



European Journal of Educational Research

Volume 11, Issue 2, 1047 - 1062.

ISSN: 2165-8714

<https://www.eu-jer.com/>

English Speaking Lecturers' Performances of Communication Strategies and Their Efforts to Improve Students' Communicative Competence

Leffi Noviyenty* 

Institut Agama Islam Negeri Curup,
INDONESIA

Ruly Morganna 

Institut Agama Islam Negeri Curup,
INDONESIA

Fakhruddin 

Institut Agama Islam Negeri Curup,
INDONESIA

Received: October 4, 2021 • Revised: December 8, 2021 • Accepted: February 24, 2022

Abstract: Regardless of varied lingua-cultural ideologies enriching the theories of communicative competence (CC), the four CC dimensions (e.g., linguistics, sociolinguistics, discourse, and communication strategies (CSs)) still become the main cores of English speaking (ES) classrooms. Of the four dimensions, CSs seem to be the most technical which deserve to be persistently studied. Hence, this study aimed to probe into ES lecturers' performances of CSs, their efforts to improve students' CC, and the impacts of their efforts on students' learning according to students' perspectives. Two ES lecturers and 10 students at a university in Indonesia were purposively selected to be the participants. They were observed and interviewed according to the study's purposes. This study uncovered various CSs performed by ES lecturers according to several contexts, such as to understand spoken texts, to understand spoken recorded texts, and to overcome temporary communication difficulties. Various ES lecturers' efforts were also revealed according to their functions to improve each dimension of CC. Most students perceived the lecturers' efforts positively due to the impacts on their motivation, self-efficacy, collaborative skills, and metacognition. However, few students echoed negative perceptions about a lecturer's native-speakerism-endorsed effort due to lingua-cultural issues. Implication, limitation, and recommendation are discussed.

Keywords: Collaborative skills, communicative competence, communication strategies, efforts to improve communicative competence, metacognition, motivation, self-efficacy.

To cite this article: Noviyenty, L., Morganna, R., & Fakhruddin. (2022). English speaking lecturers' performances of communication strategies and their efforts to improve students' communicative competence. *European Journal of Educational Research*, 11(2), 1047-1062. <https://doi.org/10.12973/eu-jer.11.2.1047>

Introduction

In the context of English education in Indonesia, it has been a consensus that the English curricular purpose necessitates teachers and lecturers serving as role models who can assist students in developing their English communicative competence (CC). In other words, it is required that the English teachers and lecturers are both academically and communicatively qualified (Nagovitsyn & Golubeva, 2019). English CC is one aspect of a person's competence that allows him to capture and interpret the meaning and purpose of English communication in certain contexts (Avgousti, 2018; Suvorova et al., 2021). English CC lies in a combination of linguistic competence, sociolinguistic competence, discourse competence, and communication-strategic competence or communication strategies (CSs) (Bataineh et al., 2013; Dossey et al., 2020; Fuller et al., 2018; Kim, 2016; Quasthoff & Wild, 2014).

In the Indonesian context with limited natural English communicative staging due to its socio-cultural factors positioning English as a foreign language (Kirkpatrick & Liddicoat, 2017), the issue *vis-à-vis* the proper acquisition of English CC, even amid English lecturers, is still questionable. Such an issue is even commonly found in the midst of English teachers or lecturers across many Asian countries (see studies conducted by Kaewnuch, 2019; Nguyen, 2016). However, it is interesting that the preliminary survey study we already conducted at a university in Indonesia, where we taught English, showcased significant data about the English speaking (ES) lecturers' CC. The preliminary study uncovered that they were known to have met the standard scale of three domains of English CC within the context of Indonesian culture. The forgoing was demonstrated by meeting 90% of the CC indicators extending to linguistic, sociolinguistic, and discursive competences. However, in the domain of CSs, they only reached a percentage of 60%. The foregoing data triggered us to probe more into their CSs in English communication by looking into their communication performances as the actual pictures of using CSs in the classrooms.

* Corresponding author:

Leffi Noviyenty, Institut Agama Islam Negeri Curup, Bengkulu, Indonesia. ✉ leffinoviyenty@iaincurup.ac.id

The CSs in English communication can be defined as the mastery of verbal and nonverbal strategies that can be used to maintain the continuity of communication and to avoid communication breakdown (Zhu et al., 2019). The mastery of CSs aims to clarify the function of English in a context of which it is being used (Pinto-Llorente et al., 2017). In a classroom setting, for example, the meaning of an expression can be more than just what is said. The meaning is entirely dependent on the students' comprehension and the lecturer's strategy for ensuring that the students understand the meaning of the expression. The performances of CSs may even appear or be displayed without the use of a single word, but rather through body movements or even silence (Dounghummes & Zarchi, 2021; Shih, 2014). In the other condition, the communication strategy should be realized through words with explaining an unclear message to let students understand the lecturers' actual intention (Chau, 2007). Hence, this study on the performances of CSs covers both verbal and non-verbal expressions (e.g., facial expressions, gestures, and body languages) used by lecturers in teaching English speaking.

Many prior studies on English CC have been conducted and concentrated on the aspect of students' CC (e.g., studies conducted by Cheng (2016); Clavel-Arroitia (2019); Hermosilla et al. (2018); Komariah et al. (2020); and Lee (2017)). However, our reviews of literature have ended up with a perception that there are still few studies on English CC with the foci central to English lecturers. Drawing upon the need to continue our preliminary study on ES lecturers' CC, especially in the domain of CSs as previously explained, and anchored in the literature gap with limited studies on English CC in the aspect of lecturers. Hence, the present study has been designed to work on the following research questions: 1) How are the ES lecturers' performances of CSs? 2) What are ES lecturers' efforts to improve students' CC? 3) What are the impacts of ES lecturers' efforts on students' learning according to students' perspectives?

Literature Review

Communicative Competence

CC is the ability to transfer, receive, and interpret messages and to provide meanings in interactions between individuals within specific contexts (Avgousti, 2018). The dimensions of CC cover both linguistic and extralinguistic elements including nonverbal language (Parola et al., 2016). The development of CC theories has provided clear and specific domains, such as linguistic competence, sociolinguistic competence, discourse competence, and CSs (Ho, 2020). First, linguistic competence pertains to the mastery of linguistic elements, such as the abilities to recognize morphological, lexical, syntactic, and phonological structures, and the abilities to use the forgoing structures to form and modify words, phrases, and sentences (Pinto-Llorente et al., 2017). Also, linguistic competence demonstrates the ability to explicitly display language rules (Perconti & Plebe, 2020). Someone with linguistic competence will use language rules effectively in communication rather than simply stating them (Hazrati, 2015). Second, sociolinguistic competence refers to the ability to communicate by making adjustment to the existing socio-cultural rules. It addresses the suitability of an utterance that is properly uttered and understood in various social environments, in which such an utterance is strongly influenced by the speaker's and listener's status, the purpose of the interaction, and the rules and norms that apply in the interaction (Ureel et al., 2021). Third, discourse competence is the ability to communicate in terms of unity and continuity (Piątkowska, 2015). The former depicts the relationship between utterances and the grammatical structures used that allows one to understand the meaning of the discourse as a whole. The latter refers to the relationships among meanings in an utterance (Sengani, 2013). Conceptually, discourse competence indicates a person's ability to understand the relationships of sentences and meanings as unified whole, rather than as single components. Fourth, CSs refer to one's ability to maintain successful verbal and nonverbal communication in order to conceal communication flaws caused by communicative constraints (e.g., when he forgets certain grammatical rules) and to improve communication effectiveness (Dounghummes & Zarchi, 2021). To some extent, CSs can be said as the ability to overcome imperfect mastery of grammatical rules. In another definition, CSs can be categorized as verbal and nonverbal strategies demonstrated in the form of actions or utterances to compensate for language deficiencies.

