for instance, well, now, oh yes, but, awfully nice, aha, mm, yeah..

• Turn–taking: In conversations and dialogues this refers to the change from one speaker to another.

1.1.4.3. Socio-cultural Competence

The EFL learners will develop their communicative competence when they know the appropriate context of language use. Therefore the social competence cannot be separated from the elements of the communicative competence. At the same time, the cultural features are very important to avoid the misunderstanding, or the failure to use the language.

1.1.4.4. Fluency competence

This refers to the ability to express oneself quickly and easily, yet fluency is not synonymous with fast speech or correctness. One can be fluent and incorrect, fluent and correct but unable to talk fast, or not fluent and correct.

1.1.4.5. Strategic Competence

This is the speaker’s ability to solve communication problems (communication breakdowns) using different strategies, the concept covers problem solving strategies that learners choose in order to solve what they experience while communicating. This concept will be discussed in details in the following section, “Strategic Competence”.

In his description of communication, Canal (1980) explained the components of the communicative competence that is composed of grammatical, socio-cultural, discourse and strategic competence.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Type of competence</strong></th>
<th><strong>Definition</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grammatical Competence</td>
<td>refers to the extent that mastery of the language code has occurred, including vocabulary knowledge, word formation, syntax, pronunciation, spelling and linguistic semantics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socio-cultural Competence</td>
<td>refers to mastery of the socio-cultural rules of use and rules of discourse; “the extent to which utterances are produced and understood appropriately depending on contextual factors”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discourse Competence</td>
<td>refers to mastery of “how to combine grammatical forms and meanings to achieve a unified spoken or written text”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Competence</td>
<td>refers to mastery of verbal and non-verbal communication strategies we employ during breakdown in communication or when we lack any of the competences to communicate effectively; also used to enhance effective communication</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conclusion

Second or foreign language learners face many obstacles while trying to perform communication activities, whether in classroom interaction or when they intend to communicate with a speaker of the target language. These speaking abilities obstacles can be explained by a gap in their linguistic knowledge, so in order to fill this gap and to keep the conversation going, they make use of some communication strategies. Therefore, communicative competence has a vital role in developing students’ speaking interaction which is based on students’ communicative needs.

Over the last years, linguists and many syllabus designers have changed their interest to the communicative approach and its implementation in the learning process, Hymes (1971), for instance viewed communicative competence as the interaction of grammatical, psycholinguistic, sociocultural, and probabilistic systems of competence, this combination aims to facilitate interaction, and the appropriate use of the target language in a particular situation. The different kinds of tasks that teachers employ in the classroom are used to serve as integral tasks to improve learners’ productive and comprehensive competence of actual communication.

This section discussed the notion communicative competence and its development through time, also it presented some of the exercises that teachers may adapt for their classroom activities including; fluency and accuracy tasks, information-gap tasks, and so on. Also it has dealt with the different component of communicative competence and how teachers make a distinguish between these components.
Introduction

Most of English language students are not in the appropriate English language environment where they find the authentic language use. Students find it hard to be fluent, to be more accomplished as a speaker, or to keep a conversation going. Sometimes when students try to manage a conversation, they may fail or cause frustration for both speaker and listener, this happens because the lack of the appropriate strategies and techniques needed when breakdowns occur.

Communicative competence gave birth to the strategic competence as one of its major components that enable EFL students to overcome different issues, repair breakdowns and prevent miscommunication. This component has been defined by Canale and Swain (1980, p. 30) as “verbal and non-verbal communication strategies that may be called into action to compensate for breakdowns in communication due to performance variables or to insufficient competence”. In other words, when a problem arise in any communication process, strategic competence gets one’s meaning and significance across successfully to communicative partners.

EFL teachers should be aware about the importance of this component, since it is very useful to handle their communication problems in classroom activities. Teachers have different roles in apprenticing various techniques and strategies to be more communicatively competent. In the other hand, EFL students have different roles in the way of acquiring the communication training.

This section will tackle how linguists defined the concept of the communicative competence, its pros and cons, the strategic competence models of Bachman and Palmer, ways to teach strategic competence in the EFL classes, teachers’ and students’ roles, and how to integrate strategic competence into foreign language courses.
1.2.1. Definition of Strategic Competence

Knowing that strategic competence is a part from communicative competence that cannot be neglected, which introduces foreign learners’ ability to know how to overcome the issues of verbal or nonverbal communication use due to the lack of understanding of proper grammar use or/and insufficient knowledge of the social and communication norms. So many linguists have defined the concept of strategic competence, but they all agreed on a common fact about strategic competence which is “using strategies when communication is difficult.”

Mainly, using different techniques to help learners getting over the difficulties, or repairing issues and breakdowns in communication. Some examples that demonstrate strategic competence such as the use of synonyms to substitute for words the speaker has not learned yet, maybe giving descriptions or general information of that particular word, sometimes using physical gestures to convey the meaning.

The communication breakdowns does not occur only while learning a foreign language, but it happens even in our mother tongue, this thought was mentioned by Zoltan Dornyei and Sarah Thurrell “Strategic competence is relevant to both LI and L2, since communication breakdowns occur and must be overcome not only in a foreign language but in one's mother tongue as well” (1991, p.17). Other linguists have defined strategic competence as a crucial element to obtain a natural and ordinary discourse, as Wagner and Firth (1997) claimed that “strategic competence (SC) is a very prominent element in speech production and therefore an important element in natural discourse” (P.342).

From a holistic view, “Strategic competence is the ability to overcome the difficulties that may happen during the communication “(Celce-Murcia, Dornyei&Thurrell, 1995). Rather than taking them as a deficit, teachers should consider it as a chance to develop learners’ strategic competence. There are some strategies that enable teachers to identify whether the breakdowns had occurred or not, like noticing the body gestures or checking
the listener comprehension. Also, Canale (1983) has expanded the definition of strategic competence in a way that it includes both the compensatory characteristics of communication strategies and the enhancement characteristics of production strategies: “mastery of verbal and nonverbal strategies both (a) to compensate for breakdowns in communication due to insufficient competence or to performance limitations and (b) to enhance the theoretical effect of utterances” (p. 339).

1.2.2 Pros and Cons of Strategic Competence

In foreign or second language program, the most conventional instructional framework is the communicative language teaching. This framework aims at increasing students’ communication competences. Since strategic competence is considered as one of the significant components of the communicative competence, that enables students to solve communication problems, it has several benefits for both teacher and learner, but at the same time it has a number of disadvantages, as well.

1.2.2.1 The Pros of Strategic Competence

Teaching communication strategies is beneficial to enhance students’ strategic competence. Many linguists supported the teaching of communication strategies to students of foreign languages, (Faerch and Kasper 1983; Dornyei 1995; Dornyei and Thurrell 1991; Tarone and Yule 1989; Faucette 2001; Rabab’ah 2004; and Maleki 2007) those linguists and lecturers are supposed to be the proponents of the teachability of communication strategies, Dornyei and Thurrell 1991, for example argued that “A lack of strategic competence may account for situations when students with a firm knowledge of grammar and a wide range of vocabulary get stuck and are unable to carry out their communicative intent” (p.17). Also Faucette (2001) believes that “communication strategies could be excellent means for less
proficient learners to have the tools to maintain the conversation, resulting in the opportunity to receive more language input and improve their language ability”.

In 2001, Council of Europe published the Common European Framework of References for Languages (CEFR for Languages) and stated that the language learners' progress can be clearly seen in their ability to be involved in language activities and to utilize their strategic competence (Council of Europe, 2001).

1.2.2.2. The Cons of Strategic Competence

The cons of strategic competence include the major points which are not in favor of teaching strategic competence that should be taken into account. Some experts such as Bialystok, Kellerman (1991), and Stephan Krashen(1987), think that EFL learners do not need to be taught strategic competence since it may develop in their first language. Research (Tarone 1981; Savignon 1983; Dornyei 1995; Nakatani 2005; Wood 2010) have shown that strategic competence cannot be beneficial for EFL learners, especially when more time is consumed for structured output and practice with interlocutors. Poulisse (1990) states that L2 learners do not have to develop a special L2 strategic competence; rather they can apply their L1 strategic competence instead.”(p.82). It is known that strategic competence is made up of two components which are verbal and nonverbal communication strategies, sometimes it is very difficult to find the appropriate component to use in a particular situation especially for the nonverbal gestures.

Taking into account the disadvantages of strategic competence that some researchers mentioned, strategic competence can stimulate communication, help L2 learners to maintain conversation and to solve their problems using different strategies and techniques to improve their oral performance.
1.2.3. Bachman and Palmer’s Strategic Competence Models

The concept Strategic Competence has drawn a lot of attention and controversial opinions among linguists about its role and importance in language proficiency. One of the remarkable linguists who emphasized on the role of strategic competence are Bachman and Palmer, their model of strategic competence includes two main areas; psycholinguistic and neurolinguistic areas. In 1990, Bachman suggested an important point which is ‘Strategic competence is the central to all communication’. He added that “It achieves its orchestrating role by carrying out a mediation role between meaning intentions (the message which is to be conveyed), and underlying competences (background knowledge and context of situation)” (p.250).

