

UNIVERSITY OF EDUCATION, WINNEBA

**COMMUNICATIVE STRATEGIES IN THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE
TEACHING CLASSROOM AT SELECTED COLLEGES OF EDUCATION
IN THE BONO AND AHAFO REGIONS OF GHANA**



DOMINIC NTI

(8180590022)

**A thesis in the Department of Applied Linguistics, Faculty of Foreign Languages
Education and Communication, submitted to the School of Graduate Studies, in
partial fulfilment**

**of the requirements for the award of the degree of
Master of Philosophy
(Teaching English as a Second Language – TESL)
in the University of Education, Winneba**

SEPTEMBER, 2019

DECLARATION

STUDENT'S DECLARATION

I, DOMINIC NTI, declare that this thesis, with the exception of quotations and references contained in published works which have all been identified and duly acknowledged, is entirely my own original work, and it has not been submitted, either in part or whole, for another degree elsewhere.

SIGNATURE:

DATE:

SUPERVISOR'S DECLARATION

I hereby declare that the preparation and presentation of this work was supervised in accordance with the guidelines for supervision of thesis as laid down by the University of Education, Winneba.

NAME OF SUPERVISOR: DR. CHARLOTTE FOFO LOMOTÉY

SIGNATURE:

DATE:

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I would like to express my appreciation, first and foremost to God, my Creator and Sustainer. The next appreciation goes to my supervisor Dr. Charlotte Fofu Lomotey, who guided me to develop my study into a practical frame in the very beginning and offered valuable suggestions while the work was in progress, Doctor, may God bless you and given you long.

My thanks also go to all lecturers who instructed me throughout this programme by which I have been motivated to explore some interesting issues concerning the teaching and learning of English Language as a second language.

I am extremely obliged to a great number of friends whose genuine encouragement is unprecedented.

I owe a debt of thanks to the following friends. Dr. Dennis Ohene Kyere, Emmanuel Sah Agyapong, Daniel Takyi, Christopher Gyau and my uncle Hanson Ofori Kwabena who stood by me in my difficult moments, I say God bless you all.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Content	Page
DECLARATION	iii
DEDICATION	iv
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	v
TABLE OF CONTENTS	vi
ABSTRACT	x
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Background to the Study	1
1.2 Statement of the Problem	3
1.3 Objectives of the Study	5
1.4 Research Questions	6
1.6 Significance of the Study	6
1.7 Delimitation of the Study	6
1.8 Organization of the Study	7
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW	8
2.0 Introduction	8
2.1 Communicative Strategies - Overview	8
2.2 Theoretical Framework	10
2.2.1 The psycholinguistic approach	10
2.2.2 The interactional approach	11
2.3 Definitions of Communicative Strategies	13
2.5 Identification of Communication Strategies	18
2.4 Types of Communicative Strategies	21
2.5 Taxonomies of Communicative Strategies	22
2.6 Tarone's Taxonomy of Conscious Communicative Strategies	23
2.6.1 Avoidance strategies	23

2.6.2	Compensatory strategies	24
2.7	Classification of Communicative Strategies	28
2.7.1	Communicative strategies: Achievement versus reduction	28
2.7.2	Communicative strategies: Adjusted ends versus adjusted means	30
2.7.3	Communicative strategies: Strategy versus process	31
2.7.4	Communicative strategies: Strategy versus plan	33
2.7.5	Communicative strategies: Communication versus learning strategies	35
2.8	The teachability of communicative strategies	38
2.10	Empirical Studies on Communicative Strategies	39
2.11	Assessing Strategic Competence	45
2.12	Conclusion	47
CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY		51
3.0	Introduction	51
3.1	Research Design	51
3.2	Population of the Study	52
3.3	Sample Size and Sampling Techniques	53
3.4	Research Instruments	54
3.5	Validity	55
3.6	Trustworthiness	55
3.7	Data Collection Procedure	56
3.8	Data Analysis	57
3.9	Ethical Considerations	59
3.10	Conclusion	60
CHAPTER FOUR: FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS		61
4.0	Overview	61
4.1	Types of Communication Strategies	61
4.1.1	Pauses and hesitation	61

4.1.2	Questions	66
4.1.3	Code-switching	69
4.1.4	Message abandonment	72
4.1.5	All-purpose words	75
4.1.6	Restructuring	76
4.1.7	Literal translation	76
4.1.8	Repetition	77
4.1.9	Appeal for assistance	78
4.1.10	Summary	79
4.2	Reasons for Using Communicative Strategies	80
4.2.1	To avoid break in the communication process	80
4.2.2	Develop learner autonomy (learner training)	81
4.2.3	To deepen teacher-student interaction	82
4.2.4	Correct/reduce errors to reach the goal of communication	85
4.2.5	Summary	87
4.3	Effects of using communicative strategies	88
4.3.1	Enhances fluency	88
4.3.2	Enhances learners' willingness to communicate	89
4.3.3	Achieve higher perception of communicative competence	91
4.3.4	Improves one's self-confidence	92
4.3.5	Psycholinguistically comforting	92
4.3.6	Motivates	93
4.3.7	Summary	95
4.4	Conclusion	96
CHAPTER FIVE: CONCLUSION		97
5.0	Overview	97
5.1	Summary of Findings	97

5.2	The Role Communicative Strategies in the Classroom	98
5.3	Pedagogical Implications	99
5.4	Suggestions for Future Research	102
5.5	Conclusion	102
REFERENCES		104
APPENDIX		118
TRANSCRIPTION		118



ABSTRACT

The purpose of the study was to investigate the type of communicative strategies used by tutors and students, its importance and effects. The case study design was employed in this study. The study population comprised tutors of English Language and students from selected Colleges of Education in the Bono and Ahafo Regions of Ghana. Purposive sampling technique was adopted by the researcher to select three (3) tutors of English and five hundred (500) students for the study. A qualitative content analysis research method was employed to analyse the data. The study revealed that students' use of communication strategies is not a sign of communication failure, conversely, communication strategies surfaced as they realize that they have problems of expressing their intended meaning and they need to solve the problems. The study further unveiled that the communicative strategies used by students and tutors in the English language classroom in the colleges of education are: questions, pauses, code-switching, message abandonment all-purpose words, restructuring, literal translation, repetition, and appeal for assistance. Finally, the study revealed that the effects of the use of communicative strategies were that: it helps to reduce both tutors and learners' level of communication apprehension, helps them to achieve a higher perception of communicative competence and improve their state of communicative self-confidence. The study recommended that Colleges of Education should include communicative strategy knowledge in their teaching training programs to make tutors aware of the importance of communication.



CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background to the Study

When attempting to communicate a message to listeners, a speaker may have to struggle to find appropriate expressions and grammatical constructions to compensate for gaps between what he/she intends to express and the available linguistic resources. Communicative strategies are generally defined as the ways in which a speaker attempts to solve communication problems to achieve particular communicative goals (e.g. Dörnyei, 1995; Færch & Kasper, 1983; Tarone, 2005). The study of communicative strategies can be traced to the work of Selinker (1972) on interlanguage, which introduces the notion of communicative strategies, on the basis of which Veradi (1973) and Tarone (1977) produce systematic analysis of these strategies. Since then, there has been a growing increase in the number of studies dealing with communicative strategies.

However, different researchers see communicative strategies from different points of view. These can be observed in terms of the perspectives of communicative strategies, the taxonomy of communicative strategies, the variables affecting communicative strategies, and the use of communicative strategies in L1 and L2. Communicative strategies are usually associated with spoken language and research has shown that speakers tend to use various strategies when they are unable to express what they want to say because of their lack of resources in their L2 (Hedge, 2000). When speakers experience that fluency in their first language (hereafter L1) does not follow the same pattern as their L2, a gap is created in the knowledge of their L2. These gaps can take many forms: a word, a phrase, a structure, a tense marker or an idiom (Bialystok, 1990, p. 1). In order to overcome that gap, speakers have two

options: they can either leave the original communicative goal or they can try to reach other alternative plans and use other linguistic means that they have at their disposal. Furthermore, speakers “can compensate for their lack in resources in the L2 by either changing their original intention or by using other ways of expression” (Hedge, 2000, p. 52).