The trajectory of CC theories today has split CC into two lingua-cultural ideologies, known as native-speakerism and non-native-speakerism (Kramsch, 2013). The former places native English speakers' language and culture as the standard norms. Thus, in the context of English learning, the learning target the students have to attain is to speak English with native-like skills (Choi, 2016). On the contrary, the latter does not force students to reach native-like norms, but it guides students to the abilities to use English across cultures (Chan, 2020; Fang, 2017; Galloway, 2017; Si, 2018). As the foregoing, intelligibility and comprehensibility are central to be the yardsticks of students' English. However, different ideologies as such do not change the dimensions of CC *per se*. What has changed is the way English teachers and students construe the nature of English itself. Concerning the main dimensions of CC, both ideologies viewed CC as a combination of competences composed of linguistics, sociolinguistics, discourse, and CSs. The non-native-speakerism ideology does not change the existing dimensions of CC, but it just adds up another competence, the so-called intercultural competence. In the present study, we do not address the ideological debate between the two because the debate is endless. Because both ideologies still, in the same way, regard the four dimensions of CC as the critical components to be learned by students, we therefore limit our scope to just address the four dimensions of CC regardless of ideological differences. Of the four dimensions, CSs become one dimension that we highlight more due to its importance in English learning processes.

Communication Strategies

CSs represent the mastery of verbal and nonverbal strategies that can be used to maintain the continuity of communication and to avoid communication breakdown (Awobamise et al., 2021; Liu, 2019). In actual communication, this competence is not merely limited to a way of solving grammatical problems. More than that, a person with a good mastery of CSs is also able to handle sociolinguistic problems (e.g., how to greet, call, and the like) (Imafuku et al., 2021). For the users of English as a foreign language (EFL), this competence is indeed very critical because it has many benefits to help them maintain English communication and lower the possibility of communication breakdown (Lockwood, 2015). Some of the benefits of this competence are to help EFL users cope with grammatical difficulties, to address sociolinguistic issues, to cope with discourse difficulties, and to overcome some performance obstacles.

To cope with grammatical difficulties, there are some CSs which can be applied by EFL users, such as using reference sources (e.g., dictionaries and grammar books) (Mäkinen et al., 2014; Rakedzon & Baram-Tsabari, 2017), doing grammatical and lexical paraphrasing (Ranta, 2017), asking an interlocutor to perform a slower speech (Disogra, 2017), and using nonverbal symbols such as gestures, facial expressions, and pictures (Birlik & Kaur, 2020). To address sociolinguistic issues, EFL users can do a couple of ways which represent their CSs. For example, first, the users use a single grammatical form for multiple communicative functions, such as declarative sentences as to construct a statement, a question with a strong intonation, a promise, an order, an invitation, or a threat depending on the sociolinguistic contexts (Canale, 2014). Second, they use the most sociolinguistically neutral grammatical forms when feeling unsure whether other forms are appropriate in certain communicative situations (Canale, 2014). Third, they apply their first language knowledge to the appropriateness of grammatical forms or communicative functions. To cope with discourse difficulties, EFL users can use nonverbal symbols or empathic emphases to convey cohesion and coherence (e.g., the use of pictures to express sequences of actions or ideas) (Pawlak, 2015). When they are unsure about the aspects of foreign language discourse, they can use their first language knowledge of spoken or written discourse patterns (Burley & Pomphrey, 2015). To address the performance factors, the EFL users can find ways to lower background noise, interruptions, and other disturbances which can hinder the continuity of English communication. Also, the users can use pauses or fillers to maintain the continuity of communication, and at the same time they are looking for ideas or grammatical forms that are appropriate (Pawlak, 2015).

The purpose of CSs is to prepare and encourage language learners to make the best use of their limited CC in a foreign language in order to participate in actual communicative situations (Canale, 2014). The staging of communication *per se* will be heavily influenced by ones' CC in their dominant language, their motivation and attitudes towards the target language, and their effective use of CSs. With good CSs, the EFL users can communicate using English with others fluently, both orally and in writing (Cheng et al., 2021). Simply put, they can be good at the four skills of English.

Methodology

Study Design

Drawing on a constructivist epistemology, this qualitative study was designed to work on three purposes: probing into ES lecturers' performances of CSs, investigating the lecturers' efforts to improve students' CC, and revealing the impacts of the lecturers' efforts on students' learning according to the students' perspectives. This study was executed in the ES classrooms of the English education department at a university located in Bengkulu Province in Indonesia. As the lecturers, we could access the data sources with no significant barriers because we were the lecturers in this department.

Participants

To work on the first and second research foci, we involved 2 lecturers who taught ES subjects. They were selected purposively due to several criteria. First, they were the ES lecturers whose teaching orientations would be the most proximate to the realms of CC and CSs. Second, they were adequately experienced and knowledgeable about CC and CSs in theory-to-practice ways because both of them had been teaching ES subjects across academic years. Third, they were willing to voluntarily take part as the participants of this study. According to the demographic data, the first lecturer was a male at the age of 37. During this study, he was teaching the subject of ES for daily communication. Subsequently, the second lecturer was also a male at the age of 42. He was teaching the subject of ES for academic purpose. With respect to the third focus of this study, we incorporated 10 students purposively. 5 students were the third semester ones and taken from the class of ES for daily communication, and other 5 students were the fifth semester ones taken from the class of ES for academic purpose. They were selected according to a couple of criteria. First, they were sufficiently more communicative compared to others, so they had good potential to provide in-depth data. Second, they were easily accessible. Third, they were willing to voluntarily join this study as the participants.

Data Collection and Analysis

The data *vis-à-vis* the first research focus, ES lecturers' performances of CSs, were collected from observations. The processes of observations were guided by field note sheets containing some indicators of CSs (e.g., defining a word,

using fillers, using gambits, and others). The observations were made in the ES classrooms held by the two lecturers. The data pertinent to the second research focus, ES lecturers' efforts to improve students' CC, were gathered using observations and interviews. In a similar vein, the observations were guided by field note sheets with the indicators of CC (e.g., the competences of linguistics, sociolinguistics, discourse, and CSs). Subsequently, interviews were conducted to elicit information about the reasons why the two lecturers made efforts in the way they did. Lastly, concerning the third research focus, the impacts of ES lecturers' efforts on students' learning according to students' perspectives, the data were obtained from interviews with ten students already selected purposively. The data were analyzed using an interactive model (Miles et al., 2014). This model encompassed four interconnected dimensions: collecting data, condensing data, displaying data, and conclusion drawing. As previously explained, the data were collected using interviews and observations. The data were further condensed by grouping them resting upon the emerging themes. The theme-based data were presented in the form of figures, selected transcripts, explanations, interpretations, and discussions. Lastly, the data conclusion was drawn comprehensively.

