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Abstract. The present study firstly was an attempt to investigate the comparative effects of two methods of communication strategy training (SSBI and CALLA) on Iranian EFL learners’ speaking performance. To do the study, a quasi-experimental study was designed in which 60 pre-intermediate Iranian EFL male and female learners who had been selected out of 72 learners based on the result of a proficiency test (KET) participated. The students who did not meet the criterion also participated in the study but their scores were not included in the related analyses. The participants were divided into two experimental groups and were instructed through two treatment methods, i.e. CALL and SSBI. As the gender was a definite variable in this study, the researcher homogenized female and male in both groups. The study participants went through the process of pretesting, intervention, and posttesting. Then the collected data were analyzed and measures of two-way analysis of variances (two-way ANOVA) and multivariate analysis of variances (MANOVA) were run to probe the null hypotheses of the study. The results of data analysis firstly revealed that the Styles and Strategies-Based Instruction (SSBI) group significantly outperformed the Cognitive Academic Language Learning Approach (CALLA) group on the posttest of speaking. Also, the results indicated that there was not any significant difference between the male and female groups’ means on the posttest of speaking test. In fact, there was not any significant interaction between types of treatments and gender; the SSBI group had higher means than the CALLA participants in both male and female groups. Finally, it was concluded that the SSBI group significantly outperformed the CALLA group on the posttests of grammar and vocabulary, interactive communication, and pronunciation. The findings has implications for EFL classroom.
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LITERATURE REVIEW

Language learning strategies are techniques used by second language learners for remembering and organizing sample of L2. In fact, strategies are specific methods of approaching a problem or task, modes of operation for achieving a particular end, planned designs for controlling and manipulating certain information. Oxford and Leaver (1996) defined second language learning strategies as “specific actions, behaviors, steps, or techniques used by students to enhance their own learning” (p. 8). Strategies are most often conscious and goal-driven. They are contextualized battle plans that might vary from moment to moment, or from one situation to another, or even from one culture to another. Strategies vary within an individual. Each of us has a number of possible options for solving a particular problem, and we choose one or several in sequence for a given problem in learning a second language. Metacognitive is a term used in information-processing theory to indicate an executive function, strategies that involve planning for learning, thinking about the learning process as it is taking place, monitoring one’s production or comprehension, and evaluating learning after an activity is completed.
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Communication Strategies: The field of second language learning has distinguished between two types of strategies including learning strategies and communication strategies. Learning strategies relate to input which is processing, storage, and retrieval messages from others. Communication strategies relate to output. In fact, communication strategies relate to the fact that how we productively express meaning, how we deliver messages to others (Cook, 1996). According to Tarone (1983), while learning strategies deal with the receptive domain of intake, memory, storage, and recall, communication strategies pertain to the employment of verbal or nonverbal mechanism for the productive communication of information. Communication strategies are those strategic options relating to output, how one productively expresses meaning, and how one effectively delivers messages to others. In fact, communication strategies emphasize the use of language rather learning the rules or language usage. Starting from definition of communication strategies; Canale and Swain (1980) believed that the real career of communication strategies is communicative competence. They stated that communicative competence is composed of three components including grammatical competence, sociolinguistic competence, as well as strategic competence. They believed that communication strategies are constituents of strategic competence. According to Canale and Swain (1980), strategic competence is “the ability to employ strategies of language use in the attempt to reach communicative goals (p. 134).” According to Tarone (1981), there is a confusion about the meaning of the term communication strategies especially when it is used interchangeably with terms such as “learning strategies” and “production strategies”. She suggested some criteria in the definition of communication strategies which can easily separate this from learning and production strategies. She believed that communication strategies is “a mutual attempt of two speakers to agree on a meaning in such situations where the required meaning structures, both linguistic and sociolinguistic structure, are not shared” (p. 89).

Teachability of CS: Dornyei (1997) stated, the issue of teachability of communicative strategies has been a controversial and much disputed subject within the field of English teaching. While some theoretical studies reject the validity and usefulness of communicative strategies training, practical studies and experiences seem to support the idea of communicative strategies teaching. According to Bailystok (1990) and Canale and Swain (1980), teachers should only teach the language and prepare enough opportunities for learners to practice in real-life environment so that they could have already developed L1 communicative strategies. If so, the competence for using communicative strategies is a part of their L1 communicative competence and there is no point in teaching these strategies such as avoidance. On the other hand, some researchers such as Dornyei and Thurrel (1991), Dornyei (1997), Maleki (2010), and Nakatani (2005) have explicitly argued in favor of communicative strategies training and suggested that it is possible to develop some strategy training activities. They stated that teaching communicative strategies is not only useful, but also feasible since communicative strategies are contributing to language learning.

Effectiveness of Communication Strategies Instruction: According to Mesgarshahr and Abdollahzadeh (2014) and Rahman (2010), learning to speak is the most important purpose of learning an L2, because in improving speaking abilities, learners are provided by some skills that can be useful for the rest of their lives. Students can reach many goals if instructions and opportunities to practice speaking are available, because speaking is a mode of communication. Mesgarshahr and Abdollahzadeh (2014) claimed that willingness to communicate is the degree to which an EFL learner is willing to interact inside the classroom when he/she feels
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free to do so. They found that the level of willingness to communicate for the experimental group who received communicative strategies training improved in comparison with control group who followed a regular language instruction. Accordingly, it is concluded that language learners will become more willing to communicate if they acquire the ability (employing CSs) to overcome communicational problems. Some researchers such as Dornyei (1995), explicitly and implicitly suggest a two-phase training scheme that would include both an instruction and a practice stage. According to Dornyei (1997), the instruction stage consists of raising students’ awareness of three components: the existence of CSs, the crucial role of CSs as a communication problem solving device, and the communicative efficacy of different CSs. So as Manchon (2000) mentioned, this phase can be seen as a form of metacognitive training. The other phase is called practice phase. Manchon (2000) argued that this phase is in fact a practice of communicative strategies uses. According to Dornyei and Thurrel (1991), there are some activities that are designed to help learners overcome processing time problems or problems which are because of the lack of vocabulary knowledge such as object description activities or a two-way communication task that require exchange of information.