Choosing this particular model of strategic competence is that, because it assigns strategic competence as a central role which separates strategic competence from language competence. In CLA (Communicative Language Ability) framework Bachman based his model on other linguists, and researchers’ theoretical frameworks such as Hymes, Canal and Swain. Canal and Swain, for instance, they recognize strategic competence as an important component of communicative competence, and in 1980 they introduced some of the applications to their theoretical framework “syllabus design, teaching methodology, teacher training and the development of materials”(p.31-35). This framework was considered as a basis for Bachman in the development of the Communicative Language Ability Model. In CLA framework of Bachman (1990),”Strategic competence is to relate language competence to the language user’s knowledge of the world and to the features of the situation in which language use takes place and it is defined as consisting of three components:

• Assessment,

• Planning and
• Execution (Bachman, 1990, p.100)

  a) Assessment: Bachman described the component Assessment as “the one which is concerned with the information relevant to achieving a communicative goal in a given context, determining what language competencies are available for use in achieving this goal, and further evaluating whether it has been achieved.” (1990, p100-101).

  b) The planning component: Bachman defined it as “retrieves relevant items from language competence and formulates a plan whose realization is expected to achieve the communicative goal.

  c) Execution component: According to Bachman it means “draws on the relevant psychophysiological mechanisms to implement the in the modality and channel appropriate to the communicative goal and the context” (Bachman, 1990, p.103).

Later on, Bachman and Palmer (1996) considered communicative language ability as the major contributor in language performance. After providing their model in 1996, they defined strategic competence as a set of metacognitive strategies, or components, which can be considered as executive processes implementing a cognitive management function in language use.

Bachman (1990) described Communicative Language Ability as “consisting of both knowledge, or competence, and the capacity for implementing, or executing that competence in appropriate, contextualized communicative language use” (p.288). It consists of three components: language competence strategic competence and psychophysiological mechanisms. (p.84) and he explained this in Figure:
Ways to Teach Strategic Competence in EFL Classes

Since EFL learners are always struggling in communication, and sometimes they get stuck when they want to express an idea or an opinion. This is considered as one of the biggest challenges for teachers who have to find the effective ways, or methods to prepare those students for a spontaneous communication. Therefore it is known that communicative competence includes a major component, termed as strategic competence which could be a major objective of current communicative language teaching. So, it should be present to
enable them communicate easily and appropriately. In order to teach strategic competence there are two main types of strategies that should be taken into consideration; Message Adjustment Strategies and Resource Expansion Strategies (Corder 1981), or as they are termed by (Faerch and Kasper, 1983), Reduction/Avoidance Strategies for the first, and Achievement Strategies for the second one.

1.2.4.1. Message Adjustment Strategies

Dornyei and Thurrell (1991), have defined this strategy as “the strategies which involve the tailoring of one’s message to one’s resources, which involve either a slight alteration or a redaction of the message. In other words, these strategies may lead the learners to feel that what they said is vague and unclear, for example saying: ‘I know how far I can go, and what I should not even try’ (Dornyei and Thurrell, 1991, p.18).

1.2.4.2. Resource Expansion/Achievement Strategies

Dornyei and Thurrell (1991) pointed out that, students use such strategies whenever they attempt to keep up the flow of the conversation and to convey their messages and meanings more appropriately by means of various communication strategies. Thus, learners tend to draw upon one of the following strategies:

1.2.4.2.1. Paraphrase or circumlocution: describing or exemplifying the target object or action (Dornyei and Thurrell, p.18), for instance “it is something we use to dry our hands with when they are wet” for a ‘towel’.

1.2.4.2.2. Approximation: it means the use of a term which expresses the meaning of the target lexical item as closely as possible, for example “a ship “for a “sailing boat.”(Dornyei and Thurell).

1.2.4.2.3. Non-linguistic means: the use of mimes, gestures, or imitation.
1.2.4.2.4. **Borrowed or invented words:** for instance ‘house controller’ or ‘caretaker’

1.2.4.2.5. **Using Fillers or Hesitation Devices:** when learners want to keep a conversation along or when they need time to think about the answer, they may use these prefabricated patterns or conversational formulas which are called Fillers, and actually they range from a very short structures like, (well, I mean, actually, you know, so…); to phrases such as (as a matter of fact, to be quite honest, now let me think, I see what you mean…). (Dornyei and Thurrell, 1991, p.19).

1.2.4.2.6. **Appealing for Help:** the learner may tend to appealing for help from his/her interlocutor when he/she lacks that language item, for example saying;”the thing that we use to dry our hands with, what do we call?

1.2.4.2.7. **Guessing:** according to Dornyei and Scott (1997), this strategy implies a greater degree of certainty regarding the key word, for instance (oh then it is not a car, is it a bus?)

1.2.4.2.8. **Asking for Repetition:** as Rabab’AhGhaleb (2015), requesting for repetition happens when not hearing or misunderstanding something properly, for instance saying (Pardon! or What did you say, Can you say it again).

1.2.4.2.9. **Clarification Request:** asking for explanation of an unfamiliar meaning or structure (Rabab’Ah, 2004). For example, What do you mean, or You saw what?

Once teachers are aware about all these strategies and they try to apply them in their classrooms this may make some differences at the level of students’ communicative competence, their motivation to talk more and to learn new strategies to keep a conversation going. Teachers can inspire from these strategies various techniques and activities in order to fill the communicative gaps of learners and to enhance their strategic competence.
1.2.5. Teachers and Students’ Roles in Strategic Competence

Teachers are individuals in classrooms who have the knowledge, the proficiency, the tools and information to transmit knowledge and instruct students. Nowadays, teachers play major and crucial roles in attracting students attention to learn a subject or a language, at the same time students are supposed to receive the information and knowledge submitted by the teacher, also they are supposed to react to the different activities and home works posed by their teachers. The Communicative Language Approach (CLA), implies new roles for both teachers and learners since the learning process shifted from teacher-centered approach to learner-centered approach in which student and teachers plays different roles in order to have successful and motivating learning and teaching environment.

1.2.5.1. The Role of Teachers in Communicative Language Approach (Strategic Competence)

Teachers are supposed to be the main members in the classroom environment since they are the decision makers of any action taken in the classroom, also teachers provide opportunities for communicative activities which plays a major role in promoting positive personal relationships among students and between students and teachers. Among the significant roles of the teacher are as Littlewood mentioned in his book (1981, p.19), that teachers should be:

- **Passive observer**: here the teacher’s function becomes less dominant than before, but not less important, for instance once students are not agree about an issue he can solve the disagreement by offering an advice or a necessary language item, in other words his role is the source of guidance and help by being available to support his learners whenever they need help.
- **A monitor**: the teacher has to monitor and supervise his students while performing any task (role-play, interviews, conversation, answering a question …), but without interrupting or intervening them, instead he/she has to observe their weaknesses and strengths.

- **A facilitator**: the teacher needs to make sure that the students understand what they are required to do in the activity, also he can adjust the difficulty of the task.

Breen and Candlin (1980) summarized by their own words the different roles of the teacher to train their students communicatively:

The teacher has two main roles: the first role is to facilitate the communication process between all participants in the classroom, and between these participants and the various activities and texts. The second role is to act as an independent participant within the learning-teaching group. The latter role is closely related to the objectives of the first role and arises from it.(Breen and Candlin, 1980, p.99).

It is concluded that the teacher role in communicative language teaching can be varied into three main roles; a facilitator which means being the one who facilitates classroom communication and the one who states the situations, contexts and activities which aim at promoting communication. Secondly, a co-communicator by being the one who participates in activities with his students. Finally, a teacher should be an advisor who monitors his students while performing and providing any kind of help when necessary.

### 1.2.5.2. The Role of Learners in Communicative Language Teaching

It is important to bear in mind that both teachers and students are responsible for learning, traditionally teachers were considered as the dominant figure in the classroom, but this fact has changed to a learner-centered approach which makes students feel more
comfortable and communicate without any threats. So the learners now have various roles in
the classroom environment as it is mentioned by Littlewood, W.(1961):

- Participating in classroom activities which are based on cooperative rather than
individual approach to learning.
- Taking the responsibility for their own learning, rather than relying on the
  teacher all the time.
- Listeners: students need to be comfortable with listening to their peers, whether
  in group work or pair work tasks.
- They don’t have to ignore each other instead they have to communicate with
  one another and to appreciate the contribution from one another.
- Performers: students need to perform and to carry out the different tasks, role-
  plays, or any kind of activity proposed by their teacher.
- Students have to help each other whenever they face a problem or any
difficulties instead of asking the teacher for an advice.

In sum the student can offer teachers and the other students a new source of the
process teaching-learning group as a whole. Breen and Candlin (1980) summarize this idea by
arguing that: “a communicative methodology would allow both the teacher and the learner to
be interdependent participants in a communicative process of learning and teaching” (Breen
and Candlin, 1980, p.101)

1.2.6. Integrating Strategic Competence into Foreign Language Courses

The main objective of any EFL classroom or any learner of a foreign language is to be
a native-like speaking proficiency, but the common problem that most of EFL learners face is
coding and decoding messages, and the process of forming and expressing thoughts and ideas
appropriately. In order to solve this problem many linguists, researchers, lecturers, syllabus
designers and teachers suggested that learners should have new courses which facilitate the learning of the speaking abilities rather than teaching them the linguistic structures (phonology, grammar, and vocabulary,..), in the traditional way, and neglecting the use of language in situational contexts. Christina B.Pauleston, 1992, pointed out that, “within the last five years, there has been an increasing and justified concern for communicative activities in language teaching, we see evidence of this every day, in the titles of papers, and articles and dissertations”(p.37). So the teaching of the English language has changed to teach the communicative principles and strategies.