These two ways of dealing with communicative difficulty have been referred to as reduction strategies and achievement strategies. Both of these strategies are used for the purpose of maintaining communication. However, the crucial difference between them is that when it comes to reduction strategies, the solution is based on omission, whereas the solution is based on commission in achievement strategies (Poullisse, 1990). Ellis (1994) suggests that communicative strategies be seen as a set of skills, which learners use in order to overcome their inadequacies in the target language. For speakers to succeed in their interactions, they have to find a way to communicate in other ways, for example, by imitating sounds, code-switching or avoiding the topic.

Previous research on communicative strategies is divided into two different fields. These two approaches define and classify the strategies as either interactional or psycholinguistic. The definition and classification of communicative strategies depend on the kind of approach used. Second language acquisition research claims that it is good for learners to use their L2 provided in a point of need, in a meaningful context, created by themselves in order to reach a better acquisition (Hedge, 2000). However, it is not clear whether communicative strategies lead to second language acquisition or whether they merely solve a current problem (Tornberg, 2000). There has indeed been disagreement amongst L2 researchers when it comes to communicative strategies. Consequently, Cook (1988, p. 120) and Ellis (1994, p. 396)

divide research about communicative strategies into two different approaches when it comes to interpreting communicative strategies. There are sociolinguistically-oriented researchers such as Tarone (1980), who treat communicative strategies as a discourse strategy where learners interact with each other, and psycholinguistically-oriented researchers such as Færch and Kasper (1984), Poulisse (1990), and Kellerman (1997), who approach communicative strategies in terms of intra-individual speech processes and cognitive processing.

The definition of communicative strategies very much depends on what kind of theoretical approach is applied and therefore the identification and classification of communicative strategies depends upon it. Cook (2008) suggests that communicative strategies are important for the teacher who wants to teach some sort of communication skills to students. With this, he intimates that students need to practice and learn ways of dealing with communication breakdown if they want to become successful in communicating in their L2. Rampton (1997) also opines that social interaction is relevant when it comes to communicative strategies, and that communicative strategies in the L2 are the same as in the L1, and therefore should be a part of any language teaching curriculum. In view of this, the present study aims at analyzing communication strategies in the English language teaching classroom in selected Colleges of Education in the Bono and Ahafo Regions of Ghana.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

According to Abura (1998), effective communication is essential to the success of both the student and the teacher. This means that teachers and their students consider communication as performing a vital role in lesson delivery. Communication is necessary for almost any profession, especially for teachers, in teacher-student relationship. While technology can make communication easier and

more convenient, students generally value the opportunity for personal contact and conversation with the teacher as well. The qualities for a positive relationship can vary to set a learning experience approachable and inviting the students to learn. According to Fenn (2014), it is necessary that the process of communication is understood mutually by the teacher and the student to make the teaching-learning process effective. Teachers impart new knowledge constantly, or transmit information to the students. In fact, the reverse also holds, especially in today's context of enormous materials available to all through the Internet (Fenn, 2014). This assertion means that ideally one should be able to communicate without any challenge or difficulties. However, in reality, research has shown the opposite: both students and teachers are confronted with a lot of challenges when it comes to communication. Færch et al (1984) explain how low-level learners may sometimes benefit from being aware of the advantages of asking for help instead of just giving up or using a native language word. At intermediate levels, learners use a larger repertoire of strategy types, even though individual learners often have their own preferences for specific types.

There is some evidence that those learners who have the most limited linguistic skills are also the least efficient strategy users. At advanced levels, one might expect to find few communicative strategies because learners who have reached this far may be expected to have a closer fit between their interlanguage resources and their communication needs. Cook (2008) posits that message abandonment is not only used to leave an intended goal, but is also used as an alternative way to retrieve the intended message and start over again. Consequently, these communication difficulties make teachers unwilling to speak, thereby raising their level of communication apprehension. Communication apprehension is defined as “an

individual's level of fear or anxiety associated with either real or anticipated communication with another person or persons" (Burroughs et al, 2003, p. 231). The fear of engaging in interaction adversely affects one's willingness to communicate. Again, these communicative difficulties lower one's perception of communicative competence. These are two perspectives on an individual's communicative competence: the actual communicative competence and the perception one has of one's communicative competence. As noted by Clément et al (2003), the latter ultimately determines the choice of whether to communicate or not. Finally, these communicative challenges reduce teachers' self-confidence. This is because teachers may not gain the psychological security (Dörnyei & Thurrell, 1991) and linguistic self-confidence (MacIntyre et al, 1998) to communicate. Although people have undertaken research in communicative strategies elsewhere, in Ghana, however, there is no known finding on communicative strategies. Based on this, the researcher sought to find out if communicative strategies are used in the colleges of education and for what.

1.3 Objectives of the Study

The following constituted the objectives of the study:

1. to examine the types of communicative strategies used by tutors and students in the English language teaching classroom at the selected Colleges of Education in the Bono and Ahafo Regions of Ghana;
2. to determine the reasons for their usage;
3. to explore the effects of their usage.

1.4 Research Questions

The study attempted to answer following research questions:

1. What are the types of communicative strategies used by tutors and students in the English language teaching classroom at selected the Colleges of Education in the Bono and Ahafo Regions of Ghana?
2. What reasons account for the use of communicative strategies by tutors and students in the English language teaching classroom at the selected Colleges of Education in the Bono and Ahafo Regions of Ghana?
3. What are the effects of using communicative strategies in the English language teaching classroom in the selected Colleges of Education in the Bono and Ahafo Regions of Ghana?

1.6 Significance of the Study

The results of the study would help in revealing the communication strategies used by tutors and students in the English language teaching classroom. That is not all, the results help us to identify the reasons behind the use of communicative strategies by the tutors and students in the selected Colleges of Education. Again, the outcome of the study will also help identify the effects of using communication strategies. Pedagogically, the result of the study will highlight the significance of the teaching and learning of communicative strategies in our schools. The study will reveal the crucial role communicative strategies play as far as language learning is concerned. Finally, the results of the current study would also contribute to existing literature for other researchers to reference.

1.7 Delimitation of the Study

According to Simon and Goes (2011), the delimitations of a study are those characteristics that arise from limitations in the scope of the study defining the

boundaries of the study. The research was confined to identifying communicative strategies use by only students and tutors in the English language teaching classroom at selected Colleges of Education in the Bono Ahafo Regions of Ghana. Other colleges in other regions are not considered.

1.8 Organization of the Study

The study was organized into five chapters. Chapter 2 presents the review of relevant related literature to the study. Literature was reviewed based on theoretical, conceptual and empirical issues relevant to the study under the following strands: overview of Communicative strategies, theoretical framework of the study, definitions of communicative strategies, the identification of communicative strategies, types of Communicative strategies, taxonomies of classification of communicative strategies, the teachability of communicative strategies, empirical studies on communicative strategies and summary of the literature reviewed. Chapter 3 focused on the research design, population, sample size and sampling procedure, research instrumentation, collection of data and analysis procedure. Chapter 4 presented the analysis and discussion of results of the study, while chapter 5 is dedicated to the summary of the research findings, uses of communicative strategies in the classroom, pedagogical implication, suggestion for further studies and conclusions.

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.0 Introduction

This chapter reviews relevant literature on the study. Literature was reviewed based on theoretical, conceptual and empirical issues relevant to the study of communicative strategies. The discussion begins with the concept of communicative strategies and presents the theoretical framework for the study. From this, definitions of communicative strategies would be explored and incorporate a discussion on the identification of communicative strategies, types/taxonomies of communicative strategies as well as the classification of communicative strategies. Finally, the chapter ends with an empirical review of related studies.