Models for Communication Strategies Instruction: Cervantes and Rodriguez (2012) argued that EFL teachers are not informed how important teaching Communicative strategies is and if they are aware of its importance, they do not know how to teach them to their learners and in many cases the teachers themselves do not use these strategies at all. If strategies can help students become more effective learners of language, it makes sense that teachers should try to integrate strategy instruction into their curricula. Chamot (2004) claimed that there are various models for strategy teaching in both first and second language contexts such as those proposed by Chamot et al. (1999), Cohen (1998), and Grenfell and Harris (1999). In the present study, two strategy instruction models including Styles and Strategies-Based Instruction (SSBI Model) and Cognitive Academic Language Learning Approach (CALLA Model), are summarized by Chamot (2004) and are presented by Chamot et al., (1999) and Cohen (1998), had been concentrated on. CALLA Model is based on cognitive theory and research which focuses on explicit teaching while SSBI Model emphasizes both explicit and implicit integration of language learning and teaching (Chamot & Robbins, 2005; Cohen, 1998; Cohen & Dornyei, 2004, Oxford, 2001).

SSBI Model has five stages including teacher as a diagnostician, teacher as language learner, teacher as learner trainer, teacher as coordinator, teacher as a coach. The CALLA Model, instead, includes six stages namely preparation, presentation, practice, self-evaluation, expansion and assessment (Cohen, 1998). These two models have many characteristics in common in their first stages. To be more clearly, all of them focuses on the importance of metacognitive aspects of strategies which is raising awareness or all recommend the effectiveness of learners’ evaluations over the strategies. According to Chamot (2004), both models uses some activities such as questionnaires, discussion through familiar tasks in order to identify learners’ current strategies. However, there are some differences between these two models in other stages. At the second stage in SSBI Model, this is the teacher who shares his/her own experience and explains his/her thinking process but in CALLA Model, teacher just explains the strategy and the students have to think about their previous experiences on using the strategies. At the third stage in SSBI Model, the teacher trains students how to use the strategy while in CALLA Model, students do many exercises and practice the strategies. So, they will learn new strategies themselves and the teacher just encourages them. And at the fourth stage in SSBI Model, the teacher evaluates and plans the class while in CALLA model there is self and peer-evaluation (Manchon, 2000).

Based on the summary provided above, it can be concluded that SSBI Model is a teacher-centered method but CALLA Model is mostly learner-centered method. This may lead to a different outcome over students’ ability to use strategies.

Cognitive Academic Language Learning Approach (CALLA): Chamot and Robbins (2005, p. 118) defined CALLA as “an instructional model for second and foreign language learners based on cognitive theory and research.” They further
argued that the main purpose behind this model is for learners to learn the academic content and language and becoming independent by using different strategies. This model can be implemented in ESL, EFL, bilingual, and general education classrooms. Chamot and Robbins (2005) presented five stages for CALLA model which is presented below:

The first stage is preparation stage in which the teacher identifies objectives and activates students’ background knowledge, develops vocabulary and motivates students. The next stage is called presentation. In this stage the teacher presents new information and models the process explicitly, and finds any connections to students’ prior knowledge. The third stage is practice stage in which the teacher uses authentic content tasks and provides different cooperative learning structures. The next stage is called self-evaluation in which students themselves assess their own strategy use. And the final stage is expansion in which students make connection between language and content and apply information in their own lives. It contains parents contributing to learning (Chamot & Robbins, 2005).

**Styles and Strategies-Based Instruction (SSBI) Model:** In Cohen (1998)’s model, the teacher has a variety of roles in order to help learners learn to use strategies appropriate to their own learning style. According to Cohen and Dörnyei (2002) and Oxford (2001), styles and strategies-based instruction (SSBI) is a language teaching method that explicitly combines styles and strategy training activities with everyday classroom language instruction. There are two premises about SSBI and teachers should provide enough opportunities for learners to first of all understand what they can learn in classroom and second how they can learn language more effectively and efficiently. Styles and strategies-based approach concentrates on both explicit and implicit language learning. The purpose of SSBI model is to help learners use the target language by assisting them become more aware of the existence of the strategies, understand how to identify and use the strategies effectively and systematically, and learn when and how to transfer the strategies to new language learning and using contexts (Abdesslem, 1996).

SSBI consists of five stages as Cohen and Dörnyei (2002) and Oxford (2001) stated. These stages are as follows:

a. **Strategy preparation:** in this phase, the goal is to determine the amount of learners’ knowledge of strategies that they have already had and their ability to use these strategies.

b. **Strategy awareness raising:** in this phase, the goal is to alert learners to presence of strategies that they might never have thought about or had never used.

c. **Strategy training:** in this phase, students are explicitly taught how, when, and why certain strategies (whether alone, in sequence, or in clusters) can be used to facilitate language learning and use activities.

d. **Strategy practice:** in this phase, students are encouraged to experiment with a broad range of strategies. *Because just knowing* about strategies cannot guarantee the strategies uses. So learners should have enough opportunity to use strategies in numerous tasks and activities.

e. **Personalization of strategies:** in this stage, learners personalize what they have learned about these strategies, evaluate to see how they are using the strategies, and then look to ways that they can transfer the use of these strategies to other contexts.

**The Role of Communication Strategies in Speaking Performance:** A considerable amount of literature has been published on the effect of communication strategy teaching and its effect on speaking performance. Recent evidence suggests that strategy instruction will improve speaking performance such as Ugla et al. (2013), Maleki (2010), and Abdollahazadeh and Mesgarshahr (2014), Nakatani (2006) studies. Dornyei and Scott (1997) and Tarone (1980) argued that there are some deficiencies in the interactions of L2 users except those at advanced levels and they need to spend time and effort to make up for these difficulties and achieve the communicative goals. Therefore, several studies have been made to teach strategic language use in the last decades. Dornyei and Scott (1997) referred to communication strategies as “devices” that are essential for second language learning and use. So communication strategies instruction is becoming a key instrument in improving communicative ability.
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Oxford and Leaver (1996) noted that students don’t have to use the exact strategies that they were taught. Rather, the purpose of strategies instruction is for students to become aware of these strategies and then choose the best strategy which can fit their deficiency in the situation. So the effectiveness of a strategy in a task or situation is related to the learner’s learning style preferences. Abdolahzadeh and Mesgarshahr (2014) believed that L2 users need to acquire the ability to overcome the problems in negotiation of meaning with their competence.” Dornyei (1997) believed that many L2 users can use English effectively although they lack rich vocabulary or basic grammar in English and the reason is that they use communication strategies which is on their strategic competence. Dornyei and Thurrell (1991) that argued that the students often suffered the lack of fluency in speaking which is because of incomplete strategic competence. Therefore, as they believed it is necessary to incorporate communication strategy training into our syllabus in order to attain the communicative goals and a better speaking performance. Ugla et al. (2013) argued that recent developments in the field of using English as a second or a foreign language have led. There are some strategies used by English speakers while using English as an international communication mean to overcome the breakdowns during oral communication, these strategies are called communication strategies. Nakatani (2005) investigated the effects of awareness-raising on oral communication strategy use. Because of the class availability at that particular time, only female students were chosen as his study’s participants. He mentioned this as a potential weakness of his study and he claimed that the results cannot be generalized to other population because there may be a difference in research’s results while the participants are male. He argued that the results of female participants cannot be generalized for male subjects. Fakhri (1984) argued that the theoretical and empirical studies about communication strategies have provided a framework for analyzing how students convey difficult meaning and messages. In this regard, Maleki (2007) insisted on the importance of integrating the communication strategies training into school syllabus.