In view of the fact that strategic competence is a major component of communicative competence which solve students’ communication problems or breakdowns, it should be implemented and integrated in EFL syllabuses or courses, many linguists stressed on the necessity of teaching communication skills and strategies such as; William Littlewood in his book *Communicative Language Teaching* (1981), in chapter two he emphasized on the various communicative activities that teachers need to practice in EFL classes. Also Christina B. Paulston in her book *Linguistic and Communicative Competence* (1992), she has used the whole chapter 6 in discussing the developing of communicative competence; goals, procedures, and technique. Some lecturers suggested that strategic competence can be taught in EFL classes to improve students’ oral performance, such as Zoltan Dornyei and Sarah Thurrell they published an article in 1991 which was under the title “*Strategic Competence and how to Teach it*”, in this article they mentioned the importance of implementing strategic competence into FL classes by presenting the different strategies students need to learn, and how teachers can use those strategies to train their students like, (circumlocution, approximation, borrowing, using fillers, appealing for help..). Then in 1994, they published another article under the title “*Teaching Conversational Skills Intensively: Course Content and Rational*”, in which they presented the two main approaches to the teaching of
conversational skills in (p.41), and they added the conversational rules and structure in (p.42), and how to teach it.

Many researchers, teachers and syllabus designers recommended the integration of strategic competence into FL classes, so they made researches and presented dissertations to examine the success of the implementation of strategic competence, for instance in Indiana University (1980) Albert Valdman made a research about “Communicative Ability and Syllabus Design for Global Foreign Language Courses”, in which he reported “If we develop a curriculum based on the creative nature and communicative purpose of language, we can offer students a unique learning experience”(p.84), another researcher called Per Selin (2014), in the university of Gothenburg, he conducted a research within the Swedish National Research School for Learning Studies, in which he investigated “the Developing of Strategic Competence in Oral Interaction in English as a Foreign Language”, in his thesis he used the learning studies to answer the thesis’s questions, at the end of his research he found that pupils have changed in terms of oral performance and this happened after they were taught and have discerned the critical aspects of how to do it.

Another research which supports the implementation of strategic competence into FL classes was made by a professor and the head of Department of Linguistics in Jordan University, Dr.Ghaleb Rabab’Ah his thesis was about “The Effect of Communication Strategy Training on the Development of EFL Learners’ Strategic Competence and Oral Communicative Abilities” he concluded that, “syllabus designers are also invited to integrate these strategies into the EFL syllabi so that language learners understand that such strategies are an essential part of everyday conversation for both native and nonnative speakers”. Furthermore in the university of Indonesia (East Java), Novi Prihantento made a research about “Strategic Competence: Its Perceptions and Implementation in EFL Teacher Training &Education in East Java”, in which he explained that “The English language learning and
teaching curriculum in Indonesia adopt the notion of communicative language learning and teaching with its communicative competence as the main goal. Hence, strategic competence should be learnt and taught”.

The integration of strategic competence in EFL courses has a crucial importance in developing students’ communication abilities, interaction and motivation, at the same time teachers will benefit from this latter to have an active classroom with motivated learners, and since many linguists and researchers all around the world supported this idea, it would be very helpful to apply it in the Algerian syllabuses of EFL classes.

**Conclusion**

In summary, strategic competence is an important part from the communicative strategy. It is defined as the solver of handicap during the communication breakdowns and difficulties. Processing a language in EFL learners’ real life demands a lot of time and efforts to be accomplished. As any strategy, strategic competence has the pros and cons, since the teachability of strategic competence has been a controversial issue; the cons had been concerned with the similarities between L1 and L2, however, the pros had been concerned with not applying the L2 strategic competence. It can be taught through different strategies such as circumlocution, or code switching…etc. Teachers and learners should be aware about their roles during the classroom, because this will lead to a good and effective learning. As a matter of fact implementing and integrating strategic competence into EFL syllabi is very important and it would be a fruitful step if it is applied in the Algerian EFL syllabi.
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Introduction

This chapter is devoted to the methodology and data analysis. Specifically, it sets the task to address the quasi-experiment used to investigate the effect of the communicative competence training on the enhancement of EFL students’ strategic competence. This chapter will represent a summary of the research design, the learners who participated in the study, the materials used in the period of treatment, ending up a detailed statistical analysis of the gathered data.

2.1.1. Research Design

Out of the different methods of data collection available to find out how can communicative competence training effect EFL students’ enhancement of strategic competence, we decided to design a quasi-experiment in which we utilized pre-test/post-test for both, experimental and control group. We employed this particular method because it’s suitable for these cases:

1- Manipulation of the independent variable (the experimental group was given an enhanced materials whereas the control group was given no enhanced material just traditional materials).

2- Pre-test for both groups, experimental and control group (comparison groups).

3- Post-test for both groups, experimental and control group (comparison groups).

2.1.2. Participants

The target population of the present study is 40 third-year students of English in the English Department at L’Arbi Ben M’Hidi University, Oum El Bouaghi for the academic year 2017/2018, we have chosen the experimental group and the control group randomly. For the
Experimental group we have chosen group 03 in the department the classroom includes more than 20 student, but we have worked only with 20 of them because the others some were absent , some have missed either the pre-test or the post-test, others have skipped some of the treatment sessions . For the control group we have chosen group 04 and we also worked with 20 students to have a balance in population’s number of students.

Furthermore, we have chosen third-year students and not second or first year, because third-year students are assumed to have a higher level in the target language on one hand, and they are supposed to present role-plays and storytelling in their curriculum of the year in the other hand, so they are the ones who need more training to communicate and to speak appropriately. In addition, these students should be prepared for the next years in which they will have to present presentations and researches, also they have to be prepared to display in their master dissertation day.

Both groups are considered to be as homogeneous, and they are all Algerians native speakers of Arabic. Also all of them have gone through the same curriculum of the three past years.

2.1.3. Research Question

The following research question was addressed within the context of the present study:

How can communicative competence training effect EFL students’ enhancement of strategic competence?

In order to answer this question we hypothesis that:

$H_1$: Communicative competence training enhances EFL students’ strategic competence.

The null hypothesis was stated as follows:
H₀: Communicative competence training does not enhance EFL students’ strategic competence.

From the research question and the hypothesis mentioned above this study will examine two variables which are:

The independent variable: communicative competence training.

The dependent variable: strategic competence.

2.1.4. The Procedures

In order to measure the effect of communicative competence training on the enhancement of students’ strategic competence, a five week quasi-experiment study was designed using quantitative research methods. The schematic representation of the design is as follows:

Fig. 2 Experimental Group Procedures
2.1.5. The Experiment

2.1.5.1. The Pre-test

Both the control group and the experimental group were subject to the pre-test during the first week. Since we are examining EFL students’ oral performance and communicative competencies, so the pre-test had an oral form rather than written activities, because the written activities won’t illustrate the communication breakdowns that most of the students make. The pre-test was an interview in which students work in pairs, and we were recording their interviews. The interview was an applying for a job interview adapted from Rabab’ah, G. (2004). So students were asked to perform in the situation, ask and answer the questions spontaneously, they were provided by a paper includes the kind of questions to be asked as a guidance to them. The pre-test for both groups was exactly the same. Rabab’ah, G. (2004). suggested the activity of a role play in which students perform applying for a job interview, which we adapted in our work with some changes,

Role play: Applying for a Job

Role A. You just graduated from the University, and you applied for a position at ABC Company, whose business is translation and providing students with a wide range of services.
Role B. You are the ABC Company employer who is looking for a BA holder, and who can assist you in translating a variety of texts and do some other office duties. You received A’s CV and you want to interview him/her. Ask he some questions to make sure that he is the most suitable candidate.

Through the transcription and analysis of the interviews we find out the common communication breakdowns that most of the students repeat and face, so on the basis of the interviews’ analysis we have chosen the effective aspects of strategic competence that should be taught in the period of treatment, in order to treat their communication breakdowns.

2.1.5.2. The Treatment

In the second week, only the experimental group was exposed to the period of treatment, every session took 60 min. After the analysis of the pre-test we focused on four aspects of strategic competence to be taught which are: Circumlocution, Asking for Repetition, Guessing, and Fillers. In addition to Conversational skills that were totally ignored in their recording. So we divided the session of treatment according to the aspects as follows:

2.1.5.2.1. The First Lesson: Circumlocution and Guessing Aspects

In the first session of treatment students were presented with the circumlocution and guessing aspects of strategic competence, we started the lesson by a task which was a kind of a game so students become more motivated to the lesson, the task was having pieces of papers with different items such as; a baby, a museum, regret, a hospital…etc. Then each student will choose one of the papers randomly and try to define the item or explain it to his friends without naming it. The other students were supposed to guess what the item is, this activity was adapted from Rabab’ah, G. (2004), e.g.,

Learner A: They are used in the kitchen.
Learner B: Are they dishes?

Learner A: No, they aren’t. They are made of rubber.

Learner B: Are they gloves?

Learner A: Yes, they are.

After that we introduced the Circumlocution and guessing aspects to the students.