2.1 Communicative Strategies - Overview

Communicating successfully means to pass on meaningful messages to the listener. In order to achieve a successful level of communication, where learners face problems when there is a mismatch between their communication goals and their linguistic resources, they tend to use devices to improve the gap that the mismatch would create. These devices are called communicative strategies. The word communication is derived from the Latin word „communico“. It means to share, to take part in, to join or to connect. In other words, communication is defined as a process in which a message is sent from a sender to a receiver; the sender encodes a message and the receiver decodes it.

Communication problems occur when the encoded message differs from the decoded message (Williams & Kemper, 2004). When these problems occur, learners manage to overcome them by employing what are known as communicative strategies

in order to fill in the gap between their communication intentions and the linguistic abilities they have. It is possible to see a number of strategies at work, and although this list of strategies is not intended to be a full list of all existing communicative strategies, it is intended to clarify the meaning of strategies used by students and tutors in my study, thus, students and tutors in some selected Colleges of Education in the Bono and Ahafo regions of Ghana. These strategies can be viewed as an attempt by the learners to get their meanings across, to keep the conversation going and, in some situations, to fill a lack left by target language. Communicative strategies are a crucial part of the competence-based language education system, as well as essential techniques for any fluent speaker of a (second) language within and without the language classroom. They are required for adding to the fluency of any speaker of the second or foreign language when s/he is facing difficulties in verbal communication. In addition, they are both teachable and highly adaptable to the different study situations within and outside a language classroom.

Foreign language learners may face various communication problems when their language lacks the necessary resources. In order to convey their messages and remain in the conversation until their goals have been achieved, they need to use communicative strategies to cope with these problems (Laszlo, 2017). Analysis of these strategies provides us with deep insight into the complex process of language acquisition and gives us ideas about how to help learners develop their competence. It is claimed that learners may improve their competence skills by developing and shaping an ability for using specific communicative strategies to compensate for their target language deficiency (Bialystok, 1990; Dornyei, 1995). Therefore, for the purpose of facilitating the process of language learning, studying communicative strategies is pretty significant.

2.2 Theoretical Framework

The theoretical framework introduces and describes the theory that explains why the research problem under study exists. The theoretical framework connects the researcher to existing knowledge. Guided by a relevant theory, the researcher is given a basis for choice of research methods. The theoretical framework of the study is underpinned by the Psycholinguistic approach and the interactional approach to communicative strategies. These are discussed in the sections that follow.

2.2.1 The psycholinguistic approach

The properties of the psycholinguistic approach deal with the cognitive processes that are occurring within the learner, and hold the belief that learners are either aware or not aware of the fact that they have a plan when it comes to solving a problem in order to make themselves understood. Psycholinguistics is the study of the interrelation between linguistic factors and psychological aspects. The field is concerned with psychological factors that enable humans to acquire, use, comprehend and produce language. The discipline is mainly concerned with the mechanisms in which languages are processed and represented in the brain. Modern research makes use of linguistics, and information science to study how the brain processes language, and less so the known processes of, communication theories and infant development, among others. Psycholinguistic was found in philosophical and educational fields, due mainly to their location in departments other than applied sciences. Psycholinguistics has roots in education and philosophy, and covers the „cognitive processes“ that make it possible to generate a grammatical and meaningful sentence out of vocabulary and grammatical structures, as well as the processes that make it possible to understand utterances, words and text. Developmental psycholinguistics studies children's ability to learn language.

The work of Færch and Kasper (1983) presents a model of two different phases for speech production: a planning phase and an execution phase. The purpose of these phases is to aid the speaker to develop speech which can be executed and allow the speaker to reach his communicative goal (Ellis, 1994). Communicative strategies are seen as a part of this planning and therefore the goals that are mentioned are related to the activity of communication (Færch & Kasper, 1983). When learners are confronted with a problem in communication, they can either choose to apply an avoidance strategy; which means they can change their original communicative goal using a reduction strategy, or they can apply an achievement strategy and try to go through with their original goal and create some sort of an achievement strategy. Færch and Kasper (1983) argue that the choice of strategies learners use are not only based on the type of strategy they apply, but they also depend on the kind of problem they are facing (Færch & Kasper, 1983).

2.2.2 The interactional approach

When things go wrong in the conversation, both participants try to come up with an appropriate communicative strategy to get out of the difficulty. The first study on the use of communicative strategies was made by Váradi (1973), who raised the question of empirical work in communicative strategies research and claimed that learners need to get into interaction with native speakers in order for researchers to detect the effect of communicative strategies (Færch & Kasper, 1983). Tarone (1977), among others, has adopted the interactional approach and defines communicative strategies as an attempt of two speakers to come to an understanding in a situation where they do not share the necessary meaning (Ellis, 1994). Achieving one's communication goal is "mutual attempt[s] of two interlocutors to agree on a meaning

in situations where requisite meaning structures do not seem to be shared” (Tarone, 1980, p. 420 in Cook 1988, p. 120).

In this approach, learners are mutually trying to keep the conversation going, and this is a type called co-operative strategy. Interactional approaches take into consideration the interactional nature and the communicative functions of language to account for the mechanism of second language learning. Conversation Analysis, a sub-area of discourse analysis, examines language learning as situated in the social interaction that the learner participates in. It recognizes that language cannot be understood in isolation from social contexts and argues that changes in the structure of the interaction discourse evidence learning (Selinker, 1972, pp. 281–283). In this framework, the conversation between the L2 learner and his or her interlocutor constitutes an important source of language acquisition, serving a variety of functions, for example, to provide feedback and corrections, to encourage participation and to negotiate meaning. Conversation analysis focuses on the significant role of input and interaction in language learning. By including both form and function, it initiates a number of new directions to investigate SLA. The interactional approach acknowledges both reduction strategies and achievement strategies, which are typically shown in the taxonomy favoured by researchers. When things go wrong in the conversation, both participants try to come up with an appropriate communicative strategy to get out of the difficulty.

Tarone (1980) claims that communicative strategies involve both speaker and listener, and when these two participants stumble upon a problem in understanding each other they fall back on three main types of communicative strategies: avoidance, paraphrase and transfer. Avoidance deals with the notion of not wanting to talk about things you know are difficult to express in a second language situation, which can be

either whole topics or individual words. Paraphrase is used by the learners to compensate for a target language word that is not known, and transfer occurs when learners fall back on their first language. Appeal for assistance and mime are also mentioned as communicative strategies by Tarone. Appeal for assistance occurs when learners ask for help, for example by asking „*What is this?*“ and mime occurs in situations where learners use other explanations than verbal, for example by miming „*blowing out candles*“ when singing „*Happy birthday*“. These strategies are discussed in this study. Both the psycholinguistic and the interactional approaches share a similarity: they argue that communicative strategies are inherently mental procedures. Thus, all follow a primarily linguistic approach to defining communicative strategies. A speaker should think before speaking. Therefore, communicative strategies research should investigate the cognitive process underlying strategic language just as this study seeks to do.

2.3 Definitions of Communicative Strategies

Although there are many definitions of communicative strategies in the literature, most of them are based on the concept of “problematicity” (Bialystok & Frohlich, 1980; Faerch & Kasper, 1980, 1983, 1984; Tarone, 1977, 1980, 1981). For example, Varadi defines communicative strategies as “a conscious attempt to communicate the learner’s thoughts when the interlanguage structures are inadequate to convey that thought” (cited in Tarone, 1977, p. 195). Williams and Burden (2000, p. 150) also define communicative strategies as “strategies used by speakers when they come across a difficulty in their communication because of lack of adequate knowledge of the language”. According to Tarone (1977, p. 195), communicative strategies are “strategies used by an individual to overcome the crisis which occurs when language structures are inadequate to convey the individual’s thought”. Tarone

(1980, p. 419) also provides a broad explanation that characterizes a communicative strategy as “a mutual attempt of two interlocutors to agree on a meaning in situations where requisite meaning structures do not seem to be shared”. Another definition is given by Tarone that “a speaker’s attempt to communicate meaningful content in the face of some apparent deficiencies in the interlanguage strategies, and to distinguish them from those that promote learning or language production”. Tarone (1980, p. 419) establishes three criteria that must be present in a communicative strategy:

1. A speaker desires to communicate meaning X to a listener.
2. The speaker believes the linguistic or sociolinguistic structure desired to communicate meaning X is unavailable, or is not shared with the listener, the speaker chooses to:
 - avoid/abandon his attempt to communicate meaning X.
 - attempt alternative means to communicate meaning X.
3. The speaker stops trying alternatives when it seems clear to him that there is shared meaning.