Factors Affecting the Use of Communication Strategies: In a pyramid-figure model of L2 Willingness to communicate, which incorporated a range of potential linguistic, communicative, and social psychological variables that might affect one’s willingness to communicate in L2, proposed by MacIntyre, Clément, Dörnyei and Noels (2003), attempts have been made to try to explain the interrelations of affective variables influencing L2 communication behaviors and strategies. They placed willingness to communicate in Layer II and claimed that willingness to communicate strongly implies a behavioral intention, and this intention is the most immediate cause of communication strategy. That is, they identified willingness to communicate as a behavioral intention, the final step before using L2 with a specific person. In this model, the factors contributing to willingness to communicate are divided into two groups: enduring influences and situational influences. The three layers closest to the top of the pyramid are Communication Behavior, Behavior Intention, and Situated Antecedents, and they are thought to have situational influences and to be the closest causes of L2 communication. The bottom three layers are Motivation Propensities, Affective-Cognitive Context, and Social and Individual Context. These latter three layers signify relatively stable and enduring influences on the process of L2 communication. Therefore, from the top to the bottom, the layers represent a move from the most immediate, situation-based contexts to the more stable, enduring influences of particular variables on L2 communication strategy. This model illustrates the complexity of the concept of L2 use and explains willingness to communicate as cognitive affective variables interacting with social factors. In general, the cognitive affective variables included in the model are personality, attitudes, motivation, L2 competence, and self-confidence. According to this model, affective variables such as personality, L2 competence, and attitude have only an indirect influence on willingness to communicate, while motivation and self-confidence have direct effects on willingness to communicate. According to Ugla et al. (2013), there have been a number of studies investigate different factors that affect the use of communicative strategies. These factors vary from language proficiency, frequency of the use of English out of the classroom to self-perceived English oral proficiency. Also, the
learners’ variables play an important role in using communicative strategies. The learners’ variable includes biological variables, cognitive variables, affective variables and socio-cultural variables. Moreover, of all the learners’ variables, the most influential ones are those related to emotions, attitudes and personality because emotions control the will to activate or to shut down the cognitive functions. From the affective variables, self-schemas play an important role in learners’ willingness to communicate or learning. Gallagher-Brett (2007) considered anxiety and learners discomfort in language classes as some influential factors in the use of communicative strategies.

METHODOLOGY
A key concept in improving the speaking performance could be the use of communication strategies by speakers. Communication breakdowns have been shown to have adverse effects on speaking performance. Thus communication strategy training can play an important role in addressing the issue of overcoming speaking difficulties. This section, entitled methodology, provides an account of the participants of the study, instruments used, procedures to collect the data and the design employed to conduct the study.

Participants: Initially, 72 English language learners were selected based on convenience sampling method from 4 classes, each containing 18 participants, from Shekouh Language Institute in Bandar Abbas. All these learners had completed four terms at the basic level, four terms at the elementary level, and were supposed to start the pre-intermediate level. Then, a standard test, Key English Test, (KET) was administered in all classes to select homogeneous participants. According to the manual, those whose scores fall between 120 to 149 on the KET are labeled as pre-intermediate; as a result 12 students whose scores were lower and higher than the aforementioned scores (120-149) were not taken into consideration in this study, through based on the institute regulations they took part in the classes. That is to say, 60 pre-intermediate learners with an average age of 17 were selected as the final sample of the study and divided into two groups each containing male and female pre-intermediate learners and were instructed through two treatments, i.e. CALL and SBBI. As gender was a definite variable in this study, the researcher homogenized female and male in both groups. Hence, in each group, there were 14 female and 16 male participants.

Instrumentation: Data on participants’ proficiency level and their speaking performance were collected using a standard KET and speaking test, respectively.
Key English Test: A standard Key English Test (KET) was administered before starting the study to decide whether the participants were at the same level of English proficiency or not. Meanwhile, the test was piloted in a group of 30 learners to check its reliability. To be more clearly, the data from this test were analyzed in order to help the researcher to choose the final sample of the participants and also to be sure about their proficiency. This test consists of 81 items which includes three exam papers that incorporate all four language skills (Reading, writing, listening, and speaking) in three sections: paper 1 Reading and Writing, paper 2 Listening, and paper 3 Speaking. The first paper (Reading and Writing) includes 56 items in nine sections that carries 50% of the final marks. Parts 1-5 require different reading skills in multiple choice format. Parts 6-8 demand a combination of reading and writing skills in word and form completion format. Part 9 is a test of continuous writing, where the participants have to write a piece of 25-35 words. This paper (reading and writing) takes 1 hour and 10 minutes. The second paper (Listening) includes 25 items of multiple choices and word completion form in five sections and a total possible mark of 25, thus representing 25% of the total marks. The listening material is on CD and participants are supposed to listen to each part twice. This part takes about 25 minutes. The third paper is the speaking part. The KET speaking test includes two sections. The first section focuses on personal information of participants and the second section concentrates on prompt card activity which is asking for and giving non-personal information. This part takes 8-10 minutes. For the purpose of the present study all papers were administered in almost 2 hours.