Table 2 The Lesson Plan of Circumlocution and Guessing aspects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The aspects</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>The lesson plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Circumlocution &amp; Guessing</td>
<td>One hour</td>
<td>- The warm up: 15 min for a task (kind of game), in which each student had a piece of paper that includes an item, and then the student was supposed to explain or define the item without naming it. His/her classmates were supposed to guess the item. Most of the students participated and were motivated for the game.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- The lesson 45min : students were exposed to the lesson of circumlocution and guessing aspects taken from ZoltdnDomyei and Sarah Thurrell (1991),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1- Paraphrase or circumlocution, i.e. defining, describing or exemplifying the target object or action (e.g. the thing you open wine bottles with for corkscrew, or small fast military plane for fighter)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2- Guessing is similar to a confirmation request but the latter implies a greater degree of certainty regarding the key</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
word, whereas guessing involves real indecision. (e.g. Oh. It is then not the washing machine. Is it a sink?).

2.1.5.2.2. The Second Lesson: Conversational Skills and Asking for Repetition Aspects

Students were exposed to listen one of their recording in which there were no use of conversational skills (the opening and closing of the conversation), and in which also the ask for repetition was not well used. Then students were presented to the lesson of Conversational Skills and Asking for Repetition aspect.

Tabl.3 The Lesson Plan of CS and Asking for Repetition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The aspects</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>The lesson plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conversational Skills &amp;</td>
<td>One hour</td>
<td>-Warm up: 15 min, students were exposed to one of their recording in which there were no conversational skills, and we drive their attention to this gap.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asking for Repetition Aspects</td>
<td></td>
<td>- The lesson: 45min, the lesson taken from ZoltdnDomyei and Sarah Thurrell (1994), The opening and closing of a conversation:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1- Openings: There are many ways of starting a conversation, and most of them are fairly ritualized as, for example, in different sequences</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
of greetings and introductions (e.g. *How are you? I Fine thanks. And you?*). Other ways of initiating a chat include questions (*Excuse me, do you know ..?*), comment on the weather (*At last some sunshine!*).

2-Closings: Unless we want to be deliberately rude, we cannot end a conversation by simply saying, 'Well, that's all I want to say, bye', or, on the phone, just hang up abruptly without any notice. Instead, people typically apply a sequence of pre-closing and closing formulae to prepare the grounds for ending a conversation (e.g. *It's been nice talking to you . . ., Well, I don't want to keep you from your work ..., We must get together sometime ...*).

3-Asking for repetition: Requesting repetition when not hearing or misunderstanding something properly (e.g., *Pardon!, what did you say, Can you say it again?).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.1.2.5.3. The Third Lesson: Using Fillers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

In this session students were introduced to the aspect Using Fillers, including its short structures and phrases. Then they were exposed to a one of the Ellen TV show titled “The Women Who Defended a Muslim Subway Rider”, this show is very famous and most of the
students liked the Ellen show, so students were asked to pick up all the fillers used by the speakers in the show (the fillers that they have learnt in the session), and to set them in a table one column for the short structures and the other one for the phrases.

Table.4 The Lesson Plan of Using Fillers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The aspects</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>The lesson plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Fillers     | One hour | -lesson :45min, students were introduced to the lesson of fillers, taken from Domyei and Sarah Thurrell (1991), The knowledge and confident use of fillers are a crucial part of learners' strategic competence, since these invaluable delaying or hesitation devices can be used to carry on the conversation at times of difficulty, when language learners would otherwise end up feeling more and more desperate and would typically grind to a halt. Examples of fillers range from very short structures (well; I mean; actually; you know), to what are almost phrases (as a matter of fact; to be quite honest; now let me think; I'll tell you what; I see what you mean; etc.). -Activity: 15min, students were exposed to video of the Ellen TV show titled “The Women Who Defended a Muslim Subway Rider”, then they were asked to pick up all the fillers used by the speakers,
2.1.5.3. The Post-test

The post-test was administered during the fifth week. The post-test was similar to the pre-test in terms of; form and aspects of strategic competence. Another interview was given to the students but within another topic which is talking about movies. So like the pre-test students were asked to perform in the situation, ask and answer the questions spontaneously, they were provided by a paper includes the kind of questions to be asked as a guidance to them, and they were recorded.

2.1.5.4. Scoring Procedures

As far as the scoring was concerned, after the transcription of the interviews each breakdown was given a point for its frequency in the interview. It was organized as follows:

- Hesitation (aah), each time it is said scored 01.
- Incomplete Sentences, each time it is said scored 01.
- Saying (ummh), each time it is said scored 01.
- Silence (…..), each time it is occurred scored 01.
- Repetition, each time it is occurred scored 01.
- Conversational Skills (the opening and closing of the conversation, and the asking for repetition), yes/no
- Using fillers, each time it is said scored 01.
• Saying (I don’t know), each time it is said scored 01.

2.1.5.5. Materials

It is noteworthy to mention that all the materials used in this study are authentic materials taken either from the internet, books, newspaper articles, or in published works. Most of them were widely used in testing EFL learners’ strategic competence.

2.1.6. Data Analysis and Results

In this section all the retrieved data will be presented and analyzed. The statistical procedures carried out are common in the social sciences. T-test was used to find out whether providing students with lessons to be communicatively competent significantly improved their post-test performance as compared to their pre-test performance.

2.1.6.1. Pre-test Results

The participants in both the experimental and the control group were asked to have a recorded interview i.e, one asks a question the other one answers.

It is worth that the questions are arranged in appendices as a guide.

2.1.6.1.1. Participants’ Scores in the Pre-test

The data were re-coded using SPSS for the sake of making results more analogous and easier to be interpreted. Table.5 and figure4 Explain Participants’ Scores in the Pre-test:
2.1.6.1.1 The Experimental Group Pre-Test Results

With the help of SPSS, the participants’ standard scores are calculated and arranged in the following table:

Table 5 Descriptive Statistics of the Participants’ Standard Scores on the Experimental Group Pre-Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Missing</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>5,272</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The overall mean score of the experimental group before the treatment was M= 13.3 (SD= 5,272). The minimum score was 7 and the maximum one was 25. The most frequent values are, clearly, 10 and 11.

2.1.6.1.1.2 The control group pre-test results

Participants in the control group received the same pre-test as the experimental group and we followed the same procedure in analyzing it.

The data were re-coded using SPSS, for the sake of making results more analogous and easier to be interpreted. More details are in the following table:
Table 6. Descriptive Statistics of the Participants’ Standard Scores on the control Group Pre-Test

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>4,346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The overall mean score of the control group was M=13.9 (SD=4,346). The minimum score was 5 and the maximum on was 17. We can notice in this group the communicative skills are low. The most frequent value is, clearly, 7.

2.1.6.1.1.3 Experimental Group vs. Control Group Results on the Pre-Test

Data of experimental and the control groups on the pre-test are summarized as follow, we can notice that:

- There is no great difference between the descriptive statistics of both groups.
- There is no difference in their level, they both have communication breakdowns.
- The mean score (M) of the experimental group as well as the control group ranges between [13-13.9], the mean was approximately the same; 13.3~13.9
- The standard deviation (SD) of both groups is almost identical, but the standard of experimental group is higher than the one of the control group.
As a result, their pre-test range does not differ a lot. This can help us later when comparing the scores of the post-test; if the learners of both groups started from approximately the same level, any difference in the post-test results will be due to the treatment.

Table 7: Participants’ Scores in the Pre-test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control Group</th>
<th>Pre-test</th>
<th>Experimental Group</th>
<th>Pre-test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sum = 139  Sum = 133
Mean = 13.9 Mean = 13.3
From figure 4 we can notice that frequency of distribution of the pre-test of the control group 6 (lowest scored interview) and 7 (highest scored interview) with the peak 7 (the most frequent scored interview). For the experimental group, 7 (lowest scored interview) and (highest scored interview) with the peak 6 (the most frequent scored interview).

2.1.6.2 Post-test Results

2.1.6.2.1 Participants’ Scores on the Post-Test

2.1.6.2.1.1 Control Group Pre-test Scores Vs Control Group Post-test Scores

Table 8 Control Group Pre-test Scores Vs Control Group Post-test Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control Group</th>
<th>Pre-test</th>
<th>Post-test</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2.1.6.2.1.2 The control group’ results on the post-test

With the help of SPSS, the participants’ standard scores are calculated and arranged in the following table:

*Table 9. Descriptive Statistics of the Participants’ Standard Scores on the control Group Post-Test*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Missing</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>8.832</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is pretty remarkable from the above table that, the overall Mean score of the control group in the post-test was, $M=14$ (SD= 8.832) The Minimum score was 4 and the Maximum score was 33.
2.1.6.2.1.3 The experimental group’ results on the post-test

Using the SPSS, we calculated the participants’ standard scores and they are arranged in the following table:

Table 10. Descriptive Statistics of the Participants’ Standard Scores on the Experimental Group Post-Test

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N Valid</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Missing</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>2,079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The overall Mean score of the experimental group after the treatment sessions was M=11.10 (SD= 2,079). The Minimum score was 9 and the Maximum score was 15.