Corder (1983, p. 16) defines communicative strategies as “a systematic technique employed by a speaker to express his meaning when faced with some difficulty”. What is meant by difficulty here is the lack of basic grammar and vocabulary in the target language. Ammari (1991) points out that: Corder draws the attention to the difficulty faced by the speakers’ insufficient knowledge of the target language. In doing so, he offers a considerably different way in dealing with communicative strategies. He refers to these strategies not in relation to errors, but in connection with ability analysis. He elucidates that these strategies are in balance in a native speaker, where in a learner, they are not. Faerch and Kasper (1983) theorized that the speaker in a communicative event begins with a goal. This goal can be related

to the speech act, the relationship between speakers, or the content of the event. With the goal in mind, the speaker then enters a planning phase and eventually an execution stage. In other words, students are not always conscious of their strategy utilization. In the planning stage, if a blockage occurs, the speaker chooses either to reduce one's goals; "reduction strategies" or to seek alternative means for achieving the initial goal; "achievement strategies." If the problem occurs in the execution phase, the speaker could resort to "retrieval strategies" to achieve the goal. Learners fall on retrieval strategies when they locate the communicative strategies within a general psycholinguistic model of speech production.

They demonstrate that these strategies are conscious plans employed in the face of problems either in planning or performing a language structure. Thus, they define communicative strategies as potentially conscious plans for solving what to an individual presents as a problem in reaching particular communicative goal. This definition is all encompassing in that it does not only refer to the learner or the non-native speaker, but to a native speaker as well. Communicative strategies are located in the individual language user, who is the person to experience the problem and to decide on a strategic plan for its solution.

Oxford (1990), define communicative strategies as strategies that are used to overcome problems in communication messages due to limitations in knowledge or working-memory overload during real-time communication. Examples of such strategies include switching to the mother tongue, using mime or gesture, and adjusting or approximating the message. Language learning strategies, on the other hand, consist of attempts to promote linguistic and sociolinguistic competence in the L2. Brown (1994), expands the definition of communicative strategies further by including verbal and non-verbal mechanisms for solving the communication problem.

This definition is very much similar to Canale and Swain's (1980, p. 27), who define it as "verbal and non-verbal strategies that may be called into action to compensate for breakdown in communication due to ability variables or to insufficient competence". They also regard communicative strategies which they define in their communicative model as the primary constituents in strategic competence. Nanako (1996, p. 32), regards the term "communicative strategy" as problematic because many of the instances of their use in the literature could be attributed to insufficient awareness of discourse strategies. He also argued however that the distinction between phases and strategies is blurred. He questions whether speakers actually change their goals. He also adds that problemat�icity arises from the disparity between the learner's ends and means". Khanji (1996), identifies three components of communicative strategies: 1) a communication difficulty owing to target language inadequacy, 2) student awareness of the problem, 3) a solution to overcome it.

Khanji (1996) and Yule (1997), claim that the difference between communicative strategies and learning strategies is that the usage of communicative strategies is contingent on problemat�icity: having a problem in achieving communicative goals for lack of linguistic devices. This issue of problemat�icity is not the case with learning strategies. However, Dornyei and Scott (1997), argue that the term „problem“ is not clearly defined, thus, causing considerable divergence in research on communicative strategies. This concept of problemat�icity also called "problem-orientedness" (Rampton, 1997, p. 281), leads to problem-solving strategies that a speaker uses when lacking morphological, lexical, or syntactic knowledge. However, communicative strategies research has primarily focused on lexical deficiencies within the speaker's knowledge, since lexical communicative strategies are easy to identify (Kasper & Kellerman, 1997). Mitchell and Myles (1998, p.94),

define communicative strategies as “strategies that learners employ when their incomplete linguistic system lets them down”. They also gave another definition based on Faerch and Kasper’s definition as “tactics used by the non-fluent learner during L2 interaction, in order to overcome specific communicative problems”. Generally speaking, earlier researchers in the 1970s began their research by creating definitions and then by examining the characteristics identified by communicative strategies. Later researchers in the 1980s, not only defined the communicative strategies, but also, they focused on evolving a systematic series of techniques and skills in different communicative strategy taxonomies (Lin, 2007).

In the 1990s, several significant works on communicative strategies were published. One of the most valuable works was Bialystok's: *Communicative strategies: A psychological analysis of second language use*. In this work, Bialystok introduced the definitions and theories of communicative strategies developed by many scholars such as Corder (1967,1983), Faerch and Kasper (1983), Kellerman (1978), Paribakht (1985), Tarone (1977, 1980, 1981) and Varadi (1980). The researchers in the 1990s mainly investigated the relations between strategy application and different variables of proficiency level, gender, nationality, and teaching pedagogy (e.g. Lin, 2007). In the 2000s, many researchers have played a key role in the field of communicative strategies. Most of them based their work on the teachability of communicative strategies and offered several strategy trainings and approaches. Rababah (2002), discusses different definitions, taxonomies, and teaching pedagogies of communicative strategies. In relation to this, Littlemore (2003) studied communicative strategies from linguistic perspectives. Despite the differences, the enumerated definitions implicitly have three features in common: *problematicity* (i.e., communicative strategies are used only when a problem is encountered),

consciousness (i.e., language learners are aware of the communication problems and seek ways to solve them), *intentionality* (i.e., language learners are in control of all the options/strategies that they face when solving a communication problem and deliberately select those which have definite effects on achieving their goals).

2.5 Identification of Communication Strategies

Different scholars have identified different communicative strategies. Unlike other researchers, Bialystok (1990), doubts whether the criteria of problemat�city, consciousness and intentionality are critical to the definition of communicative strategies. Restricting communicative strategies to instances of difficulty or *problemat�city*, she argues, implies that a distinction of another form of language use which is not problematic, and hence non-strategic, must be made. Yet, it is not clear how this distinction can be applied in real communication, nor is there any certainty about the status of language use that is “not normally perceived problematic but which nevertheless may be strategic”. To illustrate her argument, she gives the following example:

You take this street to the place where there is a round park in the centre and many roads come together”.

This very utterance could be used by an L2 learner who does not know the word „roundabout“, as well as by a native speaker (NS) in an attempt to describe the concept to a North American visitor who has never driven on one. In other words, to claim that problemat�city is characteristic to communicative strategies is to say that the above utterance is strategically used in one case and non-strategically used in the other, which, she argues, undermines the credibility or the psychological plausibility of such a claim.

Again, Bialystok is skeptical about the role of *consciousness* in distinguishing between communicative strategies and other constructs of language use. The claim that communicative strategies are conscious events of language use, according to her, implies that the speaker is aware of using them. This would imply, in her view, that only those speakers who are conscious of their strategic behaviour employ communicative strategies. Young children, for whom a lack of conscious monitoring of their cognitive processing is claimed (e.g. Piaget's study on children in their „pre-operational“ cognitive stage) will, therefore, be excluded from the group of speakers using communicative strategies. Bialystok rejects this reasoning by providing a number of studies conducted by Clark (1983), Dockrell and Campbell (1986), among others, which show that children's use of communicative strategies to overcome lexical shortages is approximately the same as it is the case with adults. Likewise, she cites Snow et al (1989), among others, who clearly show that children's strategic use in cognitive domains in general and linguistic domain in particular does not differ significantly from adults' strategic use.