Speaking Pretest and Posttest: The speaking parts of two different Key English Test (KET) were used for Pretest and Posttest. It should be mentioned that speaking part of the KET which was used for homogeneity purpose, was also used as the pretest. But for the posttest a speaking part of another version of KET was used. The KET speaking test requires two participants and two examiners, one of whom assesses the candidates and takes no part in the interaction. There are two parts to the speaking test. Part one focuses on giving personal factual information (the examiner asked each participant some questions about themselves, e.g. about their daily life, interest, etc.). Part two is a collaborative task with the other participant. The examiner gives each participant a prompt card and requires them to ask and answer questions related to the prompt card. All takes 8-10 minutes. Speaking performance assessment was based on Cambridge English Language Assessment of the standard Key English Test which measures three components (Grammar and vocabulary, Pronunciation, and interactive communication) in six bands. In band 1 of grammar and vocabulary, the participant shows only limited control of a few grammatical forms and uses a vocabulary of isolated words and phrases. In band 3 of the same component the participant shows sufficient control of simple grammatical forms and uses appropriate vocabulary to talk about everyday situations. In band 5 of grammar and vocabulary the candidate shows a good degree of control of simple grammatical forms and uses a range of appropriate vocabulary when taking about everyday situations. In band 1 of the next component which is pronunciation, the participant has a very limited control of phonological features and is often unintelligible. In Band 3 of the same component the participant’s pronunciation is mostly intelligible, despite limited control of phonological features. In band 5 of pronunciation the performance of pronunciation is mostly intelligible, and has some control of phonological features at both utterance and word levels. In band 1 of the third component that is Interactive Communication that is related to the second section of the speaking test in which two candidates ask and answer some questions about the prompt cards, the participants have considerable difficulty maintaining simple exchanges and require additional prompting and support. In band 3 of interactive communication, the candidates maintain simple exchanges despite some difficulty and require prompting and support. And in band 5 the participants maintain simple exchanges and require very little prompting and support. For all three components (Grammar and Vocabulary, Pronunciation, and Interactive Communication) band 0 indicates performance below band 1. Band 2 is related to the performance that shares features of band 1 and 3. Band 4 is related to the performance that shares features of band 3 and 5.
Raters: Raters of the speaking and its components were the researcher herself and her friend who was an M.A. graduate of Islamic Azad University with a 10-year experience of teaching and testing English. It should be mentioned that both raters were trained by an English professor in one session which lasted one hour in order to have the reliable scores. The final score of each criterion i.e. grammar and vocabulary; pronunciation; and interactive communication, for each student was calculated by the average score of both raters.

Procedure: The sixty participants of the study were selected from a subject pool of 72 EFL learners based upon the results of the KET. They were then divided into two groups each containing 30 participants. One group received the communication strategies instruction through CALLA method and the other group through SSBI method.

In the CALLA group, communication strategies were taught through CALLA procedure (Chamot & O’malley, 1996) which includes preparation, presentation, practice, evaluation and expansion phases. In the preparation phase, the teacher asked students to describe the strategies they already used in various situations where they found it difficult to remember a vocabulary or made themselves understood. Then the teacher gave individuals stories that were selected from intermediate section of “Steps to Understanding” book and gave them time to read the stories without using dictionaries. Then the students were supposed to just discuss the topic and generate it by adding their personal opinion or in some cases by talking about their own experience about the topic in pairs. After that the teacher asked them to recall the strategies that they had used in order to elicit their prior knowledge (Chamot & O’malley, 1996). At the end the teacher wrote down the name of strategies they had mentioned. In the presentation phase, the teacher had already selected strategies to teach and explained them and listed them on pieces of papers and she gave them to the pairs. But the teacher rarely told students why and when to use the strategy. She only modeled how to use the strategy with the same kind of task. The focus of this stage was on delivering new information which was communication strategies to students (Chamot & O’malley, 1996).

In the practice phase, the teacher had already chosen some new stories from the intermediate section of the “Four Steps to Understanding” book and provided activities for students to practice the strategies in pairs or group discussion. She kept reminding the students to use the strategy or strategies that had been taught. In the evaluation phase, students had been encouraged to evaluate their own use of strategies by discussing with their classmates which strategies they found the most useful for the tasks they had just completed. The main purpose of this stage was to develop metacognitive awareness of their learning process and give them the chance of evaluating themselves in order to evaluate their success (Chamot & O’malley, 1996). To do so, the teacher asked them to put a check mark beside the strategies they had used. In the expansion phase, the teacher rarely suggested the students how they could use the strategies in their daily life. The teacher was only concerned with the subject taught. Instead the students were given opportunities to relate their learning to their cultural background and talk about all communication strategies and decide which strategies they found most effective. The goal of this stage was for “students to become independently strategic learners” (Chamot & O’malley, 1996, p. 270).