Data Validation and Reliability

Since this was a qualitative study, the validation was oriented towards the pursuance of data's credibility. To this end, we implemented triangulation and member checking techniques. In respect of the triangulation technique, we applied this technique with the components consisting of researcher triangulation, method triangulation, source triangulation, and theoretical triangulation (Yeasmin & Rahman, 2012). Concerning the researcher triangulation, the three researchers worked together to design, collect, and analyze the data, so that any detail of this study rested upon a shared and confirmable agreement instead of an individual work. In respect of method triangulation, we deployed more than one technique of data collection. We conducted interviews and observations to collect the data, so that the data garnered from the two techniques could be confirmed with each other to avoid bias, and the data could be synthesized to reach a shared and confirmable ground. Corresponding to source triangulation, we incorporated multiple data sources consisting of two lecturers and ten students, so that the data obtained were based on multiple perspectives which were further synthesized for the sake of generalizability. Regarding theoretical triangulation, the data gathered in this study were discussed theoretically so that the umbrella discourses of the data did not shift away from those of the related literature. The foregoing way could avoid the potential bias. Concerning the member checking technique, before the results of data analysis were reported in this paper, we had previously given the results of data analysis to all participants to get their confirmations and agreements that the analysis results did not shift away from the actual information they had intended.

To pursue the data's reliability, we applied an inter-coder reliability technique (O'Connor & Joffe, 2020) during data analysis. Practically, the raw data garnered from interviews and observations were initially analyzed by each of the researchers. The thematic data of each researcher's version were further compared with one another. Subsequently, we held critical discussions in order that we could determine a set of the agreed and confirmable thematic data. Hence, the mapped and organized data which had been coded in this study were the results of our shared agreements made based upon critical discussions.

Findings

The study's findings are presented according to three areas oriented: 1) CSs performed by ES lecturers, 2) ES lecturers' efforts to help students improve CC, and 3) the impacts of ES lecturers' efforts on students' learning according to students' perspectives.

Communication Strategies Used by English Speaking Lecturers

The observation data portrayed that the ES lecturers had applied CSs well. They performed CSs according to several contexts or purposes as displayed in the coded data illustrated in figure 1.




Figure 1. CSs Performed by ES Lecturers

The observational data indicated three contexts of which the lecturers used CSs. The first context was to understand spoken texts. As observed, while teaching, the lecturers built up active interactions with students. As a natural consequence, some students would pose questions unpredictably, such as the questions asking the meanings of words the students had encountered personally during their own learning in prior, in which such questions could not always be answered by the lecturers due to their limited vocabularies. It was natural because none of EFL users knew all English vocabularies. Dealing with such a situation, lecturer 1 used a strategy in a way that asked other students who probably had known the meaning of a word asked. As the last resort, if none could answer, the lecturer would use a dictionary. Similar to lecturer 2, he used a dictionary as part of the strategy to solve unanswered questions about vocabularies. The second context was to understand spoken recorded texts. Oftentimes, learning activities held by the two lecturers made use of English audios or videos as the role model input. The students even had their own English audios or videos. A problem inclined to occur when some students asked the lecturers to help them understand English utterances from the audios or videos they personally brought. Coping with this condition, both lecturers applied a strategy in the form of repetitive listening. The lecturers believed that repetition helped make the utterances clear to be interpreted.

The third context was to overcome temporary communication difficulties. The observations identified twelve CSs performed by the lecturers in this context. The first CS was replacing a message with another. In this case, lecturer 1 used this strategy when he got stuck to construct a clear explanation about a material. He made an effort not to let his speaking flow stop. Instead of taking a longer time just to remember what to be explained, the lecturer skipped such a certain message and directly replaced that message with another he had got in his mind. He would jump back into the skipped message when he remembered again what to explain. The second CS was elaborating ideas. This strategy was identified when lecturer 1 perceived that the students did not seem to get the most out of what he had just explained. To make students easier in understanding his explanation, he subsequently re-explained his message using understandable vocabularies with slower speed and providing more details within his elaboration. The third CS was using non-linguistic modes, such as facial expressions. This strategy was demonstrated when lecturer 2 played with indirectness, especially when he responded to a student's unclear message. Instead of directly judging that the student's English was wrongly uttered, the lecturer chose to make a certain facial expression signaling that the student had to rephrase her words into intelligible and understandable ones. The lecturer believed that this way could save the

student's face better and could avoid any sense of demotivation. The fourth CS was using mother tongue for certain urgency. The use of this strategy was encountered when lecturer 2 found that most students did not seem to understand certain sentences he uttered while explaining an important emphasis of a material. The lecturer had tried to rephrase his words, but the students still showed difficulties understanding the words. The lecturer finally used Indonesian for a few sentences and then went on using English. He considered that Indonesian utterances for certain urgency could be fine to be used because at that time his target was on the students' understanding of the emphasized part of the material.

Another CS, the fifth, was making efforts to remember. It was demonstrated when lecturer 1 forgot a word choice in the middle of his talk. He looked quite experienced in this case because he did not directly say that he had forgotten a word, but he tried to ask some students, by giving some clues, to brainstorm their memories about the forgotten word together until he could get the word from one of the students who could comprehensively catch his clues. In such a way, he did not look like he had forgotten the word. The sixth CS was using fillers to maintain fluency. At a certain time during observation, the lecturer 1 seemed to find it hard to explain a complex idea using fluent English, but the lecturer could still maintain the flow of communication by using a couple of fillers at certain stops while thinking about the content and procedure of his explanation. The seventh CS was asking for help directly. This strategy was identifiable when lecturer 2 got stuck in speaking due to forgetting a word to say, and he got nothing though he had tried to remember that word. The lecturer then directly asked the students if they knew of the English word of an Indonesian vocabulary he had just mentioned. The lecturer did not position himself as the only source of learning. He even positioned himself as the students' learning partner, so he did not perceive that asking the students a word he had forgotten as something embarrassing. The eighth strategy was asking for repetition. We observed this strategy when lecturer 1 seemed to receive an unclear message from an idea explained by a student using English. The lecturer seemed to understand that the nature of communication was to have ideas exchanged successfully, so he asked the student to repeat her words.

The next CS, the ninth, was asking for confirmation. This strategy was depicted when lecturer 2 was listening to students talking about their responses to an English video they had just watched. At that time, there were two versions of students' understanding from a single video watched. The lecturer took an action to probe into the milestone of why the students' understanding could be diverse. In this way, the lecturer asked students using some leading questions to let them confirm their understanding. The tenth CS was showing misunderstanding verbally and non-verbally. This strategy was portrayed when the lecturers did not get the most out of what the students had just conveyed in English. For example, lecturer 1 directly stated that he did not understand what a student had just said, and he asked the student to rephrase her words. In a different way, lecturer 2 chose to use a facial expression to indicate his misunderstanding of what the student had just said. In the foregoing condition, the student got an implication that she had to rephrase her words. The eleventh CS was observing the interlocutors' comprehension. This strategy was applied when lecturer 2 was explaining a material to students. The lecturer was adequately experienced in this way because he focused not only on the delivery of his explanation but also on making sure, through students' expressions and gestures, if they understood his explanation or not. Once finding out that some students did not seem to have got his points, the lecturer initiated to repeat his explanations slowly. The twelfth CS was using body language. Slightly similar to the use of facial expression, during observation, the lecturer 2 used his body language as another symbolic mode to help students understand his explanation easily.

English Speaking Lecturers' Efforts to Improve Students' Communicative Competence

The data concerning ES lecturers' efforts to help students improve their CC were garnered from observations and interviews, especially to clarify the functional reasons beyond their efforts. The flow of data can be seen in figure 2.