2.1.6.1.4. Experimental Group vs. Control Group Results on the Post-Test

We shall first calculate the means

\[ \bar{X}_c \text{ pr} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{20} f_i x_i \] this will give us \( \bar{X}_c \text{ pr} = 13.9 \)

\[ \bar{X}_c \text{ po} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{20} f_i x_i \] this will give us \( \bar{X}_c \text{ po} = 13.7 \)

The difference score between the mean of the pre-test and the post-test is:

\[ d = \bar{X}_c \text{ po} - \bar{X}_c \text{ pr} = -0.2 \]

The \( d \) value shows that there was not a remarkable improvement, statistical this is not significant (still under the average score).
From the table and the figure above, we can notice that the control group recorded a low post-test mean ($\bar{X}_c^{po} = 13.7$) then the pre-test mean($\bar{X}_c^{pr} = 13.9$), which is an indication of improvement but this latter (improvement of decreasing communication breakdowns) is not remarkable and that is evident when we consider the mean difference

$$d = -0.2.$$  

2.1.6.3 Experimental Group Post-Test vs. Experimental Group Pre-Test 

Table.11 Experimental Group’s difference Scores between the Pre-test and Post-test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experimental Group</th>
<th>Pre-test</th>
<th>Post-test</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We shall first calculate the means

\[ X^E_{pr} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{20} f_i x_i \] this will give us \( X^E_{pr} = 13.3 \)

\[ X^E_{po} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{20} f_i x_i \] this will give us \( X^E_{po} = 8.9 \)

The difference score between the pre-test and the post-test is

\[ d = X^E_{po} - X^E_{pr} = -4.4 \]

Fig. 6 Experimental Group’s difference Scores between the Pre-test and Post-test
From experimental group’s difference scores between the pre-test and post-test, we can notice that the scores of the experimental group improved significantly. The significance is evident when we see that, the scores of the interviews on the post-test have decreased than their counterpart of the pre-test. In order to determine if the difference between the experimental group pre and post-tests is statistically significant we made use of the paired sample t test by using a tool called SPSS.

**2.1.6.4 Paired Sample T Test**

*Table 12. The paired sample t-test*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paired Differences</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 1 Expost - Expre</td>
<td>4.400</td>
<td>6.94742</td>
<td>2.19697</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table shows that the p value is less than 0.05 because (0.076/2 > 0.05 one tail counted). So, the scores of communicative breakdowns in the post-test are lower than the pre-test. Those results shows that there has been a significant improvement in the experimental group scores, this improvement is really due to the manipulation of the independent variable which is in this case, the communicative competence training. In other words, the independent variable (communicative competence) has a positive effect on the dependent variable (strategic competence).
2.1.6.5 Independent Sample T-Test

2.1.6.5.1 The Independent t-test Control Group vs. Experimental Group Scores on the Post-test

Unlike the paired sample t-test which is used to compare the means (d) in the same group before and after the period of treatment, the independent t-test is used to compare the means (d) of two different groups; control group and experimental group.

*Table 13. Control Group vs. Experimental Group Scores on the Post-test*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control Group</th>
<th>Post-test</th>
<th>Experimental Group</th>
<th>Post-test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sum = 137  
Mean = 13.7

Sum = 89  
Mean = 8.9

The table shows both the experimental and control group scores on the post-test, it can be noticed that there is significant difference between both groups. The experimental group’s Mean is M= 8.9, while the control group’s Mean is M=13.7. This significant difference is actually due to the treatment’s period that the experimental group experienced.
This figure shows the difference between the experimental group’s scores and the control groups’ scores on the post-test, it is remarkable that the frequency of using communicative breakdowns has decreased at the level of the experimental group, 2 (lowest scored interview) and 6 (highest scored interview), while the control group, 3 (lowest scored interview) and 8 (highest scored interview).

2.1.6.5.2 The P value

To determine if the control and the experimental groups are significantly different we make use of the independent sample t test by using SPSS. The P-value enables us to check if there is a significance difference between the two groups or not:

\[ P \leq 0.05 \text{ means: there is a significant difference between the two groups.} \]

\[ P \geq 0.05 \text{ means: there is no significant difference between the two groups.} \]
Table 14. The independent sample t-test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Levene's Test for Equality of Variances</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ScoresP post</td>
<td>1.268</td>
<td>.275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table shows that the p value is more than (0.05) because (0.092/2 < 0.05 one tail counted). So, the experimental group and the control group are significantly different. As a result, the communication breakdowns in the experimental group are significantly lower than the control group. In other words, the independent variable (communicative competence) has a positive effect on the dependent variable (strategic competence).

From the comparison of the experimental group and the control group results on the post-test we can summarize the following:

- Unlike the pre-test where there was no great difference between the descriptive statistics of both groups. There is a remarkable decrease of the level of making communication breakdowns in the experimental group post-test results.
- The mean score (M) of the experimental group ranges between [8; 8.9], whereas the mean score (M) of the control group ranges between [13; 13.7].
- The experimental group participants had a high level of using strategic competence aspects, whereas the control had a low level of using strategic competence aspects.
It is noticed also, that the experimental group participants’ communication skills had improved through the use of the aspects they have learnt in the period of treatment.
2.2. Teachers’ Questionnaire

Introduction

This chapter is concerned with the analysis of data. It includes the choice of the method, the sample, description, administration, analysis and summary of the results of teachers’ questionnaire. The aim of teachers’ questionnaire is to get a better understanding of how teachers see the implementation of strategic competence in EFL curriculum is important. At the end of this chapter, we will see the results obtained from the questionnaire and make a general evaluation of the validity of the research hypothesis.

2.2.1. The Choice of the Method

The method used to answers the second question of this research is a descriptive survey method, by means of a questionnaire. Due to, the answer the question the degree of teachers’ agreement about implementing strategic competence in EFL curriculum. In addition, we have chosen the descriptive method in order to have a comprehensive perspective of our present work and because we regard it as the appropriate method that will lead to valid results.

2.2.2 The Sample

This research has dealt with ten teachers of oral expression module at Larbi Ben M’Hidi university of Oum El Bouaghi. The choice of working with those particular teachers was deliberate because in the oral expression module students are supposed to talk whether debating, playing role plays, having conversation, answering questions (of the teacher, or of their classmates), or making interviews. So here the teacher can observe the students’ communication level, strategies, and skills and his role is to figure out the different ways to enhance and develop their communication competences, so it would be more reliable to deal with teachers of oral expression module.
2.2.3 The Description of the Questionnaire

This questionnaire is composed of 15 questions including both open and close-ended questions. Furthermore, it provides a free space for their personal suggestions. It includes five main sections:

**Section one:** consists of 03 questions aimed at determining general information about teachers’ gender, educational qualifications, and their experience in teaching English.

**Section two:** consists of 04 questions. This section is about the teachers’ opinions about the role of teaching communication strategies in EFL classes, highlighting the students’ level in communication, and in what ways can communication training influence students speaking abilities.

Example: According to your experience in teaching how can you evaluate your students’ level in communication?

| Below the average | Average | Above the average |

**Section three:** it consists of 05 questions intended to determine teachers’ use of strategic competence in the classroom. Drawing their attention to the different obstacles and difficulties that students face during classroom interaction. Furthermore, it looks for recognizing the way teachers train their students to be communicatively competent. Also it seeks to report their opinions about the suitable aspect of strategic competence to be taught in order to improve their speaking abilities.

Example: Do your learners face difficulties while classroom interaction? Yes/No. Justify

**Section four:** this section consists of 02 questions, aimed at determining the effect of the communication competence training on strategic competence. The first question seeks to determine the effect of the communicative training on students’ motivation, and the second one aims at figuring out the possibility of implementing strategic competence in EFL curriculum, and giving the participants the chance to justify whatever was their the answer.
Example: Do you believe that including strategic competence in EFL curriculum would be useful and effective? Yes/No. Justify

Section five: it consists of one question which is about giving further comments or suggestions about the issue.

2.2.4. Administration of the Questionnaire

This research has dealt with ten teachers of oral expression module at L’Arbi Ben M’Hidi university of Oum El Bouaghi, in the first half of the second semester of the academic year 2017-2018. The sample consists of ten teachers of oral expression module who have experience in teaching English, and particularly teaching oral expression module. The teachers asked for time to answer the questionnaire, which was distributed individually so they returned it back a day after; the questionnaire was a self-administered questionnaire in which the participants answered the questions without any help or intervention from us. So their answers were very fruitful and serious.

2.2.5. Analysis of the Questionnaire

Section One: Background Information Questions

Item One: Gender

*Fig. 8 Teachers’ Gender*
From these results, one can notice that both males and females teachers are teaching oral expression module and they were interested in answering most of the questionnaire’s questions.

**Item 2: Educational Qualification**

Fig. 9 Teachers’ Educational Qualification

This question was asked for the reason that teachers’ educational qualification has an important role in the efficiency of teaching oral expression module. Teachers’ answers reveal that 10% of the teachers have a Ph.D, and 90% of them have a Magister degree, while there is no one has a Master degree. This means that all of them are qualified enough to teach oral expression module.

**Item 3: How long have you been teaching English as a foreign language?**
Fig. 10 Teachers’ Experience in Teaching English as a Foreign Language

The reason why this question was asked, is to examine whether teachers’ experience affects students’ communicative competence. 40% of the teachers have been teaching English for more than 10 years, while the others they have more than 4 years of teaching English; this implies that they have enough experience in teaching oral expression module and to evaluate students’ level and problems during classroom interaction. So the experience has no effect on students’ failure in having a healthy communication.

Section Two: Teaching Communication Strategies

Item 1: According to your experience in teaching how can you evaluate your students’ level in communication?

Table 1.5 Teacher’s Evaluation of Students’ Level in Communication

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answers</th>
<th>Teachers’ number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below the average</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>70 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above the average</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This item of information aims at determining how teachers evaluate students’ level in communication, so most of teachers see that students’ level is average, while 30% of them see that student’s level in communication is below the average. So many students may have communication problems, and teachers considered it as an average level since students are not native speakers of English.