According to Chamot and O’malley (1996), these five stages of CALLA instructional model were not always presented in a linear fashion and strictly but were often recursive because the teacher needed to elicit students’ background knowledge at various points. “CALLA instruction was learner-centered” (p.266) and emphasized on explicit teaching. The role of teacher was to show students how to recognize and make good use of their prior knowledge and she worked as a guide and provided meaningful practice opportunities. In the SSBI group, communication strategies were taught through SSBI procedure (Cohen &Weaver, 2005) which includes Strategy Preparation, Strategy Awareness-Raising, Strategy Instruction, Strategy Practice, and Personalization of Strategies Phases. In the strategy preparation phase, the students were given a short reading passage (approximately 150 words) adapted from the intermediate section of “four steps to understanding” book with some unfamiliar words
and phrases was provided on the task sheet in order to ensure that it was a more learning and speaking task than one of reading comprehension. The teacher asked each student to read the reading passage. After reading the passage, the students were asked to summarize the story orally, referring back as little as possible to the written text. As they were telling the summary, the teacher recorded the students’ voice. In the strategy awareness-raising phase, the teacher played the recordings in the class and whenever one of the communication strategies was used, she stopped the recording and asked students how they were trying to convey the message. For example when one of the students had forgotten a new word and instead tried to explain it or in similar situation, he/she tried to avoid using the new phrase he/she found difficult to use. In the strategy instruction phase, the teacher wrote down the name of the strategies on the board and the students were explicitly taught how, when, and why certain strategies (whether alone or in sequence) could be used to facilitate communications. The teacher described, modeled, and prepared examples of strategies use and then asked students to recall their previous experience of using these strategies. In the strategy practice phase, the students were given the opportunity to use the strategies in order to try them out. To do so, the teacher gave another short reading passage adapted from intermediate section of “four Steps to Understanding” book and the students had to read and tell the summary in pairs. At the same time, the teacher was monitoring the pairs and motivating the students to use the strategies whenever it was possible. In the personalization phase, the students personalized what they had learned about the communication strategies, evaluated the effectiveness of the strategies and the application of the strategies in real contexts with their classmates in groups of three. According to Cohen and Weaver (1996), SSBI instruction model is mostly teacher-centered in which the teacher acts as a coach and supervises students plans and monitors their difficulties and it is the curriculum writers’ and the teachers’ role to decide on which strategies to teach and how to present it to the class. This model emphasizes both explicit and implicit teaching and learning process. Chamot and O’malley (1987) claimed CALLA instruction model consists of a six-stage procedure (Preparation, Presentation, Practice, Self-evaluation, Expansion, and Assessment) and three major components; “a curriculum correlated with main stream content area, English language development integrated with content subjects, and instruction in the use of learning strategies” (p.231). They believed that in order to integrate these three components there is a need for developing language activities. Chamot and Rubbins (2005) introduced different tasks in order to implement CALLA instructional model. For the purpose of the present study discussion about different topics were adapted based on the short passages of Four Steps to Understanding book in order to make students use their inner resources and reduce their anxiety by reading about a topic and getting ideas to start talking. According to Cohen and Weaver (1996), SSBI instruction model consists of a five-stage procedure (Strategy Preparation, Strategy Awareness-raising, Strategy instruction, Strategy practice, and personalization of Strategies) and two major components. The first component deals with teaching explicitly how, when, and why strategies can be used and second components focused on the fact that strategies should be integrated and embedded into classroom materials and tasks. In order to do so, teachers may need to design activities to introduce or reinforce the strategies. For the purpose of the present study a task (Summarizing short stories adapted from Four Steps to Understanding book) was designed according to one of the three speaking tasks from Speaking Task Battery designed by Cohen and Weaver (2005) consisting of a series three speaking tasks called: Self-description, Story Retelling, and City Description. The instruction in both classes involved 6 sessions, twice a week, and each session was 90 minutes. Then, in the 7th session, the posttest was administered. The results of the pretest and posttest were compared in order to determine the more effective method.

Design of the Study: The selection of the participants in this study was non-random, but the assignment of the participants to the experimental groups was random, therefore the design is a quasi-experimental one. Having a pretest, interventions, and a posttest also confirmed the quasi-experimental nature of the present research.
As Bechhofer and Paterson (2012, p. 24), present “the most valid quasi-experiment is where the treatment groups are both measured before and after the experiment”. That is, for each group, there is both a pretest and a posttest. So there are four measurements: a measurement on each group in advance and a measurement on each group afterwards. In the present research, two experimental groups were taken into consideration and both groups received the same pretest and posttest, however, they did not receive the same treatment between the tests (Mackey & Gass, 2015). SBBI and CALLA methods were considered as the independent variables of the study, while pre-intermediate EFL learners’ speaking ability was considered as the dependent variable of the study. Also, the components of speaking including; grammar and vocabulary, pronunciation, and interactive communication were viewed as the dependent variables. Participants’ language proficiency and their gender were regarded as the control variables.

Data Analysis: A two-way analysis of variances (two-way ANOVA) was run to compare the CALLA and SSBI groups’ means on the pretest of speaking in order to prove the groups were homogenous in terms of their speaking ability prior to the main study. Then, a multivariate analysis of variances (MANOVA) was run to compare the SSBI and CALLA groups’ means on the three components of the pretest of speaking; i.e. grammar and vocabulary, interactive communication and pronunciation in order to prove that they were homogeneous in terms of their speaking abilities on the above mentioned sub-scales prior to the administration the treatments. A two-way analysis of variances (two-way ANOVA) was run to compare the CALLA and SSBI groups’ means on the posttest of speaking in order to probe the first and third null-hypotheses raised in this study, while a multivariate analysis of variances (MANOVA) was run to compare the SSBI and CALLA groups’ means on the three components of the posttest of speaking; i.e. grammar and vocabulary, interactive communication and pronunciation in order to prove the second null-hypothesis. KR-21 reliability index was used to calculate the reliability of the proficiency test (KET), while the inter-rater reliability indices for components of the speaking test were calculated through Pearson correlation. Also, a factor analysis through the varimax rotation was carried out in order to probe the underlying constructs of the tests administered during the main study.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Testing Normality Assumption: The null-hypotheses of the study were analyzed through two-way ANOVA and two-way MANOVA whose core assumption is normality of the data. The ratios of skewness and kurtosis over their respective standard errors were lower than +/- 1.96; hence the normality of the data was met.

KR-21 Reliability of Total KET (Pilot Study): The descriptive statistics and KR-21 reliability index for the piloting KET are displayed in (Table 1). The KR-21 reliability index was .74.

| Table 1. Descriptive Statistics; Piloting KET |  |
|---|---|---|---|
| N  | Mean | Std. Deviation | Variance |
| KET | 30 | 39.17 | 9.399 | 88.351 |
| KR-21 | .74 |  |

KR-21 Reliability of Total KET (Participant Selection Phase): A group of 72 students took the KET test in order to select 60 participants to participate in the main study. The descriptive statistics and KR-21 reliability index for the piloting KET are displayed in (Table 2). The KR-21 reliability index was .82.

| Table 2. Descriptive Statistics; KET Test (Participant Selection Phase) |  |
|---|---|---|---|
| N  | Mean | Std. Deviation | Variance |
| KET | 72 | 63.96 | 11.048 | 122.009 |
| KR-21 | .82 |  |

Inter-Rater Reliability Indices for Components of Pretest: The results of the Pearson correlation indicated that there were significant agreements between the two raters who rated the participants’ performance on the pretests of:
- Grammar and vocabulary (r (58) = .79, representing a large effect size, p = .000).
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- Pronunciation (r (58) = .78, representing a large effect size, p = .000).
- Interactive communication (r (58) = .80, representing a large effect size, p = .000).