The third criterion that is implied in the definitions is *intentionality*. Intentionality, in Bialystok's view, presupposes systematic manipulation and selection of the strategies according to some factors, such as the learner's proficiency level, the nature of the tasks being used, the conditions under which real communication takes place, and so on. Yet, there is little evidence that such a link exists. There seems to be, however, some relations between the learners' proficiency level and the use of the L2-based or L1-based strategies (the L2-based strategies are presumably preferred by more advanced learners), but this does not determine the exact strategy or strategy type that will be used (Bialystok, 1983, 1990; Poulish, 1990). From the discussions, the researcher can reasonably assert that researchers

have identified three components of communication strategies: problemat�city, meaning that the person recognizes a communication problem; consciousness, meaning that the person is conscious of the problem and is consciously employing a strategy to resolve it; and intentionality, which implies that the person is able to choose between options for overcoming a communication problem. However, Bialystok and other researchers have pointed out that communication strategies may be employed by language learners when there has been no breakdown in communications (no problemat�city) and that language learners typically use the same small set of strategies routinely, rather than intentionally and consciously choosing to employ a communicative strategy (Tarone, 1977).

Bialystock has also explained that “communicative strategies may be used equally well in situations where no problems have arisen, as in the case when a native speaker gives a road description to a stranger using a long definition instead of the actual word”. He argues that “communicative strategies are continuous with ordinary language processing and cannot be served from it by virtue of distinctive feature”. This means that communicative strategies cannot be exclusively defined by reference to any particular feature because each feature is a matter of degree, as demonstrated in the arguments presented. He perceives problemat�city as a notion that influences a speaker’s decision concerning the employment of communicative strategies. This means that a speaker only uses communicative strategies when he perceives problems which may interrupt communication. Nayar (1988, p.63), proposed five criteria to identify communicative strategies:

1. Noticeable deviance from native speaker norm in the L1 syntax or word choice or discourse pattern.

2. Apparent, obvious desire on the part of the speaker to communicate "meaning" to listeners as indicated by overt and covert discourse clues.
3. Evident and sometimes repetitive attempts to seek alternative ways, including repairs and appeals, to communicate and negotiate meaning.
4. Overt pausological, hesitational and other temporal features in the speaker's Communicative behavior.
5. Presence of paralinguistic and kinesthetic features both in lieu of and in support of linguistic inadequacy.

2.4 Types of Communicative Strategies

The number and type of communicative strategies that second language learners use constitute a topic of interest to SLA researchers because of their apparent role in the L2 acquisition process (Smith, 2003). Other researchers (Beauvois, 1992; Maleki, 2010; Tiwaporn, 2016), add another task –free discussion. Studies on free discussion have focused on content and on how students express their ideas. Most studies employing jigsaw tasks have been limited to examining the negotiation of meaning among interactants (Blake & Rapanotti, 2001; Fidalgo-Eick, 2001), an aspect that does not appear to be of paramount concern in free discussion. Very few free discussion studies examine negotiation of meaning and how students resolve communicative problems (Fernandez-Garcia & Arbelaiz, 2002; Lee, 2002). What follows is a closer look at why the main task utilized by the current study, namely free discussion, is not included in the aforementioned typology and why free discussion is most pertinent to this study. Free discussion refers to a situation where learners engage in a discussion of a given topic in a classroom situation. Oscoz (2003), defines such tasks as “activities in which students converse about a reading or class topic in

the online environment”. Free discussion has also been used by other researchers. Among them are Beauvois (1992), Darhower (2002), Kelm (1992), and Kern (1995).

2.5 Taxonomies of Communicative Strategies

The taxonomies basically look at the classification of communicative strategies. There are two main approaches of classifying communicative strategies. These are product-based classification and process-based classification. Product-based has resulted in the typology based on surface structural differences in the utterances and claimed that under such differences, there are possibilities to express thoughts. In the light of the interactional approach, for example, Tarone (1977), reveals that there are strategies that can be used to overcome linguistic knowledge differences between second language learners and native speakers. There are 5 main categories: avoidance, paraphrase, conscious transfer, appeal for assistance, and mime. Faerch and Kasper view communicative strategies as a model of speech production that consists of planning phase (where the plan is developed), and execution phase (where the plan is executed). If a learner faces the communication problems so that the plan cannot be executed, he/she either avoids the problems which leads to a change of the communicative goal and reduction strategies, or faces the problems and develops an alternative plan which leads to achievement strategies. Process-based classification proposes alternative taxonomy of communicative strategies which is based on the assumption that identifying cognitive processes that underlie the choice of the strategy is essential, as well as taking into account the factors involved in such selection (Tiwaporn, 2016).

Kellerman (1991) claims that some of the strategies demonstrate the same underlying cognitive processes and should therefore not be classified as different strategies even if they are not generalized over task, language, and learner. He further

criticized the definition of the strategies, that are sometimes too vague and the choice of some criteria, for instance, the construction of a new word “as a definition of word coinage” excludes all the words created by the learner but that already exist in the language. The taxonomies of communicative strategies vary depending on whether the focus is on the produced verbal interaction (Tarone, 1980, 1983; Faerch and Kasper, 1983; Yule and Tarone, 1997), or on the cognitive process of selecting communicative strategies (Bialystok & Frohlich, 1980; Huang, 2013; Kellerman & Bialystok, 1997; Poulisse, 1997). Many researchers have conducted studies based on different taxonomies. The oldest taxonomy was developed by Tarone (1977).

2.6 Tarone’s Taxonomy of Conscious Communicative Strategies

Communicative strategies as stated earlier are the strategies that a language user makes use of whenever he feels some deficiencies in vocabulary and grammar. These strategies have been put into taxonomies by various researchers. The taxonomies offered by various researchers seem to vary on the surface but they say the same thing. Tarone came out with five taxonomies as cited in Bialystok (1990): Avoidance (Topic avoidance, Message abandonment); Paraphrase (Approximation, Word coinage, Circumlocution); Conscious transfer (Literal translation, Language switch); Appeal for assistance, and Mime. Another taxonomy was developed by Dornyei (cited in Brown, 2000, p. 128): Avoidance strategies and compensatory strategies.

2.6.1 Avoidance strategies

Avoidance strategies are the strategies that a speaker uses to avoid speaking about a particular topic or changing the goal of a particular goal as a result of lack of linguistic resources. Message abandonment refers to the situation where a speaker

leaves a message unfinished because of language difficulties. Topic avoidance occurs when a speaker avoids some topic areas or concepts that pose language difficulties.

2.6.2 Compensatory strategies

In trying to communicate, a speaker may use a strategy to be able to reach a particular communication goal. These strategies are referred to as compensatory strategies. In compensatory strategies, circumlocution is the act of describing or exemplifying the target object of action (e.g. the thing you open bottles with for corkscrew). Approximation is when a speaker uses an alternative term which expresses the meaning of the target lexical item as closely as possible (e.g. ship for sailboat). A speaker can also utilize all-purpose words; extending a general, empty lexical item to contexts where specific words are lacking (e.g. the overuse of thing, stuff, what-do-you call-it, thingies). Word coinage involves the creation of a non-existing L2 word based on a supposed rule (e.g. vegetarianist for vegetarian). Prefabricated patterns are used through memorized stock phrases, usually for “survival” purposes (e.g. Where is the or Comment allezvous? where the morphological components are not known to the learner). Nonlinguistic signals include mime, gesture, facial expression, or sound imitation, while literal translation takes place when a speaker translate literally, a lexical item, idiom, compound word, or structure from L1 to L2.

Code-switching: Using a L1 word with L1 pronunciation while speaking in L2. Code-switching occurs when a speaker knows more than one language that is why the study of code-switching can be seen as a part of the study on bilingualism (Romaine, 1989). Code switching is certainly a communicative strategy, but it is also the case that code-switching is a category of its own, outside the study of communicative strategies. Code-switching is L1 then used as a specific L2 feature

used by bilingual learners. Appeal for help: Asking for aid from the interlocutor either directly (e.g., what do you call...?) or indirectly (e.g., rising intonation, pause, eye contact, puzzled expression). Stalling or time-gaining strategies: Using fillers or hesitation devices to fill pauses and to gain time to think (e.g., well, now, let's see, uh, as a matter of fact).