**Item 2:** Do you think that communication training is important for learners?

*Table.16 The importance of communication training for learners*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answers</th>
<th>Teachers’ number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the aforementioned results, all the teachers agreed and emphasized on the importance of the communication training for learners. The result that can be drawn from these answers is that, the communication competence training is very important and helpful to develop students’ strategic competence.

**Item 3:** If yes, do you think that because it:
There are different views about the reason why communication training is important for learners. 70% of them agreed on all the reasons for the importance of the communicative training, namely, to improve students’ vocabulary, to improve students’ classroom interaction, and to improve students’ fluency. So those teachers believe that the communicative training has a crucial importance to develop students’ strategic competence and communicational skills, since it improves their vocabulary, fluency and classroom interaction and motivation. Whereas 20% of them believed that the communication training is essential because it improves students’ vocabulary, this may reveal that the major problem that students face in the classroom is the lack of vocabulary, and the communicative training can solve such a problem; 10% of the teachers considered the communication training as a method to improve students’ fluency, this may display that since students are not native speakers of the language, so they need a method (which would be the communicative training) to improve their fluency.

**Item 4:** The more students are trained communicatively, the more their speaking abilities will be developed.
Table 1.7 Teachers’ Degree of Agreement about the Development of Students’ Speaking Abilities when they are Trained Communicatively

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answers</th>
<th>Teachers’ number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This question aimed at determining the teachers’ degree of agreement about the development of students’ speaking abilities when they are trained to be communicatively competent. So 50% of the respondents’ answers reveal that the teachers are strongly agree about the issue; the more students are trained communicatively, the more their speaking abilities will develop. While the other 50% of the respondents’ answers reveal that they are agree about the same suggestion. Therefore the result that can be drawn from this is that all the teachers support the teaching and the training of communicative strategies and skills, since it has many benefits for both teachers and learners.

**Item 5**: Do your learners face difficulties while classroom interaction

*Fig. 12 Students’ Difficulties during Classroom Interaction*
This question intends to determine if EFL students encounter difficulties during classroom interaction. So 90% of the teachers find that most of EFL students face difficulties while interacting in the classroom; and just 10% of them denied having any problems while interacting in the classroom. As a result, the majority of EFL students find it hard to express their thoughts appropriately, and they come across a lot of difficulties and obstacles, whether in terms of finding the appropriate vocabulary, the right structure, or other difficulties.

**Item 6: If yes, what kind of difficulties?**

The teachers who answered by YES, they were supposed to justify their answer by mentioning the kind of difficulties that their students face. From their answers it can be noticed that the kind of difficulties can be linguistic problems, or psychological problems.

*Table 18. The Linguistic and Psychological Problems that Students Face*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Linguistic Problems</strong></th>
<th><strong>Psychological Problems</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-Shortage in lexical or lack of vocabulary</td>
<td>-Shyness and cannot express their feeling in open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Shortage in grammatical knowledge</td>
<td>-Hesitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Lack of mastery of communication skills and strategies</td>
<td>-Lack of confidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Lack of fluency</td>
<td>-Presenting facts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Proficiency level</td>
<td>-Anxiety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Convincing</td>
<td>-Inhibition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Lack of ideas</td>
<td>-Fear of making mistakes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above answers reveal that most of EFL students share the same problems, and teachers see that the communication training can solve such problems. So whether the problem was in terms of students’ linguistic background, or in terms of the student’s psychology and self-esteem; this will be reflected in his/her oral performance. Thus the
assumption that can be drawn from these answers is that there is a certain problem that can be referred back the way of teaching oral expression module, also this shows that there is a necessity to develop students’ communication skills and strategies to exceed such difficulties.

**Item 7: How do you usually train your students communicatively?**

This open question aimed at determining how teachers train their students to become communicatively competent and to develop their speaking abilities in the target language. So each teacher suggested his/her own method to train his/her students, these suggestions are the following:

- Teacher 01: “I usually train my students by making them perform discussions and oral tasks; also by teaching them the principles of communication such as when and how to use the appropriate vocabulary.”

- Teacher 02: “I usually train my students by teaching them to respect turn-taking when communication (conversations); in addition the method of increasing students’ talking time and decreasing teachers’ talking time is very helpful to encourage them to talk more.”

- Teacher 03: “I usually train my students to develop their communicational skills by not interrupting them when they are talking, as well as avoiding the negative feedback.”

- Teacher 04: “The methods I generally use to train my students communicatively, since I teach them oral expression module, is by taking into account their preferences in terms of topics and classroom activities, besides encouraging them to raise their hands to answer or to give any comments about the issue.”

- Teacher 05: “I think the best way to train the students communicatively is by giving them positive feedback and try to start the lesson by asking questions about the previous lesson.”

- Teacher 06: “Students can develop their communicative competence through asking them questions, making comparisons, and doing a technique in the oral expression session called ‘STATE OF MIND’ by which they have to express their feeling.”
Teacher 07: “In the oral expression module I try to make my student moving from guided speech to debating then to free speech, and encouraging them by positive feedback”.

Teacher 08: “I usually train the students by exposing them to context-based tasks, also support them to work cooperatively”.

Teacher 09: “In order to develop students’ communication strategies I use language games such as, TONGUE TWISTER activities that help them to develop their speaking abilities, and tips about contraction...etc.”

Teacher 10: He gave no answer.

From the above answers it is noticed that most of the teachers are trying to train their students to be communicatively competent through various methods and strategies.

**Item 8:** In your opinion, which of the following aspects are more beneficial to teach strategic competence?

*Fig. 13 Teachers’ Opinions about the more Beneficial Aspect of SC to Be Taught*

The majority of teachers (50 %) think that students need to be taught all the aspects of strategic competence (circumlocution, appealing for help, asking for repetition, using fillers). Whereas 20% of them think that students should be taught how to define and describe an object by giving a short definition or description (circumlocution). The other 10 % of the teachers think that as teachers they have to teach their students how to ask for repetition appropriately. For the other 10 % of teachers, they see that learners would be better taught...
how to appeal the help from his/her interlocutor. The last 10% of teachers believe that the use of fillers can be the best aspect to teach EFL students. This results shows that most of the teachers are supporting the teaching of the aspects of strategic competence whatever was the aspect’s benefit since it would enhance the oral performance of EFL students.

**Item 9:** To what extent do you think that teaching strategic competence is helpful to improve your students’ communication abilities?

*Table 19 The Extent to which Teachers Think that Teaching SC Is Helpful for Students’ Communication Abilities Improvement*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answers</th>
<th>Teachers’ Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Helpful</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somehow helpful</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less helpful</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The reason behind asking this question is to see the extent to which teachers think that teaching strategic competence is helpful to improve students’ communication abilities. Most of the respondents’ answers (80%) reveal that teachers see that teaching strategic competence is helpful for the improvement of students’ communication abilities; whereas only 20% of them think that the teaching if strategic competence is somehow helpful. This can lead to the result that most of oral expression teachers are encouraging the teaching of strategic competence since they see it is very helpful and can improve students’ speaking performance.

**Section Four: The Effect of Communication Training on Strategic Competence**

**Item 1:** To what extent do you think that communication training motivates your students?
Table.20 the Extent to which Teachers Think that Communication Training Motivates Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answers</th>
<th>Teachers’ Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Motivating</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somehow motivating</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less motivating</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the above results, we can notice that all the teachers believe that communication training (CT) motivates students. For that reason the implementation of the teaching of the communication training to enhance students’ speaking abilities is important.

**Item 2:** Do you believe that including strategic competence in EFL curriculum would be useful and effective?

Table.21 the Effectiveness of Including Strategic Competence in EFL Curriculum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answers</th>
<th>Teachers’ Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All the teachers believed that the implementation of strategic competence in EFL curriculum is effective and useful, this means that including strategic competence in EFL courses has a crucial importance and the three must be a move and a change in the present curriculum or syllabus of EFL educational system. This change appears in including the teaching of strategic competence in EFL curriculum through communication training.

**Justification of the answer**

Some of the teachers justified their answer by saying:
Teacher 1: “It may be beneficial if taught and well-used.“.
Teacher 2: “to raise students’ motivation and enhance their interaction in the classroom“.
Teacher 3: “It helps in raising their motivation to take part in the classroom”.
Teacher 4: “It builds up a kind of level that would support the other four skills”.
Teacher 5: “They are important pedagogical tools in learning and teaching; also they enable learners to develop their competence in various skills”.
Teacher 6: “If the student does not interact, it will be difficult for him to communicate in the future, but when he is trained communicatively this problem will be solved“.
Teacher 7: “It would help them enhance their strategic competence and, by extension, communicative competence”.

Other teachers did not justify their answer.

This answers and justifications show that the majority of teachers believe that there is a necessity to integrate strategic competence in the EFL courses due to its advantages in developing students’ speaking abilities, motivation and classroom interaction.

**Section Five: Further Comments /Suggestions**

This section aimed at determining teachers’ comments or any further suggestion about the issue. So only two teachers gave their comments and added a suggestion:

Teacher 1: “success in communication using the target language is an aim of all EFL students. How well they communicate reflects their level, and competence that’s why EFL teachers should look for effective way to improve it”

Teacher 2: “Our department needs a change at the level of EFL syllabus by adding the teaching of communicative principles and strategies because it builds up their communicative competence”.  
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6. Summary of the Finding from Teachers’ Questionnaire

- Teachers of oral expression have the qualification and enough experience to teach oral expression module with the required proficiency.
- Teachers notice that most of EFL students face difficulties and obstacles during classroom interaction.
- Teachers are aware of the importance of the communicative training to EFL learners, since it improves students’ vocabulary, fluency, and classroom interaction.
- Teachers pointed out that the main reasons for students communication obstacles are linguistic problems (lack of lexis and grammatical knowledge) and psychological problems (anxiety, shyness…etc.).
- The most important fact discovered through the analysis of the teachers’ questionnaire is that teaching strategic competence and its aspects is very helpful and its implementation in EFL curriculum is important.