**Inter-Rater Reliability Indices for Components of Posttest:** According to the obtained results, the Pearson correlation indicated that there were significant agreements between the two raters who rated the participants’ performance on the posttests of:

- Grammar and vocabulary (r (58) = .68, representing a large effect size, p = .000).
- Pronunciation (r (58) = .77, representing a large effect size, p = .000).
- Interactive communication (r (58) = .79, representing a large effect size, p = .000).

**Construct Validity:** A factor analysis through the Varimax rotation was carried out in order to probe the underlying constructs of the tests administered during the main study. Before discussing the results, it should be mentioned that factor analysis has three specific assumptions; sampling adequacy, lack of singularity and lack of identity which are reported in (Table 3). The KMO index of .725 was higher than the minimum acceptable criterion of .60; indicating that the present sample size was adequate to run the factor analysis. The significant Bartlett’s test ($\chi^2 (21) = 358.40, p = .000$) showed that the correlation matrix was not an identity one; that is to say, there were not zero correlations among the tests. The opposite of identity is the singularity; i.e. too high correlations among all variables. The determinant value of .002 (> .00001) indicated that the correlation matrix did not suffer from singularity.

### Table 3. KMO and Bartlett’s Test

| Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy. | 0.725 |
| Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity | Approx. Chi-Square | 358.40 |
| Df | 21 |
| Sig. | 0.000 |

Determinant = 0.002

The SPSS extracted two factors as the underlying constructs of the KET and components of the pretest and posttest of speaking. This two-factor model accounted for 73.55 percent of the variance (Table 4). That is to say; the tests administered in this study measured their underlying constructs with an accuracy of 73.55 percent.

### Table 4. Total Variance Explained

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Initial Eigenvalues</th>
<th>Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings</th>
<th>Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>% of Variance</td>
<td>Cumulative %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.051</td>
<td>43.580</td>
<td>43.580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.098</td>
<td>29.969</td>
<td>73.550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.927</td>
<td>13.238</td>
<td>86.788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.491</td>
<td>7.011</td>
<td>93.798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.352</td>
<td>5.023</td>
<td>98.821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.052</td>
<td>0.738</td>
<td>99.560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>0.440</td>
<td>100.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

And finally; findings showed the factor loadings of the tests under the two extracted factors. The KET and pretests of grammar and vocabulary, pronunciation and interactive communication loaded under the first factor. These results suggested that the pretests of speaking and KET tapped on the same underlying construct. However; after the administration of the CALLA and SSBI methods, the components of posttest acquired a new construct.

**Homogenizing Groups on KET:** A two-way analysis of variances (two-way ANOVA) was run to compare the CALLA and SSBI groups’ means on the KET in order to prove the groups were homogenous in terms of their general language proficiency prior to the main study. Before discussing the results, it should be noted that the assumption of homogeneity of variances was met. The results of the Levene’s test (F (3, 56) = 1.40, p = .251) indicated that there was not significant differences between the groups’ variances. The SSBI (M = 52.38, SE = 1.30) and CALLA (M = 50.98, SE = 1.30) had almost the same means on the KET test. The results of the two-way ANOVA (F (1, 56) = .577, p = .451, partial $\eta^2 = .010$ representing a weak effect size) indicated that there was not any significant difference between the two groups’ means on the KET test. Thus, it can be concluded that they were homogeneous in terms of their general language proficiency prior to the main study. The results displayed in (Table 5) (F (1, 56) =
.299, p = .587, partial η² = .005 representing a weak effect size) also indicated that there was not any significant difference between the male (M = 52.18, SE = 1.26) (Table 5) and female (M = 51.17, SE = 1.24) groups’ means on the KET test. Thus it can be concluded that they were homogeneous in terms of their general language proficiency prior to the main study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personality</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>52.188</td>
<td>1.261</td>
<td>49.662 - 54.713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>51.179</td>
<td>1.348</td>
<td>48.478 - 53.879</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

And finally; there was not any significant interaction between types of treatments and gender (F (1, 56) = .066, p = .799, partial η² = .001 representing a weak effect size). As displayed in (Table 6), the SSBI group had higher means than the CALLA participants in both male and female groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Personality</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SSBI</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>53.125</td>
<td>1.783</td>
<td>49.553 - 56.697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td>51.643</td>
<td>1.906</td>
<td>47.824 - 55.461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALLA</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>51.250</td>
<td>1.783</td>
<td>47.678 - 54.822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td>50.714</td>
<td>1.906</td>
<td>46.896 - 54.533</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pretest of Speaking: A two-way analysis of variances (two-way ANOVA) was run to compare the CALLA and SSBI groups’ means on the pretest of speaking in order to prove that the groups were homogenous in terms of their speaking ability prior to the main study. Before discussing the results, it should be noted that the assumption of homogeneity of variances was met. The results of the Levene’s test (F (3, 56) = 1.40, p = .251) indicated that there was not significant differences between the groups’ variances. The results of Pretest of Speaking Test showed the SSBI (M = 9.23, SE = .68) and CALLA (M = 9.45, SE = .68) had almost the same means on the pretest of speaking test. The results of the two-way ANOVA (F (1, 56) = .049, p = .825, partial η² = .001 representing a weak effect size) indicated that there was not any significant difference between the two groups’ means on the pretest of speaking test. Thus, it can be concluded that they were homogenous in terms of their speaking ability prior to the main study.

Based on the obtained results (F (1, 56) = .661, p = .420, partial η² = .012 representing a weak effect size) also indicated that there was not any significant difference between the male and female groups, though, as it was found that the male (M = 8.94, SE = .66) and female (M = 9.73, SE = .71) groups’ means on the pretest of speaking test differ slightly. Thus, it can be concluded that they were homogenous in terms of their speaking prior to the main study. And finally findings showed that there was not any significant interaction between types of treatments and gender (F (1, 56) = .005, p = .943, partial η² = .000 representing a weak effect size). Based on the data, the CALLA group had higher means than the SSBI participants in both male and female groups.