Figure 2. ES Lecturers' Efforts to Improve Students' CC

Figure 2 illustrates ES lecturers' efforts to improve students' CC and the functional reasons beyond their efforts. As observed while lecturer 1 was teaching, he seemed to always praise any students who were willing to speak English as naturally as possible with good flow regardless of any possible mistakes. During an interview, he confirmed that this way could help students improve their linguistic competence. Lecturer 1 said the following:

I believe that linguistic competence, such as the ability to quickly select English vocabulary in mental language, necessitates a significant amount of practice. By praising and encouraging students to use English as often as possible, they will be motivated to keep practicing, and their practices will become a mode of natural improvement of their linguistic competence (lecturer 1).

The other effort made by lecturer 1 was to assign students to work collaboratively in groups. He confirmed that this way was functioned as to help students improve their sociolinguistic and discourse competences. During an interview, lecturer one said the following:

Students can improve their sociolinguistic and discourse competences through group activities. Group activities will provide them with numerous opportunities to interact actively with one another and use specific expressions of English as a form of sociolinguistic competence realization. Students will become accustomed to controlling the stages and flow of discourse related to the topics they addressed as a result of active interactions built during group work (lecturer 1).

It was also identifiable that lecturer 1 encouraged students not to focus on grammar while speaking in English for the sake of improving their English fluency. According to lecturer 1, besides leading students to the improvement of their fluency, he also believed that such an effort could let students improve their discourse competence through practice. During an interview, Lecturer 1 provided the following explanation:

Although grammar is one aspect of linguistic competence, I believe that grammar competence can be increased naturally and implicitly through sufficient input that is affordable to students' levels and through sufficient frequency of English-speaking practice. So, in my opinion, by giving adequate English input to students and giving them the opportunity to practice speaking English naturally without having to pay too much attention to the grammar when speaking, they will still be able to acquire grammatical abilities implicitly. In fact, this training pattern will increase their fluency in English speaking, and they will have many chances to focus on discursive organizations and the delivery of ideas when speaking in English (lecturer 1).

We subsequently observed that at a certain pace during teaching, lecturer 1 tended to provide indirect corrections when students made mistakes during speaking in English. According to lecturer 1, this way was functioned as to give them a chance to independently reflect on their mistakes in linguistic areas and to continuously revise their own mistakes by using correct English utterances. During an interview, lecturer 1 explained the following:

Giving students the opportunities to reflect on their mistakes, to identify those mistakes, and to correct such mistakes themselves, in my opinion, is a natural way to help them improve their linguistic competences, such as the abilities to use English vocabularies and correct grammar when speaking. I prefer using indirect corrections to using direct corrections to provide opportunities for such a reflection. Direct corrections, in my opinion, will only undermine their self-esteem, causing them to be less communicative in the future because of fear of making mistakes (lecturer 1).

Another effort identifiable from lecturer 1's teaching performance was that he told students to use English dictionaries just as the last resort. According to lecturer 1, this way could give them a chance to use more of their CSs to save the continuity of English speaking. As interviewed, lecturer 1 explained the following:

When my students were speaking in English, I did not forbid them from using dictionaries. However, I strongly advised them to use dictionaries only as the last resort. I even recommended that they continued to practice their CSs. I always gave them examples of how to use CSs. Personally, I also use a dictionary but only as a last resort because I prefer to use a variety of CSs to maintain the continuity of English communication (lecturer 1).

The efforts made by lecturer 1 covered all dimensions of CC. His efforts were functioned as to help students increase their linguistic competence, sociolinguistic competence, discourse competence, and CSs. During observation, we also identified several different efforts made by lecturer 2. Other efforts were similar to those of the lecturer 1. For different efforts, during teaching, lecturer 2 provided specific examples for certain utterances. According to lecturer 2, this effort was functioned as to improve students' sociolinguistic competence. In this discourse, lecturer 2 said the following:

When teaching, I always identify some expressions that native speakers collocationally use based on their socio-cultural habits. I explicitly teach students such expressions. I also provide them examples of how those expressions are used contextually. This is intended to make students aware of the socio-cultural dimension of English use. Knowing that some expressions are collocational, students may simply imitate a set of expressions and practice using them in the contexts commonly used by native speakers (lecturer 2).

In another situation, lecturer 2 used foreign films to encourage students to learn about the cultures of native speakers. He said that this way was functional to help them improve sociolinguistic and discourse competences. Explicitly, lecturer 2 said the following:

In order to familiarize students with the cultures of native speakers, I use media in the form of American or British films. Language is always linked to culture, and many English expressions are used in culturally specific contexts. Students' sociolinguistic and discourse competences will be honed by frequently watching American or British films. They will be exposed to natural input about various collocational expressions and will be familiar with the sequence of communication stages that represent various discourses (lecturer 2).

Another identifiable effort having been made by lecturer 2 was to teach students English CSs explicitly. He believed that technical things, such as CSs, could be much easier to be acquired if taught explicitly. During an interview, lecturer 2 explained the following:

There are numerous CSs available when communicating in English. I believe that such CSs are technical in nature. Students will struggle to master such strategies if they are not explicitly taught and shown how to use them, for instance, how to use fillers and gambits in communication. Students require illustrations, examples, and detailed explanations of how to use such strategies (lecturer 2).

Lecturer 2 also made an effort to improve students' linguistic competence by encouraging them to speak English in a native-like manner. Lecturer 2 believed that native English users were the most authentic models to be imitated. In this discourse, lecturer 2 said the following:

One of my mainstay efforts to improve students' linguistic competence is to invite them to speak English with native-like standards. I always make an effort to provide feedback on their linguistic competence, especially one which is still far below native speakers' norms. In the case of pronunciation, for example, I use the ELSA android application as an instrument for judging students' pronunciation. When a student articulates an English utterance with a pronunciation different from that of native speakers, I ask him to repeat it and record it using the ELSA application. This application will provide feedback on the student's pronunciation accuracy (lecturer 2).

It seemed that, similar to lecturer 1, lecturer 2 had also made efforts to improve the four dimensions of students' CC: the competences of linguistics, sociolinguistics, discourse, and CSs.

The Impacts of ES Lecturers' Efforts on Students' Learning According to Students' Perspectives

Besides probing into ES lecturers' efforts to improve students' CC alongside several functional reasons beyond their efforts, we proceeded to investigate the impacts of such efforts on students' learning according to students' perspectives. The data in this discourse were garnered from interviews with 10 students. The data exhibited that most of the students perceived positive impacts of the lecturers' efforts on students' self-efficacy, motivation, collaborative

skills, and metacognition. However, it was unique that there were two students who perceived one of the lecturers' efforts negatively. The flow of interview data can be viewed in figure 3.




Figure 3. The Perceived Impacts of ES Lecturers' Efforts to Improve Students' CC on Students' Learning

As depicted in figure 3, most of the students perceived the lecturers' efforts positively. During interviews, two students perceived that the lecturers' efforts (e.g., praising students for using English as naturally as possible as they use their first language and using foreign films to encourage students to learn about the cultures of native speakers) triggered their intrinsic motivation. The foregoing is depicted in the following transcripts:

Receiving encouragement and praise from the lecturer for my efforts to keep up speaking in English motivates me to practice my English-speaking skill at home on a regular basis. This prompts me to download a variety of Android applications in order to practice speaking English with people from various countries (student 9).