From the discussion, it is obvious that there are a group of similarities between Dornyei's and Tarone's taxonomies of communicative strategies. They both present seven types in common, which include message abandonment, topic avoidance, circumlocution, approximation, word coinage, literal translation and appealing for help. An example of one of these similarities, Tarone (1977) explains "approximation" as "the use of a single target language vocabulary item or structure, which the learner knows is not correct, but shares enough semantic features...." (cited in Bialystok, 1990, p. 40); and Dornyei's definition is "using an alternative term which expresses the meaning of the target lexical item as closely as possible" (cited in Brown, 2000, p. 128). One could see that both Tarone and Dornyei's explanations share some commonalities.

As for the differences, there are four obvious ones: (1) on the one hand, Dornyei (1995), divides communicative strategies into two opposite categories; avoidance and compensatory according to the consequence of communication. However, Tarone presents five major types: avoidance, paraphrase, conscious transfer, appeal for assistance and mime. (2) Dornyei presents three more types of compensatory strategies but Tarone, name them as use of all-purpose words, prefabricated patterns and stalling or time-gaining strategies. (3) In Tarone's typology, mime is a separate category which is explained as "all non-verbal accompaniments" while Dornyei ranges mime together with gesture, facial expression

and sound imitation to nonlinguistic signals. In that case, nonlinguistic signals provide learners with a more comprehensive description than mime (4) Language switch can be assumed to be the combination of foreignizing and code-switching. The former is defined as „the straightforward insertion of words from another language“ (Tarone cited in Bialystok, 1990, p. 41). Foreignizing refers to „using a L1 word by adjusting it to L2 phonology and/or morphology“; and code switch means „using a L1 word with L1 pronunciation or a L3 word with L3 pronunciation while speaking in L2“ (Dornyei, cited in Brown, 2000: 128).

Compared to Tarone's Taxonomy, Faerch and Kasper's (1980) was more detailed. They started by talking about Reduction strategies and Achievement Strategies. Faerch and Kasper theorized that the speaker in a communication event begins with a goal. This goal can be related to the speech act, the relationship between speakers, or the content of the event. With the goal in mind, the speaker then enters into a planning phase and eventually an execution stage. In the planning stage, if an obstacle occurs, the speaker chooses either to reduce one's goals; "reduction strategies" or to seek alternative means for achieving the initial goal; „achievement strategies“ If the problem occurs in the execution phase, the speaker could resort to "retrieval strategies" to achieve the goal.

In his taxonomy, Bialystok (1990, pp. 133-134) tried to develop a psychologically plausible system of communicative strategies. Bialystok conceptualized two main classes of communicative strategies, "analysis-based" and "control-based" strategies. The former involves attempts "to convey the structure of the intended concept by making explicit the relational defining features" that is, to manipulate the intended concept on the basis of its analyzed knowledge. The latter involves "choosing a representational system that is possible to convey and that

makes explicit information relevant to the identity of the intended concept” that is, holding the original content constant and manipulating the means of reference used to express the concept. Poulisse and Bongaerts (1994, p. 102), argued that “the main problem with previous taxonomies is that they are insufficiently related to theories of language use or development, so that studies which adopt them cannot provide much insight into the cognitive processes underlying communicative strategies use” Instead of the existing product-oriented taxonomies, her aim was to produce a context-free, process based taxonomy of communicative strategies that met three basic requirements: (a) parsimony, the fewer categories the better; (b) generalizability, independence of variation across speakers, tasks, languages, and proficiency levels; and (c) psychological plausibility, a taxonomy should be “informed by what is currently known about language processing, cognition and problem-solving behaviour” (Kellerman & Bialystok, 1997).

Communicative strategies can be studied from two sides: psycholinguistic and interactional. Dobao and Martínez (2007) reworked on strategies proposed by Tarone (1977, 1980, 1981) and Poulisse (1993, 1997) and developed a taxonomy which engages both psycholinguistic perspectives which focus on the cognitive processes the learner engages in when becoming aware of a linguistic difficulty (e.g. Bialystok 1990; Færch & Kasper, 1980, 1983, 1984; Kellerman & Bialystok, 1997; Poulisse 1990, 1993, 1997) and interactionist perspectives which treated communicative strategies as elements of discourse and focused attention on the linguistic realization of CSs (e.g. Varadi 1973; Tarone 1977, 1981; Huang, 2013 and Corder, 1983). This disagreement between researchers seems less controversial when tackling the issue of communicative strategies classification. Despite the differences in terminology and classifying dimension, the taxonomic systems converge on the type of the

strategic solutions motivating learners either to reduce or achieve their communicative goals as a result of (the assessment of) the available resources at hand. Nevertheless, Tarone's taxonomy, as far as the early work on communicative strategies is concerned, is considered to be most useful in explaining these language phenomena, because it captures a core set of strategies that recur across different taxonomies, learners, and tasks (Bialystok, 1990; Ellis, 1994; Muhammad, 2016). For this reason, it seems plausible to assume that the distinctions in strategic behaviours proposed in the taxonomies, particularly Tarone's taxonomy, are valid and hence reliable.

2.7 Classification of Communicative Strategies

Communicative strategies are classified into two main groups. These are reduction strategies and achievement strategies.

2.7.1 Communicative strategies: Achievement versus reduction

Corder et al (1983) distinguish between two main types of strategies: those that are governed by avoidance behaviour (i.e. reduction strategies) and those that are governed by achievement behaviour (i.e. achievement strategies). The choice between these strategies depends on underlying behaviour that motivates the speakers either to avoid or achieve their communicative intentions, which, in turn, depends on the available communicative resources and the situational assessment. Reduction strategies are divided into *formal* and *functional* strategies. *Formal strategies* are adopted to avoid making errors due to the incomplete command of the L2 items and rules. These strategies are further subdivided into *phonological*, *morphological*, *syntactic* and *lexical* strategies. *Functional strategies*, on the otherhand, are employed to reduce one's communicative goal in order to avoid the problem due to insufficient linguistic resources or retrieval difficulties. These strategies comprise subtypes such

as, *actional*, *modal* and *propositional* reduction strategies. Actional and/or modal strategies involve reducing, abandoning or avoiding the communicative goal that has to do with socio-linguistic appropriateness or with argumentative and directive functions. Reduction of propositional content comprises strategies such as, *topic avoidance*, *message abandonment*, *meaning replacement* or „semantic avoidance“.

Achievement strategies are those attempts by L2 learners to expand their communicative resources, either by compensating for the gaps in their interlanguage systems (through „compensatory strategies“) or by retrieving items or structures (through „retrieval strategies“). *Compensatory strategies* are classified according to the type of resources the learner is relying on to solve his communicative problems: These include *code switching* (Corder’s language switch/ borrowing), *interlingual transfer* (involves adopting linguistic features from other languages than the L2), *inter-/intralingual transfer* (overgeneralization of L2 forms based on L1 or other known language structures), *Interlanguage-based strategies* (which are, further, subdivided into *generalization*, *paraphrase*, *word coinage* and *restructuring*, *cooperative strategies* including *appeal for assistance* and finally *non-linguistic strategies*). *Retrieval strategies* are used to retrieve specific Interlanguage items and they are subdivided into the following strategies: Waiting for the term to appear, appealing to formal similarity, retrieval via semantic fields, searching via other languages, retrieval from learning situations and sensory procedures.

Faerch and Kasper (1983) described the communicative strategies as being compensatory strategies. Also, they are what Corder (1983) calls communicative resources expanding strategies. Faerch and Kasper (1983) continued this thought with “achievement strategies aimed at solving problems in the planning phase due to insufficient linguistic resources” (p. 46). There are six achievement strategies,

including code switching, interlingual transfer, “inter/intralingual transfer, Interlanguage based strategies (generalization, paraphrase, word coinage, and restructuring), cooperative strategies, and non-linguistic strategies (Faerch & Kasper, 1983, pp. 46-52).