Components of Pretest of Speaking: A multivariate analysis of variances (MANOVA) was run to compare the SSBI and CALLA groups’ means on the three components of the pretest of speaking; i.e. grammar and vocabulary, interactive communication, and pronunciation in order to prove that they were homogeneous in terms of their speaking abilities on the above mentioned sub-scales prior to the administration of the treatments. Before discussing the results, it should be mentioned that the assumption of homogeneity of covariance matrices was met (Box’ M = 16.42, p = .675)

Based on the results obtained, it can be claimed that the assumption of homogeneity of variances for components of pretests of speaking (grammar and vocabulary, pronunciation, and interactive communication), was met (p > .05).

Based on the results, it can be said that:
A. there was not any significant difference between the SSBI (M = 8.92) and the CALLA (M = 9.46) groups’ means on the pretest of grammar and vocabulary (F (1, 56) = .316, p = .576, Partial $\eta^2 = .006$ representing a weak effect size).

B. there was not any significant difference between the SSBI (M = 9.31) and the CALLA (M = 9.46) groups’ means on the pretest of pronunciation (F (1, 56) = .018, p = .893, Partial $\eta^2 = .000$ representing a weak effect size).

C. there was not any significant difference between the SSBI (M = 9.45) and the CALLA (M = 9.42) groups’ means on the pretest of interactive communication (F (1, 56) = .001, p = .975, Partial $\eta^2 = .000$ representing a weak effect size).

Based on the results displayed in, (F (3, 54) = .423, p = .737, Partial $\eta^2 = .023$ representing a weak effect size), it can be concluded that there were not any significant differences between the male and female groups’ means on the components of pretest of speaking.

In addition, based on the results obtained it can be stated that:

A: There was not any significant difference between the male (M = 8.45) and the female (M = 9.64) groups’ means on the pretest of grammar and vocabulary (F (1, 56) = .848, p = .361, Partial $\eta^2 = .015$ representing a weak effect size).

B: There was not any significant difference between the male (M = 9) and the female (M = 9.78) groups’ means on the pretest of pronunciation (F (1, 56) = .634, p = .429, Partial $\eta^2 = .011$ representing a weak effect size).

C: There was not any significant difference between the male (M = 9.09) and the female (M = 9.78) groups’ means on the pretest of interactive communication (F (1, 56) = .474, p = .494, Partial $\eta^2 = .008$ representing a weak effect size).

Additionally, according to the results (F (3, 54) = .164, p = .920, Partial $\eta^2 = .009$ representing a weak effect size), it can be concluded that there were not any significant interactions between the types of treatments and gender on the components of pretest of speaking.

Based on the results, it can be claimed that:

D: There was not any significant interaction between types of treatments and gender on pretest of grammar and vocabulary (F (3, 54) = .031, p = .862, Partial $\eta^2 = .001$ representing a weak effect size). The male and female in CALLA group had higher means than the SSBI group.

E: There was not any significant interaction between types of treatments and gender on pretest of pronunciation (F (3, 54) = .000, p = .993, Partial $\eta^2 = .000$ representing a weak effect size). The male and female in CALLA group had higher means than the SSBI group.

F: There was not any significant interaction between types of treatments and gender on pretest of pronunciation (F (3, 54) = .001, p = .975, Partial $\eta^2 = .000$ representing a weak effect size). The male and female in SSBI group had higher means than the CALLA group.

Based on the results, it can be said that:

A: The SSBI group (M = 15.89) significantly outperformed the CALLA (M = 12.48) group on the posttest of grammar and vocabulary (F (1, 56) = 33.09, p = .000, Partial $\eta^2 = .371$ representing a large effect size).

B: The SSBI group (M = 15.94) significantly outperformed the CALLA (M = 12.35) group on the posttest of pronunciation (F (1, 56) = 37.27, p = .000, Partial $\eta^2 = .400$ representing a large effect size).

C: The SSBI group (M = 15.78) significantly outperformed the CALLA (M = 12.49) group on the posttest of interactive communication (F (1, 56) = 26.51, p = .000, Partial $\eta^2 = .321$ representing a large effect size).

Based on the results, (F (3, 54) = 2.31, p = .086, Partial $\eta^2 = .114$ representing a moderate to large effect size) it was concluded that there were not any significant differences between the male and female groups’ means on the components of posttest of speaking; although the results should be interpreted cautiously due to the moderate to large effect size value of .114. As discussed below, the male participants had higher means on the posttests of grammar and vocabulary and interactive communication.

Based on the results, it can be stated that:
D: The male group (M = 14.81) had a significantly higher mean than the female group (M = 13.57) on the posttest of grammar and vocabulary (F(1, 56) = 4.38, p = .041, Partial η² = .073 representing a moderate effect size).

E: There was not any significant difference between the male (M = 14.18) and the female (M = 14.10) groups’ means on the posttest of pronunciation (F(1, 56) = .019, p = .892, Partial η² = .000 representing a weak effect size).

F: The male group (M = 14.81) had a significantly higher mean than the female group (M = 13.46) on the posttest of interactive communication (F(1, 56) = 4.44, p = .040, Partial η² = .073 representing a moderate effect size).

Based on the results, (F (3, 54) = 2.04, p = .119, Partial η² = .102 representing a moderate to large effect size), it can be concluded that there were not any significant interactions between the types of treatments and gender on the components of posttest of speaking; although the results should be interpreted cautiously due to the moderate to large effect size value of .119. As discussed below; there was a significant interaction on posttest of pronunciation. Based on the results, it can be said that:

G: There was not any significant interaction between types of treatments and gender on posttest of grammar and vocabulary (F (3, 54) = .073, p = .787, Partial η² = .001 representing a weak effect size). The male and female in SSBI group had higher means than the CALLA group.

H: There was a significant interaction between types of treatments and gender on posttest of pronunciation (F (3, 54) = 5.19, p = .027, Partial η² = .085 representing a moderate effect size). The SSBI female group had a higher mean than the male SSBI group, while the male group had a higher mean than the female group in CALLA.

I: There was not any significant interaction between types of treatments and gender on posttest of interactive communication (F (3, 54) = .016, p = .901, Partial η² = .000 representing a weak effect size). The male and female in SSBI group had higher means than the CALLA group.