You know, I always enjoy learning English especially because my lecturer often uses native English movies as learning media. This makes me do the same at home. I watch such movies too at home, and I try out speaking English to follow the actors' ways of speaking (student 2).

Intrinsic motivation was depicted in the way student 9 became more enthusiastic about practicing English independently after getting encouragement from the lecturer. As a result, she was motivated to establish online English interactions with people across countries by using Android applications. Student 2 also became more motivated after learning by using native English films in the classroom, so she finally imprinted by also using such media when practicing English independently at home. Another student perceived that a lecturer's effort (e.g., assigning students to collaborate in groups) improved his collaborative skills. The data can be viewed from the following transcript:

Before taking an English-speaking subject, I had just practiced my English-speaking skill by talking to myself in front of the mirror. It's kind of weird though. Once I took the English-speaking subject, oftentimes, the lecturer assigned us to interact in groups. I found something unique that two-way communication was not as easy as the one way as I had done before. During an interaction in a group, I was faced with a condition of which I had to be patient to take turn, and I had to learn to control my speech and my words in order to maintain the continuity of interaction (student 1).

The sense of collaborative skills was identified from the way student 1 became more patient and could monitor the pace of his speech. The other student perceived that a lecturer's effort (e.g., teaching students not to focus on grammar while speaking in English) triggered her self-efficacy. As such, the student was motivated to be more confident in speaking up in English. The data in this discourse can be seen in the following transcript.

My lecturer often emphasizes that we have to focus on meaning while speaking in English instead of grammar because the basic function of communication is central to the exchange of information. He said that grammar could be improved by time as long as we actively received sufficient English input. Such statement has been internalized

in me. So, anytime, when I am speaking in English, I feel more confident because I don't have to be distracted by the tendency to think about grammar too much. I can be more fluent in that way (student 5).

Student 5 became more confident when speaking English due to the lecturer's effort. She acquired better self-efficacy in this sense. When talking about other efforts of ES lecturers, some students perceived that the efforts (e.g., giving students indirect corrections, telling students to use dictionaries just as the last resort, providing specific examples of certain utterances, and explicitly teaching CSs to students) improved their metacognition. The data in this discourse can be seen in the following transcripts:

I love the way my lecturer gave me indirect corrections on my mistakes when speaking in English. Indirect corrections made me aware that making mistakes is part of the learning process, so I don't have to be afraid of making mistakes because, by time, I can improve my own mistakes through practice (student 4).

My lecturer often tells us not to use dictionaries when getting stuck due to having no word choice unless the situation is really urgent, and we can use dictionaries as the last solution. I think it's a good way to do because we, in fact, don't always have dictionaries in our pockets or mobiles. This made me realize that CSs taught by my lecturer are very important to save communication. Now, I am trying to practice using CSs, such as defining the forgotten English words, to save the fluency of my English (student 3).

At certain time during learning, my lecturer gave us specific examples of certain utterances which were culturally bounded. This made me aware about the nature of English which is to some extent grammatical and in some way collocational. Now, I understand that I have to add up more references of fixed and collocational English expressions (student 8).

Various CSs taught by my lecturer are indeed technical, but such strategies are so beneficial to me. Such strategies are also interesting to practice. I often try out using such strategies when speaking in English with my friends outside the classroom. I feel that I am getting a bit more fluent in English (student 10).

Students 3, 4, 8, and 10 in the above transcripts received good supports in terms of metacognition due to the lecturers' efforts. There are two dimensions of metacognition: knowledge about cognition (declarative, procedural, and conditional knowledge) and regulation of cognition (planning, monitoring, and evaluating) (Teng, 2020). Students 3 and 10 depicted that the lecturers' efforts made them better at cognition regulation in a way that they put CSs independently. Students 4 and 8 portrayed that the lecturers' efforts improved their declarative knowledge in a way that they got better learning awareness. During interviews, however, we also found two students who had negative perceptions about one of the lecturer's efforts (Encouraging students to speak English in a native-like manner). The students perceived that native-like English were too hard to follow and inaccessible. The forgoing was depicted in the following transcripts:

It's difficult for me when the lecturer insisted on us speaking English like native speakers. To be honest, I've been trying to practice imitating the pronunciation of native speakers. However, I have been unable to do so thus far. In fact, every time I say something in English, I'm afraid of getting it wrong (student 7).

I can't communicate in English like a native speaker. For example, in terms of pronunciation, I am unable to imitate native speakers' intonations and syllable stresses. Not to mention the sociolinguistics aspect, I don't know many idioms used by native speakers. Furthermore, a sociolinguistics lecturer once stated that even within America, there were many different idioms. I am still questioning about it, and I am sorry if I am mistaken. I am not complaining. I am just incapable of reaching the native speakers' norms in using English. It's my bad (student 6).

Students 6 and 7 in the above transcripts demonstrated that they found it hard to follow the norms of English native speakers when speaking in English. Both of them indicated that native English norms were inaccessible according to their contexts and abilities.

Discussion

This study has revealed three sets of findings. The first finding of this study portrayed various CSs performed by ES lecturers according to several contexts or purposes. To understand spoken texts, the strategies were to seek assistance from knowledgeable others and use dictionaries as the last resort. The possible reasons for the application of such strategies were to maintain students' interactive engagement and to maintain the smooth continuity of learning process. The lecturers seemed to have been fully aware of their facilitating roles. Hence, even though at some point the lecturers could not assist students, they still managed to maintain the embodiment of interactive class. As the foregoing, letting other helpful students contribute to the on-going class seems to be a great decision making (Yang & Yuen, 2014). Also, instead of letting the speaking class get stuck on a certain lexical difficulty, the use of dictionaries as the last resort becomes a good decision so that further steps of learning can be taken (Dakun, 2001).

To understand spoken recorded texts, the strategy was repetitive listening. The lecturers believed that repetition helped make the utterances clear to be interpreted. To overcome communication difficulties, the strategies were replacing a message with another, elaborating ideas, using non-linguistic modes, using mother tongue for certain

urgency, making efforts to remember, using fillers for maintaining fluency, asking for help directly, asking for repetition, asking for confirmation, showing misunderstanding verbally and non-verbally, observing the interlocutor's understanding, and using body language. The possible reason why the lecturers could apply various strategies as such is because both lecturers taking part in this study are the experienced ones. Demographically, both lecturers (37 and 42 years old) have been teaching English speaking subjects across various levels. Their sufficient experiences alongside their pedagogical skills and knowledge about teaching English speaking have shaped them to be very fluid in the use of various communication strategies according to the on-going contexts for the sake of overcoming communication difficulties (Gilakjani & Sabouri, 2017).

Previous studies on English CSs conducted across countries have echoed some details of the current findings (e.g., Birlik and Kaur (2020); Disogra (2017); Mäkinen et al. (2014); Rakedzon and Baram-Tsabari (2017)). However, there are also other CSs addressed by prior studies but not found to have been used by the ES lecturers in the present study. For instance, Ranta (2017) emphasized the benefit of grammatical paraphrasing as a CS. Another study conducted by Martínez and Montiel (2013) indicated the usefulness of silence as a CS. The present study's finding, to some extent, adds up some references of CSs in the literature.