2.7.2 Communicative strategies: Adjusted ends versus adjusted means

Corder’s (1983) classification of communicative strategies is organized around the relationship between *ends* (i.e., the intended meaning) and *means* (i.e., the available resources). Ideally, it is assumed that the native speaker’s ends and means are in balance, while the learners are not. Learners lack sufficient socio and linguistic resources to express their intended message successfully. When learners are engaged in communication, two main options are available to them. They can either: (1) tailor their message to meet their available resources (that is, „adjust“ their ends to their means), or (2) expand their resources so that the intended meaning will be realized. (or adjust their means to their ends). The first option is referred to as „message adjustment strategies“ or „risk avoidance strategies. Message adjustment strategies are further subdivided into topic avoidance, at one extreme, followed by message abandonment, then by semantic avoidance and message reduction at the other extreme. Resource expansion strategies, on the other hand, are sub-classed according to the risk-taking (that is, the possibility of running the risk of communication failure) characterizing each strategy. The most risk-taking strategy is that of borrowing or „switching“. The less risky strategy is the use of paraphrase or circumlocution, followed by paralinguistic and appeal for help as the least risky strategies.

To sum up, almost all the researchers examined above have classified their taxonomy of communicative strategies according to the motivation underlying the speaker’s behaviour either to reduce/avoid or achieve their communicative goals by

consulting different resources. The speakers' attempt to adjust their resources (or means) to their intended meanings (or ends) is also apparent across the different studies. However, this similarity is, unfortunately, obscured by the classifying dimension and terminological differences; the same strategy is termed, defined and classified differently by different researchers (Muhammad, 2016). A possible explanation for the similarities between taxonomies is that researchers probably develop their classification on the work of their colleagues rather than directly addressing the problem of communication processing underlying the speaker's behaviour (Bialystok, 1990, p. 47). As for the differences, it may be that the organization of the proposed taxonomies is based on the linguistic form of the data rather than on the underlying behaviour (Bialystok, 1990; Kellerman, 1991). As a consequence, different strategies and strategy types are distinguished by different researchers resulting in a flood of strategies with an open-ended nature that does not meet the criterion of validity or the psychological plausibility (Kellerman & Bialystok, 1997; Poulisse, 1990).

2.7.3 Communicative strategies: Strategy versus process

The claim that „problematicity“ and the related „consciousness“ and „intentionality“ are indicative of L2 strategic behaviour leads to the assumption that another non-strategic type of behaviour must be determined. The question that is likely to arise is how it should be determined when exactly strategies have been or have not been used in an utterance. The answer to this question is a matter of disagreement between researchers (e.g. Kovacevic, & Kovacevic, 2015). Selinker (1972), for example, considers strategies as a subclass of *processes*. The other processes involve „language transfer“, „transfer-of-training“ and „overgeneralization“. Levenston and Blum-Kulka (1977), use the two terms interchangeably as referring to

the same phenomenon. Hence, *simplification* is considered “as the act of simplifying, the strategy of communication, the process whereby specific meanings are communicated on specific occasions” (p. 52). In a later study, however, Blum-Kulka and Levenston (1983), among other researchers, use these terms to refer to different types of mental activities related to the same hierarchical system of language use. They propose the *temporal dimension* as a criterion to separate strategies apart from processes. They define strategy as “the way the learner arrives at a certain usage at a specific point in time” and process as „the systematic series of steps by which the learner arrives at the same usage over time” (p. 125). The use of a superordinate term like „flower“ instead of „rose“ to overcome the absence of the word in the learner’s repertoire, for instance, is a strategy of communication. However, the repeated occurrence of the same word in the same context over time indicates that a process has taken place. In this sense, a strategy that is used to solve an immediate problem may become a process if it occurs on more than one occasion.

Bialystok (1978), on the other hand, proposes *optionality* as a criterion to distinguish between the two categories. Processes, according to her, are obligatory (i.e., autonomous) and strategies are optional (i.e., additional) mental activities of the language system. Strategies are thus defined as “optional means for exploiting available information to improve competence in a second language” (p. 71). Strategies, then, are the range of options available for the speaker at the moment of communication, whose selection and subsequent implementation change the autonomous course of the language processing, and hence, lead to a different form of output than would be expected under normal communicative conditions (i.e. according to TL-norms). The question which arises, however, is how to determine whether the produced speech is a result of a strategy or a process. A possible answer

would be a proposition to compare the observed speech performance with an established norm of speech production (cf. Tarone et al, 1983). Yet, it is uncertain which performance can be selected as a norm. Some would suggest the speech produced by an average native speaker (e.g. Tarone et al). In this case, incorrectness rather than optionality should be taken as a criterion for distinguishing between strategies and processes. Equating strategies with erroneous speech would exclude those utterances from strategic behaviour that are correct according to the target language (TL) norms, such an assumption would undermine the validity of the construct.

2.7.4 Communicative strategies: Strategy versus plan

Another attempt to discriminate strategies from processes and other components of language use is postulated by Faerch and Kasper (1983). In their view, the real opposition to *process* is *product* rather than strategy. Process, therefore, must be used in a general sense to mean a continuing development involving a number of changes (Brown, 1976) and a dynamic sequence of different stages of an object or system (Klaus & Buhr, 1976 cited in Faerch & Kasper, 1983, p. 30). Hence, plans, rather than processes, are comparable to strategies. Strategies, then, are *a subclass of plans* that are developed during the planning phase, the execution of which leads to speech production. Two criteria are attributed to strategic use: problem-orientedness (i.e. problematicity) and consciousness. Like Bialystok (1983), Faerch and Kasper regard strategies as a separate and additional system that the speaker only employs when a communicative problem crops up. This implies that communication is possible without the learner's intervention. The same issue which has been raised above to express doubt about Bialystok's claim, that strategies –unlike processes– are not a part of normal language use, is of relevance here: it is difficult to determine how

and whether the observed data belongs to a strategy or to other constructs of language production.

According to Faerch and Kasper (1983), the existence of strategies can be inferred through special *performance features*, like temporal variables (e.g. rate of articulation, pauses, drawls and repeats), self-repairs (e.g., false starts and new starts, speech errors or slips of the tongue) and the like. Performance features in interlanguage-learner's speech generally differs from the Native speaker's in the rate of articulation, the frequency of filled or unfilled pauses, the slips of the tongue due either to inter- or intralingual transfer. Yet it is not clear whether these features are caused by strategic intervention or by other phenomena like "attention gaps, change of intention, and other forms of distraction, none of which are notably strategic" (Bialystok, 1990, p. 24).

This means the failure of the attempts to provide reliable and valid parameters that can be attributed to communicative strategies is probably due to the fact that all the approaches discussed above have failed to meet the two criteria that Bialystok (1990) refers to as the *behavioural evidence* (i.e. reliability) and the *objective measure* (i.e. validity). If two distinct systems, such as strategies and processes, are claimed to exist, then it would be plausible to expect qualitative differences in the behavioural evidence that can be attributed to their separate existence. Faerch and Kasper's performance features discussed are an excellent example of behavioural evidence, but not of the objective measure, since strategies "undoubtedly also occur even when there is no external evidence to betray them" (p. 24). Besides, as mentioned previously, performance features could also be a result of other phenomena like attention gaps and other distractional factors, which have nothing to do with strategic use as being conceptualized by Faerch & Kasper. If the

criteria proposed so far have failed to unequivocally disentangle strategies from processes –probably because of the failure of the researchers to meet what Bialystok calls the behavioural and objective criteria– then the question that is likely to arise is how to distinguish between the two phenomena in a way that can satisfy the two conditions in question.

2.7.5 Communicative strategies: Communication versus learning strategies

Another way to approach communicative strategies is to distinguish them not from processes, but from other types of strategies such as learning strategies. The first attempt in this direction dates back to Selinker's *interlanguage* (henceforth =IL) (Selinker, 1972). In this work, five processes are held responsible for the IL development towards the target norms, two of which are *strategies of second-language learning* and *strategies of second-language communication*. These two strategies are not unequivocally defined: "simplification" (a tendency on the part of learners to reduce the target language (henceforth=TL) to a simpler system", (p. 219) is, in his view, an example of a learning strategy, but no example of a communication strategy is offered. Yet, his identification of five processes governing IL-behaviour leads to the assumption that the distinction must be made between learning strategy (henceforth=LS) and communicative strategies rather than between strategies and processes. Tarone (1983) distinguishes between three different strategies, namely *production strategies* (PS), *communication strategies* (CSs) and *learning strategies* (LS). Production strategies and CSs are identified as strategies of language use and LS as strategies of language learning. Production strategies „are similar to communication strategies in that they are attempts to use one's linguistic system, but PS differ in that they lack the interactional focus on the negotiation of meaning, which is considered to be central in communicative

strategies. Thus, the use of prefabricated patterns, discourse planning and rehearsal are examples of PS, because they minimize the effort of speaking in a particular situation.