**DISCUSSION**

The results of data analysis firstly revealed that the Styles and Strategies-Based Instruction (SSBI) group significantly outperformed the Cognitive Academic Language Learning Approach (CALLA) group on the posttest of speaking. Also, the results indicated that there was not any significant difference between the male and female groups’ means on the posttest of speaking test. In fact, there was not any significant interaction between types of treatments and gender; the SSBI group had higher means than the CALLA participants in both male and female groups. Finally, it was concluded that the SSBI group significantly outperformed the CALLA group on the posttests of grammar and vocabulary, interactive communication, and pronunciation. The male participants had higher means on the posttests of grammar and vocabulary and interactive communication. However, there was not any significant difference between the male and the female groups’ means on the posttest of pronunciation. It was concluded that there were not any significant interactions between the types of treatments and gender on the components of posttest of speaking; however, there was a significant interaction on posttest of pronunciation. The SSBI female group had a higher mean than the male SSBI group, while the male group had a higher mean than the female group in CALLA. The present findings are in line with the findings of the previous research (Cohen, 2010; Cohen & Dornyei, 2002; Lam & Wong, 2000; Oxford, 2001) in terms of the effect of SSBI on the speaking development of ESL and EFL learners. The first finding of the study revealed that, compared to CALLA, SSBI had a more significant effect on the speaking development of the Iranian EFL learners. Oxford’s (2001) study concerning language learning styles and strategies proved the prime effect of individual learning styles and strategies on EFL learners’ language development. Lam and Wong (2000) propose that strategy training has significant effects on developing discussion skills in an ESL classroom. Cohen and Dornyei’s (2002) study also proved that styles, strategies and motivation significantly affect the speaking development of ESL and EFL learners. Chamot’s (2004) study on issues in language learning strategy research and teaching also proved the same.
The present study support Cohen and Wearver's (2005) study on styles and strategies-based instruction which advises the EFL teachers to make use of teaching strategies and lead the learners towards developing specific strategies which energies their L2 development. The present finding is also in line with Cohen's (2010) study which focused on the styles, strategies and motivation of the language learner, asserting that teaching speaking to the L2 learners could lead to more fruitful results in case it is oriented towards SSBI. In the present study, both SSBI and CALLA were found to be effective in improving L2 speaking among Iranian EFL learners, meanwhile, the effect of SSBI was much more. The reason might lie in the fact that Iranian EFL learners are used to employing styles and strategies based methods more than cognitive concepts in developing L2 (Maleki, 2007).

Another related issue could be the effects of awareness-raising training on oral communication strategy use (Nakatani, 2005) which seem to have been absorbing to the Iranian students taking part in the study. Though cognitive learning has been recommended by a lot of ELT and SLA researchers (Chamot & O'Malley, 1987, 1996; Raymond, 2000; Rogoff, 1990; Rubin, 1981) a synthesis of strategy instruction for language learners (Oxford & Leaver, 1996) has attracted more attention in the present study. The effect of communication strategy training on the development of EFL learners' strategic competence and oral communication ability (Rabab’ah, 2015) has also proved to be of high significance. The second finding of the study showed no significant interaction between types of treatments and gender. In fact, the SSBI group had higher means than the CALLA participants in both male and female groups. Meanwhile, when the components of speaking were taken into consideration, it was found that the male participants had higher means on the posttests of grammar and vocabulary and interactive communication. However, there was not any significant difference between the male and the female groups’ means on the posttest of pronunciation. Also, the SSBI female group had a higher mean than the male SSBI group, while the male group had a higher mean than the female group in CALLA. This signifies that female learners taking part in the study were more strategy and style oriented while the male learners were more cognitive oriented, especially in terms of pronunciation sub-skill. This might be pursued in the individual differences and gender specifications of learners (Phakiti, 2003). A closer look at gender strategy use among L2 learners signifies that females are more interested in employing communication related strategies than males (Oxford, 2001), though Byrne (2001) believes that cognitive development and consequently L2 learning can be increased in instructional contexts. The present study findings in terms of the interaction between types of treatments and gender are also in line with Samadiyan’s (2018) study on the role of gender in L2 vocabulary development concerning SSBI and its related tasks. As she found gender does not play a significant role in this regard, while the type of strategies are considered as determining factors in this regard. The third finding of the present study asserted that significant differences between the SSBI and CALLA groups’ means on the components of posttest of speaking. The SSBI group significantly outperformed the CALLA group on the posttests of grammar and vocabulary, interactive communication, and pronunciation. This signifies the differential effects of instructions through SSBI and CALLA methods on the distinct components of L2 speaking. Accordingly, it is evident that styles and strategies-based instruction not only affects the speaking fluency of the learner (Foster & Skehan, 1999), but also significantly affects the grammatical accuracy (Jones & Lock, 2011; Nassaji & Fotos, 2011; Richards & Reppen, 2014), pronunciation accuracy (Baker, 2015), and interactive communication (Bialystok & Frohlich, 1980) among EFL learners.

CONCLUSION

The outcome of the posttest data analysis clarified that the participants in the SSBI group significantly outperformed the learners of the CALLA group on the speaking test. In other words, it showed a significant difference between CALLA method and SSBI method in improving speaking performance of pre-intermediate EFL learners. Also, the results indicated that there was not any significant difference between the male and female groups’ means on the posttest of speaking test. In fact, there was not any significant interaction between types of treatments and gender; the SSBI
group had higher means than the CALLA participants in both male and female groups. Finally, it was concluded that there were significant differences between the SSBI and CALLA groups’ means on the components of posttest of speaking. The SSBI group significantly outperformed the CALLA group on the posttests of grammar and vocabulary, interactive communication, and pronunciation.

The male participants had higher means on the posttests of grammar and vocabulary and interactive communication. However, there was not any significant difference between the male and the female groups’ means on the posttest of pronunciation. It was concluded that there were not any significant interactions between the types of treatments and gender on the components of posttest of speaking; however, there was a significant interaction on posttest of pronunciation. The SSBI female group had a higher mean than the male SSBI group, while the male group had a higher mean than the female group in CALLA. Therefore, the obvious conclusion is that the devised treatment i.e. the application of SSBI to the English language speaking program of Iranian EFL learners has helped the participants in one of the experimental groups to perform better than the other group (CALLA group) in which the learners relied on the cognitive oriented learning activities without emphasis on the effectiveness of styles and strategies. Here it could be concluded that in case the EFL learners are exposed to different strategies and become aware of their style values in learning L2, they can learn various sub-skills of speaking better and, therefore, could promote their second language learning development in general and their L2 speaking and its related sub-skills in particular. This way, they will have a better L2 performance as well.
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