The second finding of this study portrayed several efforts made by ES lecturers to improve students' CC. These efforts were made according to the dimensions of CC as the main targets. To improve students' linguistic competence, the lecturers made efforts such as praising students for using English as naturally as possible as they use their first language, giving students indirect corrections, and encouraging students to speak English in a native-like manner. There are three reasons why the lecturers have made such efforts. First, praising students is part of motivating feedback for the sake of boosting students' enthusiasm about practicing English speaking. This point has been emphasized by Chien et al. (2020) whose study demonstrated that praising students can be good motivational feedback on students' English performance. Second, indirect corrections are given to avoid demotivation alongside making students aware of correcting themselves while making mistakes during speaking in English. Hosseiny (2014) elucidated that an indirect correction can be beneficial feedback to students because it saves their psychological comfort in learning. Third, encouraging students to speak English like native speakers is a motivational way to support students to keep practicing English endlessly at their own pace.

To improve students' sociolinguistic and discourse competences, the ES lecturers made efforts, such as assigning students to collaborate in groups, teaching students not to focus on grammar while speaking in English, providing specific examples of certain utterances, and using foreign films to encourage students to learn about the cultures of native speakers. Today, collaborative learning has been one of the favorite ways the English teachers apply due to its benefits to students' interactive skills and critical thinking (Osborne et al., 2018). Supporting the present study's finding, Ellis et al. (2019) recommended that teachers guide students to focus on meaning instead of grammar and provide students with some explicit teaching in the areas of vocabularies and expressions. In the same line as the present study, Aksoy (2021) highlighted the effectiveness of films as effective tools to provide input for students. To improve students' CSs, the lecturers made efforts such as telling students to use dictionaries just as the last resort and explicitly teaching students CSs. Placing the use of dictionaries as the last resort implies what Darong et al. (2020) have recommended that students have to be given great opportunities to practice the targeted skills, such as CSs in the current study's context. Regarding explicit teaching of CSs, it is relevant to an argumentation of Ellis et al. (2019) that explicit teaching could be another effective way for adult English learners due to their cognitive maturity. The foregoing is aligned with the present study whose participants are categorized as adult learners.

The third finding of this study indicated that most students positively perceived ES lecturers' efforts because such efforts were beneficial to the improvement of their motivation, self-efficacy, collaborative skills, and metacognition. Studies have identified that motivation and self-efficacy exist within the same psychological domain (Bragina & Voelcker-Rehage, 2018; Peiffer et al., 2020). Supporting the present study, Truong and Wang (2019) highlighted that teachers' efforts are needed to improve students' motivation and self-efficacy. Pertinent to collaborative skills, the data of this study have echoed Park and So's (2014) study in that students' skills in collaboration require specific efforts from teachers. With regard to metacognition, Teng (2020) explained that metacognition represents ones' cognition knowledge and knowledge regulation. In the present study, the data demonstrated that some of the lecturers' efforts triggered the improvement of students' declarative knowledge as the content of cognition knowledge (Aliyu et al., 2016) and their independent learning skills as the content of knowledge regulation (Farzam, 2018). However, there were two students in the present study who perceived an ES lecturer's effort (e.g., encouraging students to speak English in a native-like manner) as negative due to their feelings about the inaccessibility of native English speakers' norms. The foregoing condition has been addressed by Byram et al. (2002) when they introduced the model of intercultural communicative competence. They did not agree with native English norms as the standards. They questioned about which native English speakers of which states and of which social levels should be considered the standards. Their questionings make the essence of native English norms as the standards unclear (Morganna et al., 2020; Noviyenty et al., 2020). In our own points of view, as the researchers in this study, we do not theoretically adhere to any specific ideology leading us to taking one and leaving the other.

Conclusion

The present study's first finding has revealed several CSs performed by ES lecturers. To understand spoken texts, the strategies are to seek assistance from knowledgeable others and to use English dictionaries as the last resort. To understand spoken recorded texts, the strategy is repetitive listening. To overcome communication difficulties, the strategies are replacing a message with another, elaborating ideas, using non-linguistic modes, using mother tongue for certain urgency, making efforts to remember, using fillers for maintaining fluency, asking for help directly, asking for repetition, asking for confirmation, showing misunderstanding verbally and non-verbally, observing the interlocutor's understanding, and using body language. The second finding has uncovered several efforts made by ES lecturers to help students improve their CC. To improve students' linguistic competence, the lecturers make efforts such as praising students for using English as naturally as possible as they use their first language, giving students indirect corrections, and encouraging students to speak English in a native-like manner. To improve students' sociolinguistic and discourse competences, the ES lecturers make efforts, such as assigning students to collaborate in groups, teaching students not to focus on grammar while speaking in English, providing specific examples of certain utterances, and using foreign films to encourage students to learn about the cultures of native speakers. To improve students' CSs, the lecturers make efforts such as telling students to use dictionaries just as the last resort and explicitly teaching students CSs. The third finding has demonstrated that most of the students perceive the lecturers' efforts positively because such efforts contribute to the improvement of students' motivation, self-efficacy, collaborative skills, and metacognition. However, two students perceive a lecturer's effort (e.g., encouraging students to speak English in a native-like manner) negatively due to the consideration that native English norms are inaccessible. The lecturers in this study are competent at using CSs, and this condition is likely influenced by their demographic characteristics as the experienced and pedagogically knowledgeable lecturers in teaching English speaking. The foregoing can be the basis for offering a conceptual insight that experiences and pedagogical knowledge contribute to the fluid applications of varied pedagogical skills (e.g., using varied CCs in this study), continuously leading to students' positive perceptions of learning.

Recommendation

Drawing upon the data of the present study, especially the last data we discussed, regarding students' perceptions about the inaccessibility of native-speakerism, an implication can be drawn. English lecturers or teachers across educational levels need to take into account the ideological trajectory of CC theories. To some extent, the native-speakerism ideology is indeed inaccessible because no studies have proven that there is any EFL student with non-native English breed who can imitate the whole aspects of native English speakers' norms (Byram et al., 2002). In our perspectives, a good English lecturer or teacher is one who can take the benefits of any lingua-cultural ideologies for sake of helping students learn better. Both native-speakerism and non-native-speakerism ideologies have contributed much to the field of English learning. Therefore, instead of choosing one but leaving the other, why not taking the two ideologies in a constructive manner so that English lecturers or teachers can co-construct all benefits of the two ideologies into good teaching practice? Taking all the good and leaving all the bad is better than strictly taking one lingua-cultural ideology but leaving the other.

The present study, in some way, has highlighted some potential constructs related to the perceived impacts of ES lecturers' efforts to improve students' CC. Such constructs include motivation, self-efficacy, collaborative skills, and metacognition. It is recommended that further studies be conducted to examine these constructs, through psychometric analyses, under the continuum of English CC theory. Studies as such will generate a new theoretical model and will be beneficial to English academicians.

Limitation

This study is not free from limitation. We realize that our study which is qualitative in nature is not so much generalizable compared to realistic studies, the quantitative ones. However, we have made a serious effort to guarantee the trustworthiness of our data by doing a member-checking technique before finalizing the draft of this paper. We have also conducted an inter-coder reliability technique in coding the data. To do it, each of the researchers of this study had mapped and coded the data independently in prior. The independent coding results were then compared to one another and reconstructed according to the shared agreement of all researchers. Hence, the themes or coded data of the present study are sufficiently reliable and can be used by future's studies as references.

Authorship Contribution Statement

Noviyenty: Concept and design, data acquisition, data analysis / interpretation, and drafting manuscript. Morganna: Drafting manuscript, critical revision of manuscript, and technical or material support. Fakhruddin: Data acquisition, securing funding, and final approval.