In sum, it is proved that oral expression module is taught in a mere theoretical way, students do not receive any courses about communicative competence, communicative principles, and strategies that is why most of them face difficulties when it comes to communicate and make a healthy conversations in the target language. All the teachers believe that integrating strategic competence in EFL curriculum is an important change in the English department. Therefore, the hypothesis of this study is confirmed.

2.2.6. General Discussion

This study was conducted to fulfill two main aspirations; the first had to do with the effect of the communicative competence training in enhancing EFL student’s strategic competence which required an experiment to be executed. The second supplementary point, was to find out whether or not teachers agree about integrating strategic competence into EFL curriculum. The two questions that demanded to be answered entailed one possible alternative
hypothesis; the quasi-experiment’s results would confirm or reject the hypothesis which states that the communicative competence training will enhance EFL students’ strategic competence. While the results of the teachers’ questionnaire would provide an investigation about teachers’ attitudes towards the integration of strategic competence into EFL curriculum. The questionnaire results, in turn support the hypothesis of this study.

On the whole, there has been an adequate amount of improvement that resulted in the confirmation of the hypothesis owing to the strategic competence lessons treatment which is noteworthy amplified the scores of the experimental group. Furthermore, the second aspiration of this study, the integration of strategic competence into EFL students’ curriculum, has also been validated through the analysis and interpretation of the data gathered from the questionnaire. Nonetheless, there are some points to be discussed concerning the pre-test and the post-test results of both groups. The experimental and the control group as well as some remarks that belong to the teachers’ questionnaire results.

- **The Control Group Results**

   It has been revealed that both, the experimental and the control group have, approximately, second similar results on the pre-test, this was significant; the mean in the control group was (M=13,9), and the experimental group was (M=13,3) ,so, it can be noticed that both groups have approximate mean value, besides the individual scores of both groups were also approximate values, for the control group the individual score was estimated by $x_2= 6,92$, in the other group was estimated by $x_1= 7,07$, so these calculations drive as to understand that, the experimental and the control group participants have the same level, the same communicative competence and they have the same degree of frequency of making common communication breakdowns.
But, in the post-test there was a significant difference at the level of the mean value (M=8.9) in the experimental group, whereas in the control group (M=13.7). Another significance was at the level of the t value, in the experimental t= 3.37, whereas in the control group was t= 3.75. This significance goes back to that the control group didn’t receive any input that can allow them to develop strategic competence and communicative skills. That is, despite the fact that the students were exposed to authentic language in the oral expression class, there remains a need of deliberately implementing the teaching of strategic competence in EFL classrooms, otherwise there would occur no improvement in their communicative strategies and skills.

• **The Experimental Group Results**

Unlike the control group, the experimental group showed a significant improvement in the post-test, since the experimental group’s participants underwent a sequence of lessons about strategic competence and communicative skills along with the treatment period. This significance can be noticed that all students’ scores of the experimental group have significantly improved x=10.71, whereas it was x=7.07 in the pre-test, and when we compare this value to the control group x=9. It is observed that there is a change and a significant difference for both groups. Now, since the only interfering variable was the communicative competence training. We can simply conclude that the communicative competence training was the responsible for the improvement that has been recorded. The communicative competence training does have a positive effect on enhancing students’ strategic competence.

• **Teachers’ Questionnaire**

In order to support the confirmation of our study, the teachers’ questionnaire was conducted aiming at investigating teachers’ attitude towards the implementation of strategic
Most of the teachers believed that EFL students need to be trained communicatively, so they enhance their strategic competence and overcome their communicative obstacles. So, 50% of the respondents' answers revealed that the teachers strongly agree about the issue. The more students are trained communicatively, the more their speaking abilities will develop.

- The current EFL curriculum does not include any courses that provide them with the lessons of the communication training.

- Integrating strategic competence in EFL curriculum is an important change in the English department. 100% of the teachers agreed and emphasized on the importance of the communication training for learners.

**Conclusion**

The findings of this study show that the experimental group largely outperformed the control group in the post-test. This significant improvement has been statistically proved to be due to the communicative competence training (in the period of treatment) because if the traditional materials where as effective as the communicative competence training, we should have recorded some remarkable improvement in the control group performance in the post-test (something that didn’t happen). From the questionnaire results we can conclude that most of the teachers in the English department support and encourage the idea of implementing strategic competence in EFL curriculum, which in turns, supports the hypothesis of the study that is the communicative competence training enhance students’ strategic competence.
General Conclusion

The fact of having a native-like proficiency in the goal of any EFL learner, so one of the researchers’ major concerns is to develop the speaking skills and the communicative strategies. In order to enable EFL learners to speak and communicate appropriately whatever the situation was and this fact formed the basis of the current investigation. The main aim was to highlight the effect of communicative competence training on developing and enhancing EFL students’ strategic competence. Consequently, two research methods (a mixed method) were opted to fulfill the desired objectives; the quasi-experimental design that pinpointed the enhancement of strategic competence training, the experiment involved a treatment that included both written and spoken instructions as well as the use of authentic materials, and a questionnaire to investigate teachers’ attitudes towards the teaching of strategic competence and the communicative training in their classes. The results approve the hypothesis of the research in that there revealed a significant difference between the pre- and post-test scores of the participants who underwent the treatment, at the same time the questionnaire’s results transpired a high level of teachers agreements about the implementation and the teaching of strategic competence in EFL classes which in turn supports the hypothesis of our research. In general, the results displayed that the communicative competence training enhance EFL students’ strategic competence.
Pedagogical Implementations

Within the framework of teaching languages, it has been conventionally to teach the speaking skill as a primary importance. Since the ultimate goal of any EFL learner is to be able to speak, and communicate with the target language appropriately in any situation. The present study revealed how the communicative competence training can enhance students’ strategic competence, in turn, this training improved their speaking abilities and communicative skills. Therefore, when engaging in the teaching of communicative strategies and skills, teachers and syllabus designers should take into account such considerations. Teachers should take into account:

- Raising students’ awareness towards the use of communication strategies in daily communication.
- Provide the students with the definitions and examples of how to use the communicative strategies.
- Showing students that even native speakers do use the communicative strategies when communication is difficult, so that they make use of them to avoid communication breakdowns.
- Teachers have to encourage the students to use communication strategies and skills, in order to maintain in a conversation and to negotiate meaning to arrive at the intended message and a mutual comprehension with the interlocutor.
- Instead of teaching students only language function and structures, it would be better to teach them how to keep along in a conversation.

Syllabus designers are also invited to implement these strategies into EFL syllabi taking into account:
• EFL learners need to understand that such strategies have a crucial part in every day conversation for both native and non-native speakers.

• Integrating communicative strategies and skills can solve numerous speaking problems that most of EFL learners are suffering from.

• Being skillful in the use of communication strategies, can compensate classroom interaction and create a motivating teaching-learning environment.

Limitations of the Study

In our attempt to investigate the effect of communicative competence training on enhancing EFL students’ strategic competence, the results were not entirely satisfactory due to many problems we have encountered that we will mention:

1- The limited span of time, the results of this study would have been much better if it was conducted in more than a number of months, the limited span of time can affect the results positively or negatively.

2- Always with the problem of the limited time, the post-test was conducted after the holydays. So we had to make a recapitulation session of the previous lessons before conducting the post-test.

3- Many students were not cooperative, since many of them didn’t like to speak especially in the control group, yet the experimental group were not cooperative in the beginning of the study but after the lessons they changed.

4- Finally, we would like to add that finding sessions to handle our study was the hardest challenge, since teachers can’t give us the whole session because they have courses to finish.
Suggestions for Further Research

Regarding the obstacles that disrupted the research from being more accurate, a number of suggestions are recommended for further research. It will be of great abundance if future researchers work on the following suggestion:

- The present study is of a quantitative nature, if researchers alternatively make a qualitative study in which a questionnaire to students and teachers are designed, in order to investigate both teachers and learners attitudes towards the integration of strategic competence courses into EFL syllabi.

- The sample of this study is 3rd year LMD students, which was a good one since students have benefited from the experience. Future researchers can choose another sample such as the middle school students as being the level in which students can build up the basic backgrounds of the language.

We also suggest for future study, in which the other aspects of strategic competence (Approximation, confirmation request, borrowed or invented words, non-linguistic means) can be covered, and given more attention to be taught.
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Appendix A: the Pre-test

Both the control and the experimental group will have a test to examine their communication competencies.

Task 1: Applying for a job

The task is an interview for work application, it requires dividing students into pairs. Student A is supposed to be the principal (the one who asks questions to evaluate the teacher’s qualities).

Student B is supposed to be the teacher (the one who seeks to get the job).

-The principal asks the teacher about the following information:

1. Qualifications

1.1 Education (college, refresher courses, in-training courses)

2.1 Experience (number of years, city, and kind of school)

2. Personal information (this information gives the principal a picture of the person, not just the worker)

1.2 College graduation date

2.2 Health and the social status (married or single).

3.2 Community activities

4.2 Interests

5.2 Marital status

3. Salary
4. Questions to determine whether the teacher is suited to the job or not?

- Do you like teaching?

- What will you do once you have a classroom with slow learners?

- Do you think that screaming on students to get their attention is effective?

- When students misbehave, what will you do to punish them?

- Why do you think that you will be good for this job?

Adapted from; (Paulston et al., 1975, p. 44).
Appendix B: The Post-test

Both the control group and the experimental group will be tested if they acquired the communicative competencies or not.

The activity: Talking about movies

The task is an interview talking about movies, it is a pair work.

Student A is supposed to ask questions

Student B is supposed to answer

The following questions should be asked:

1/- Do you like watching movies?

2/- What type of movie you like? Why?

3/- How many time you watch a movie

4/- Do you prefer watching movies in the morning or the evening?

5/- What is your favourite movie?

6/- Could you describe a scene that fascinated you?
Appendix C: Lessons of Strategic Competence

1- Circumlocution: ZoltdnDomyei and Sarah Thurrell (1991), defining, describing or exemplifying the target object or action (e.g. the thing you open wine bottles with for corkscrew, or small fast military plane for fighter). Tarone (1983), it refers to the learner’s description of the characteristics or elements of the objects or action instead of using the appropriate target language item or structure. (e.g., It is something we use to dry our hands when they are wet (Tissue).

2- Guessing, Binhayearong (2009), is similar to a confirmation request but the latter implies a greater degree of certainty regarding the key word, whereas guessing involves real indecision. (e.g. Oh. It is then not the washing machine. Is it a sink?).

3- Conversational Skills: There are also rituals and set formulae for starting or closing a conversation and for changing the subject, Domyei and Sarah Thurrell (1994),

3-1 Openings: There are many ways of starting a conversation, and most of them are fairly ritualized as, for example, in different sequences of greetings and introductions (e.g. How are you? I Fine thanks. And you?). Other ways of initiating a chat include questions {Excuse me, do you know . . . ?)}, comment on the weather {At last some sunshine!},

3-2 Closings: Unless we want to be deliberately rude, we cannot end a conversation by simply saying, 'Well, that's all I want to say, bye', or, on the phone, just hang up abruptly without any notice. Instead, people typically apply a sequence of pre-closing and closing formulae to prepare the grounds for ending a conversation (e.g. It's been nice talking to you . . . , Well, I don't want to keep you from your work . . . , We must get together sometime . . .).

4- Asking for repetition: Asking for repetition: Requesting repetition when not hearing or misunderstanding something properly (e.g., Pardon!, what did you say, Can you say it again?).
5- Fillers: The knowledge and confident use of fillers are a crucial part of learners' strategic competence, since these invaluable delaying or hesitation devices can be used to carry on the conversation at times of difficulty, when language learners would otherwise end up feeling more and more desperate and would typically grind to a halt. Examples of fillers range from very short structures (well; I mean; actually; you know), to what are almost phrases (as a matter of fact; to be quite honest; now let me think; I'll tell you what; I see what you mean; etc.).
Appendix D: The Questionnaire

Dear teachers,

This questionnaire is designed to gather data as a part of a research work carried out in the framework of a master degree. It aims at investigating the extent to which communication strategies training enhance students’ strategic competence.

We would be very grateful if you take part in this questionnaire. Please answer each statement by ticking the corresponding box(es) and make a full statement whenever necessary.

Note: Strategic competence refers to the ability to get one's meaning across successfully to communicative partners, especially when problems arise in the communication process, and it involves strategies to be used when communication is difficult.

Thank you in advance for your collaboration.

Ms : BOUZIANI Nawal

Ms : ZIDELMAL Amina

Fatima Zohra

Department of English

Larbi Ben M’Hidi University, Oum El Bouaghi
Section One: Teacher’s Background Information

Q1: Gender  
- a. Male  
- b. Female

Q2: Educational Qualification
- a. Master Degree
- b. Magister Degree
- c. Ph.D.

Q3: How long have you been teaching English as a foreign language?
- a. 1-4
- b. 4-6
- c. 6-10
- d. more than 10 years

Section Two: Teaching Communication Strategies

Q3: According to your experience in teaching, how can you evaluate your students’ level and skills in communication?
- a. Below the average
- b. Average
- c. Above the average

Q4: Do you think that communication training is important for learners?
- a. Yes
- b. No

Q5: If yes, do you think that because it
- a. Improves students’ vocabulary
- b. Improves students’ classroom interaction
- c. Improves students’ fluency
- d. All of them

Q6: The more students are trained communicatively, the more their speaking abilities will develop
- a. Strongly agree
- b. Agree
- c. Undecided
- d. Disagree

Section Three: Teachers’ use of Strategic Competence
Q 7: Do your learners face difficulties during classroom interaction?

a. Yes ☐ b. No ☐

Q8: If yes, what kind of difficulties?

……………………………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………………………

Q 9: How do you usually train your students communicatively?

……………………………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………………………

Q 10: In your opinion, which of the following aspects of strategic competence you usually focus more in the classroom?

a. Circumlocution (giving short definitions of the target objects ) ☐

b. Asking for repetition from the interlocutor ☐

c. guessing strategy ☐

d. Using fillers ☐

e. All of them ☐

Q 11: To what extent do you think that teaching strategic competence is helpful to improve your students’ communication abilities?
Section four: The Effect of Communication Training on Strategic Competence

Q12: To what extent do you think that communication training motivates your students?

a. Highly motivating □    b. Somehow motivating □    c. Less motivating □

Q13: Do you believe that including strategic competence in EFL curriculum would be useful and effective?

a. Yes □       b. No □

-Justify your answer

---------------------------------------------------------------

---------------------------------------------------------------

---------------------------------------------------------------

Section 5: Further Comments /Suggestions

Q14: Do you have any further comments or suggestions?

---------------------------------------------------------------

---------------------------------------------------------------

---------------------------------------------------------------
Thank you
Résumé

La compétence communicative a eu beaucoup d’attention dans les domaines d’éducations étrangères, il faut ce concentré sur son importance. Apprendre aux étudiants l’indépendance de savoir maîtriser la langue. Puisque la réussite dans l’apprentissage de la langue se base sur l’utilisation de la langue, d’un autre coté elle se base sur la capacité de l’apprenti dans la communication en apprenant. C’est pour cela les études d’aujourd’hui donne la lumière à entrainer les compétences communicative. A évoluer les compétences stratégiques pour les apprenants de la langue anglaise pour arriver à ce but on a choisi des étudiants de 3ème année universitaire à l’université d’Oum El Bouaghi comme catégorie pour essai d’études. Ensuite, on a choisi deux groupes parmi cinq groupes. On a fait un choix au hasard, le premier groupe représente le choix expérimental. Mais le premier groupe c’est un témoin. Les deux groupes ont eu un test au début et un autre au final, entre le temps des deux tests. Le premier groupe a travaillé sur une série de questions et la compétence stratégique de conversations en ce moment, le 2ème groupe est témoin et n’a eu aucune consigne. Les résultats obtenus, selon les graphes et les statistiques et la comparaison. Les entrainements sur les compétences communicatives à un grand effet dans l’évolution de la compétence stratégique pour l’apprenant dans la langue anglaise, pour ces résultats on a pu donner des contenus aux éducateurs, enseignants et étudiants. Aux responsables des programmes d’enseignements. Malgré les obstacles, enfin il faut continuer la recherche.
المتخصصة

لقد تلقت الكفاءة التواصلية الكثير من الانتباه في مجالات تعلم اللغات الأجنبية ومن الجدير بالذكر التركيز على أهمية تمكين الطلاب من الاستقلالية في الاداء كمستخدمين للغة المستهدفة. مادام النجاح في تعلم اللغة يعتمد من جهة على استعمال اللغة ومن جهة أخرى يتطلب على قدرة المرء على تحديث وتمديد مخزونهم التواصلية و ذلك عن طريق المزيد من التعلم. لذلك فإن الدراسة الحالية تهدف إلى تسليط الضوء على مدى تأثير تدريبات الكفاءة التواصلية على تنمية الكفاءة الاستراتيجية لمعلمي اللغة الإنجليزية. و للوصول إلى هذا الهدف تم اختيار طلاب السنة الثالثة في جامعة العربي بن مهدي كفئة مستهدفة في الدراسة. ثم تم انتقاء عينة تتمثل في فوجين من أصل خمسة أفروج وقد تم الاختيار بشكل عشوائي يمثل الفوج الأول الفوج التجربى أما الثاني فيمثل الفوج الشاهد. تلقى كل من الفوجين اختبار ابتدائي وآخر نهائي و بين فترة الاختبارين تلقى الفوج التجريبي سلسلة من الدروس والتوجهات في كيفية تطبيق الكفاءة الاستراتيجية في اي محادثة. في حين طلاب الفوج الشاهد لم يتلقوا تعليمات مثيلة. اشترت النتائج المحصلة عليها من الدراسات الكمية للبيانات التي تم جمعها الى ان تدريبات الكفاءة التواصلية كان لها اثر كبير في تنمية الكفاءة الاستراتيجية لدى متعلمي اللغة الإنجليزية. ونظرا لهذه النتائج تم منح عدد من المربين التربوية للمعلمين والطلاب و كذا مصممي المناهج الدراسية. مع اخذ بالاعتبار للعوائق التي واجهت الدراسة من ان يكون أكثر تفصيلا اضافة الى توصيات للمزيد من الابحاث.