References

- Aksoy, S. H. (2021). The effect of short films as advance organizer on reading comprehension and self-efficacy perception. *International Online Journal of Education and Teaching*, 8(3), 2131–2149.
- Aliyu, M. M., Fung, Y. M., Abdullah, M. H., & Hoon, T. B. (2016). Developing undergraduates' awareness of metacognitive knowledge in writing through problem-based learning. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature*, 5(7), 233–240. <https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijale.v.5n.7p.233>
- Avgousti, M. I. (2018). Intercultural communicative competence and online exchanges: A systematic review. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 31(8), 819–853. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2018.1455713>
- Awobamise, A. O., Jarrar, Y., & Okiyi, G. (2021). Evaluation of the ugandan government's communication strategies of the covid-19 pandemic. *Online Journal of Communication and Media Technologies*, 11(2), 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.30935/ojcm/10824>
- Bataineh, R. F., Al Rabadi, R. Y., & Smadi, O. M. (2013). Fostering Jordanian university students' communicative performance through literature-based instruction. *TESOL Journal*, 4(4), 655–673. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesj.61>
- Birlik, S., & Kaur, J. (2020). BELF expert users: Making understanding visible in internal BELF meetings through the use of nonverbal communication strategies. *English for Specific Purposes*, 58, 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2019.10.002>
- Bragina, I., & Voelcker-Rehage, C. (2018). The exercise effect on psychological well-being in older adults—a systematic review of longitudinal studies. *German Journal of Exercise and Sport Research*, 48(3), 323–333. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12662-018-0525-0>
- Burley, S., & Pomphrey, C. (2015). Transcending language subject boundaries through language teacher education. In D. J. Rivers (Ed.), *Resistance to the Known: Counter-Conduct in Language Education* (pp. 192–215). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137345196_9
- Byram, M., Gribkova, B., & Starkey, H. (2002). *Developing the intercultural dimension in language teaching: A practical introduction for teachers*. The Council of Europe.
- Canale, M. (2014). From communicative competence to communicative language pedagogy. In J. C. Richards & R. W. Schmidt (Eds.), *Language and Communication* (pp. 1–27). Routledge.
- Chan, J. Y. H. (2020). Towards English as an international language: The evolving ELT curricula and textbooks in Hong Kong. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 30(2), 244–263. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijal.12277>
- Chau, E. (2007). Learners' use of their first language in ESL classroom interactions. *TESOL in Context*, 16(2), 11–18.
- Cheng, L. (2016). A study of Chinese engineering students' communication strategies in a mobile-assisted professional development course. *The EUROCALL Review*, 24(2), 24–31. <https://doi.org/10.4995/eurocall.2016.6467>
- Cheng, L., Im, G. H., Doe, C., & Douglas, S. R. (2021). Identifying English language use and communication challenges facing “entry-level” workplace immigrants in Canada. *Journal of International Migration and Integration*, 22(3), 865–886. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12134-020-00779-w>
- Chien, S. Y., Hwang, G. J., & Jong, M. S. Y. (2020). Effects of peer assessment within the context of spherical video-based virtual reality on EFL students' English-Speaking performance and learning perceptions. *Computers and Education*, 146, 103751. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2019.103751>
- Choi, L. J. (2016). Revisiting the issue of native speakerism: 'I don't want to speak like a native speaker of English.' *Language and Education*, 30(1), 72–85. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09500782.2015.1089887>
- Clavel-Arroitia, B. (2019). Analysis of telecollaborative exchanges among secondary education students: Communication strategies and negotiation of meaning. *Porta Linguarum*, 31, 97–116. <https://bit.ly/355606e>
- Dakun, W. (2001). Should they look it up? The role of dictionaries in language learning. *REACT*, 1, 27–33. <https://bit.ly/3LUfqSH>
- Darong, H. C., Kadarisman, A. E., Basthomi, Y., Suryati, N., Hidayati, M., & Nima, E. M. (2020). What aspects of questions do teachers give attention To? *International Journal of Innovation, Creativity and Change*, 10(11), 191–208. <https://bit.ly/36DVEL1>
- Disogra, R. M. (2017). Hearing loss in diabetes. *AADE in Practice*, 5(2), 32–37. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2325160317691535>
- Dossey, E., Clopper, C. G., & Wagner, L. (2020). The development of sociolinguistic competence across the lifespan: Three domains of regional dialect perception. *Language Learning and Development*, 16(4), 330–350. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15475441.2020.1784736>

- Doungphummes, N., & Zarchi, A. (2021). Linguistically-limited intercultural adaptations of independent Western migrants in Thailand: "Taxi Thai" communication strategy. *Journal of Intercultural Communication Research*, 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17475759.2021.1946840>
- Ellis, R., Li, S., & Zhu, Y. (2019). The effects of pre-task explicit instruction on the performance of a focused task. *System*, 80, 38–47. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2018.10.004>
- Fang, F. G. (2017). World Englishes or English as a Lingua Franca: Where does English in China stand? *English Today*, 33(1), 19–24. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0266078415000668>
- Farzam, M. (2018). The effect of cognitive and metacognitive strategy training on intermediate Iranian EFL learners' willingness to communicate. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature*, 7(1), 193–202. <https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijalel.v7n.1p.193>
- Fuller, M., Heijne-Penninga, M., Kamans, E., van Vuuren, M., de Jong, M., & Wolfensberger, M. (2018). Identifying competence characteristics for excellent communication professionals: A work field perspective. *Journal of Communication Management*, 22(2), 233–252. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JCOM-07-2016-0051>
- Galloway, N. (2017). *Global Englishes and change in English language teaching: Attitudes and impact*. Routledge Taylor and Francis Group. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315158983>
- Gilakjani, A. P., & Sabouri, N. B. (2017). Teachers' beliefs in English language teaching and learning: A review of the literature. *English Language Teaching*, 10(4), 78. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v10n4p78>
- Hazrati, A. (2015). Intercultural communication and discourse analysis: The case of aviation English. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 192, 244–251. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.06.035>
- Hermosilla, P., Boye, N., & Roncagliolo, S. (2018). Teaching communication strategies in social networks for computer science students. *Social Computing and Social Media. User Experience and Behavior*, 57–66. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-91521-0_5
- Ho, Y. Y. C. (2020). Communicative language teaching and English as a foreign language undergraduates' communicative competence in Tourism English. *Journal of Hospitality, Leisure, Sport and Tourism Education*, 27, 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhlste.2020.100271>
- Hosseiny, M. (2014). The role of direct and indirect written corrective feedback in improving Iranian EFL students' writing skill. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 98, 668–674. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.03.466>
- Imafuku, R., Saiki, T., Hayakawa, K., Sakashita, K., & Suzuki, Y. (2021). Rewarding journeys: Exploring medical students' learning experiences in international electives. *Medical Education Online*, 26(1), 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10872981.2021.1913784>
- Kaewnuch, S. (2019). Incorporating the post-process approach into the Thai EFL writing classroom. *Journal of Liberal Arts*, 11(1), 1–30. <https://bit.ly/3hbuJbl>
- Kim, K. (2016). Unveiling linguistic competence by facilitating performance. *Language Acquisition*, 23(3), 307–308. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10489223.2015.1115051>
- Kirkpatrick, A., & Liddicoat, A. J. (2017). Language education policy and practice in East and Southeast Asia. *Language Teaching*, 50(2), 155–188. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444817000027>
- Komariah, E., Erdiana, N., & Mutia, T. (2020). Communication strategies used by EFL students in classroom speaking activities. *International Journal of Language Studies*, 14(3), 27–46.
- Kramsch, C. (2013). Culture in foreign language teaching. *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research*, 1(1), 57–78.
- Lee, T. S. O. (2017). L2 motivational strategies that do not work: Students' evaluations and suggestions. In E. Piechurska-Kuciel, E. Szymańska-Czaplak, & M. Szyszka (Eds.), *At the crossroads: Challenges of foreign language learning. Second language learning and teaching* (pp. 135–153). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-55155-5_8
- Liu, K. L. (2019). Student perspectives on language and culture teaching in EFL: Implications for intercultural approach. *Journal of Studies in Education*, 9(2), 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.5296/jse.v9i2.14653>
- Lockwood, J. (2015). Virtual team management: What is causing communication breakdown? *Language and Intercultural Communication*, 15(1), 125–140. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14708477.2014.985310>
- Mäkinen, L., Loukusa, S., Laukkanen, P., Leinonen, E., & Kunnari, S. (2014). Linguistic and pragmatic aspects of narration in Finnish typically developing children and children with specific language impairment. *Clinical Linguistics and Phonetics*, 28(6), 413–427. <https://doi.org/10.3109/02699206.2013.875592>
- Martínez, L. T. P. C., & Montiel, M. G. J. R. (2013). *Training elementary school young learners on the use of communication strategies: an action research project*. Universidad Veracruzana.

- Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldana, J. (2014). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook*. SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Morganna, R., Sumardi, & Tarjana, S. S. (2020). Tertiary English students' attitudes towards intercultural language learning. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 9(3), 657–665. <https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v9i3.23216>
- Nagovitsyn, R. S., & Golubeva, I. A. (2019). Forming future teachers' communicative competences through the student scientific society activities. *Integration of Education*, 23(1), 66–84. <https://doi.org/10.15507/1991-9468.094.023.201901.066-084>
- Nguyen, H. T. M. (2016). The EFL context in Vietnam and East Asia. In H. T. M. Nguyen (Ed.), *Models of Mentoring in Language Teacher Education* (pp. 1–27). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-44151-1_1
- Noviyenty, L., Morganna, R., & Fakhrudin. (2020). The paradigms of teaching English across cultures: EFL teachers' perspectives. *International Journal of Curriculum and Instruction*, 12(1), 1–16. <https://bit.ly/33RwszK>
- O'Connor, C., & Joffe, H. (2020). Intercoder Reliability in Qualitative Research: Debates and Practical Guidelines. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 19, 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1609406919899220>
- Osborne, D. M., Byrne, J. H., Massey, D. L., & Johnston, A. N. B. (2018). Use of online asynchronous discussion boards to engage students, enhance critical thinking, and foster staff-student/student-student collaboration: A mixed method study. *Nurse Education Today*, 70(August), 40–46. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nedt.2018.08.014>
- Park, M., & So, K. (2014). Opportunities and challenges for teacher professional development: A case of collaborative learning community in South Korea. *International Education Studies*, 7(7), 96–108. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ies.v7n7p96>
- Parola, A., Gabbatore, I., Bosco, F. M., Bara, B. G., Cossa, F. M., Gindri, P., & Sacco, K. (2016). Assessment of pragmatic impairment in right hemisphere damage. *Journal of Neurolinguistics*, 39, 10–25. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jneuroling.2015.12.003>
- Pawlak, M. (2015). Advanced learners' use of communication strategies in spontaneous language performance. In M. Pawlak & E. Waniak-Klimczak (Eds.), *Issues in teaching, learning and testing speaking in a second language* (pp. 121–141). Springer, Heidelberg. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-38339-7>
- Peiffer, H., Ellwart, T., & Preckel, F. (2020). Ability self-concept and self-efficacy in higher education: An empirical differentiation based on their factorial structure. *PloS One*, 15(7), 1–24. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0234604>
- Perconti, P., & Plebe, A. (2020). Deep learning and cognitive science. *Cognition*, 203(November 2019), 104365. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2020.104365>
- Piątkowska, K. (2015). From cultural knowledge to intercultural communicative competence: Changing perspectives on the role of culture in foreign language teaching. *Intercultural Education*, 26(5), 397–408. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14675986.2015.1092674>
- Pinto-Llorente, A. M., Sánchez-Gómez, M. C., García-Peñalvo, F. J., & Casillas-Martín, S. (2017). Students' perceptions and attitudes towards asynchronous technological tools in blended-learning training to improve grammatical competence in English as a second language. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 72, 632–643. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2016.05.071>
- Quasthoff, U., & Wild, E. (2014). Learning in context from an interdisciplinary perspective. *Learning, Culture and Social Interaction*, 3(2), 69–76. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lcsi.2013.12.004>
- Rakedzon, T., & Baram-Tsabari, A. (2017). Assessing and improving L2 graduate students' popular science and academic writing in an academic writing course. *Educational Psychology*, 37(1), 48–66. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01443410.2016.1192108>
- Ranta, E. (2017). Grammar in ELF. In J. Jenkins, W. Baker, & M. Dewey (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of English as a lingua franca* (pp. 244–254). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315717173>
- Sengani, T. M. (2013). Controversies around the so-called alliterative concord in African languages: A critical language awareness on communicative competence with specific reference to tshivenda1. *South African Journal of African Languages*, 33(2), 189–201. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02572117.2013.871461>
- Shih, Y. C. (2014). Communication strategies in a multimodal virtual communication context. *System*, 42(1), 34–47. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2013.10.016>
- Si, J. (2018). English as a native language, World Englishes and English as a lingua franca-informed materials: Acceptance, perceptions and attitudes of Chinese English learners. *Asian Englishes*, 21(2), 190–206. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13488678.2018.1544700>

- Suvorova, M., Biserova, N., & Chervonnykh, A. (2021). Multimodal discourse analysis as a tool for developing communicative competence. In A. Rocha & E. Isaeva (Eds.), *Science and global challenges of the 21st century - science and technology* (pp. 645–659). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-89477-1_62
- Teng, F. (2020). The benefits of metacognitive reading strategy awareness instruction for young learners of English as a second language. *Literacy*, 54(1), 29–39. <https://doi.org/10.1111/lit.12181>
- Truong, T. N. N., & Wang, C. (2019). Understanding Vietnamese college students' self-efficacy beliefs in learning English as a foreign language. *System*, 84, 123–132. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2019.06.007>
- Ureel, J. J. J., Diels, E., Robert, I. S., & Schrijver, I. (2021). The development of L2 sociolinguistic competence in translation trainees: An accommodation-based longitudinal study into the acquisition of sensitivity to grammatical (in)formality in English. *The Interpreter and Translator Trainer*, 15(5), 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1750399X.2021.1900712>
- Yang, J., & Yuen, C. K. (2014). College English teaching methodology and language planning: A pilot study in Hefei, China. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 118, 495–502. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.02.068>
- Yeasmin, S., & Rahman, K. F. (2012). “Triangulation” research method as the tool of social science research. *BUP Journal*, 1(1), 154–163.
- Zhu, X., Liao, X., & Cheong, C. M. (2019). Strategy use in oral communication with competent synthesis and complex interaction. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research*, 48(5), 1163–1183. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10936-019-09651-0>