The distinction between communicative strategies and LS, on the other hand, is based on the learner's motivation behind the strategic use. If the learner's motivation is to learn the target items or structures, LS will be used; but, if the speaker's desire is to communicate meaning, CS are likely to be employed. Thus, performance features, such as the use of mnemonics, memorization, repetition of troublesome target structures, spelling and the like, are instances of LS rather than of communicative strategies. This distinction is important, but as Tarone observes, it is somewhat problematic, because (a) there is no way of measuring the motivation underlying the use of a strategy; (b) it may be that the learner's motivation is both to learn and to communicate; and (c) learners may unconsciously acquire language even if they are using a strategy solely to communicate meaning. Similarly, Corder (1983) recognizes the difficulty in distinguishing between communicative strategies and LS on the basis of a particular feature inferred from an utterance (e.g. motivation). The *borrowing* of an item from the learners' native or other known languages for immediate purposes may lead to acquiring it even though their motivation is to communicate meaning in the first place. This is particularly the case when features of an utterance bear a resemblance to features of the speakers' native language. Yet, unlike Tarone, who sets communicative strategies and LS apart as separate components of language use and learning, Corder puts them together under the heading of production strategies.

More or less the same view is held by Faerch and Kasper (1983) and Blum-Kulka and Levenston (1983): the learner's need to communicate clearly surpasses

any other interest in learning a foreign language. Nonetheless, two types of communicative strategies can be distinguished in connection with learning: those that have a potential learning effect (*achievement strategies*) and those that do not have that effect (*reduction or avoidance strategies*). Blum-Kulka & Levenston equally use the terms *„potentially process-initiating’strategies* for the former and *‘situation bound’ strategies* for the latter. Learning, according to Faerch and Kasper, takes place through communication, especially in informal L2 learning contexts. In order for communicative strategies to have a potential learning effect, the learner behaviour must be governed by achievement rather than avoidance. By adopting strategies aimed at achieving communicative goals, they argue, the learner forms hypotheses about the structural features of the TL on the basis of the input data he is exposed to. The learner tests these features receptively and productively. The items and structures that are in accordance with the input are incorporated in his IL system, and those that are not are revised or rejected. However, like Tarone and Corder, Faerch and Kasper also recognize the difficulty in distinguishing between CSs and LS, since, in their view, it is not quite clear when exactly learning takes place as a result of the employment of a communicative strategy.

Unlike Corder, Tarone, Faerch and Kasper and Blum-Kulka and Levenston, who assign approximately equal status to communicative strategies and LS, Stern (1983) places communicative strategies under the heading of LS. Stern identifies four LS, the use of which may lead to language learning: active planning strategy, academic (explicit) learning strategy, social learning strategy and affective strategy. Communicative strategies are considered as a subclass of *social learning strategy* and are accordingly incorporated into LS. Learning strategies is therefore defined as “general tendencies or overall characteristics of the approach employed

by the language learners” (p. 405) and CSs as “techniques of coping with difficulties in communicating in an imperfectly known second language” (p. 411). The examples given by Tarone above (i.e. mnemonics, memorization, repetition with purpose of remembering and the like) are instances of *learning techniques* rather than of LS. He defines learning techniques as “particular forms of observable learning behaviour, more or less consciously employed by the learner” (p. 405).

2.8 The teachability of communicative strategies

The teachability of communicative strategies has been discussed to a large extent in the field of communicative strategies and there have been different arguments for or against the teachability of communicative strategies. Some of the researchers in this field (Bialystok, 1990; Bongaerts & Poulisse, 1989; Kellerman, 1991; Paribakht, 1985) have questioned the validity and usefulness of the instruction of communicative strategies. They have pointed out that second language (L2) learners have already acquired the ability to solve communication problems as part of their first language (L1) so training them again to use these strategies in L2 is useless (cited in Manchon, 2000). On the contrary, a number of researchers (Dornyei, 1995; Dornyei & Thurrell, 1991; Faerch & Kasper, 1983, 1986; Kongsom, 2009; Lam, 2004, 2010; Le, 2006; Lin, 2007; Maleki, 2007, 2010; Manchon, 2000; Mariani, 2010; Nakatani, 2005; Tarone & Yule, 1989; Willems, 1987) advocate the teachability of communicative strategies and support the equipping of learners with strategic competence.

According to Manchon (2000), the arguments which lend support to communicative strategies instruction involve the following issues. First, “strategic competence is a part of the learners’ communicative competence” (Manchon, 2000, p. 18); thus, developing L2 learners’ strategic competence can help learners overcome

their challenges. One objective of L2 teaching is to develop learners' use of CSs in order to enhance their communicative competence. The second argument concerning the instructions of communicative strategies involves the issue of the transfer of L1 skills. Although there are some similarities between the communication in L1 and L2, there exist some differences. That is, L2 learners may come across different communication problems in using the L2, so they may need to develop more CSs in addition to what they pose in the L1 in order to solve them. Lastly, communicative strategies instruction contributes to the learners' "security, self-confidence, and motivation to communicate" (Manchon, 2000, p. 20).

According to Manchon (2000), communicative strategies training may contribute to developing the learner's sense of security and self-confidence when he or she attempts to communicate using his/her interlanguage resources, and thus attempts to communicate in the L2. Again, Mariani (2010) support the training of using communicative strategies as communicative strategies "encourage risk-taking and individual initiative" (p. 44). He further expatiated that communicative strategies "give learners the feeling that they can increase their control over language use, play an active role, make some choices and become more responsible for what they say and how they say it" (Mariani, 2010, p. 44). In summary, the researchers that support the teachability of communicative strategies suggest teaching communicative strategies explicitly and/or implicitly because these methods may assist develop the students' knowledge of communicative strategies.

2.10 Empirical Studies on Communicative Strategies

A number of empirical studies have been conducted in the field of communicative strategies. Researchers have focused on the language produced by the learner. They have treated CSs as isolated units of analysis. Thus, communicative

strategies have been studied as part of the learner's use of the language and not as the product of the interaction taking place between learners. Studies range from identifying the different types of communicative strategies available (e.g. Dornyei & Kormos 1998; Tiwaporn, 2016), the factors affecting the learner's choice of specific communicative strategies types, such as proficiency level (e.g. Bialystok 1983; Dobao, 2001; Paribakht 1985; Palmberg 1979; Tarone 1977), to identify the personality and learning styles (Haastруп & Phillipson, 1983; Littlemore 2003), or task-demands (Bialystok 1983; Poullisse et al, 1990; Bongaerts, 1994), to explain the potential communicative effectiveness of the different types of strategic utterances produced by the learner (Bialystok 1983; Ervin, 1979; Palmberg 1982; Poullisse et al, 1990); and finally, to present the possibility of instructing the foreign language learner on the effective use of communicative strategies (Dornyei 1995; Dornyei & Thurrell 1991; Færch & Kasper 1986; Huang, 2013; Jourdain & Scullen, 2002).

For example, Faerch et al (1984) explained how low-level learners may sometimes benefit from being aware of the advantages of asking for help instead of just giving up or using a native language word. At intermediate levels, learners use a larger repertoire of strategy types, even though individual learners often have their own preferences for specific types. There is some evidence that those learners who have the most limited linguistic skills are also the least efficient strategy users. Finally, at advanced levels, one might expect to find few communicative strategies because learners who have reached this far may be expected to have a closer fit between their interlanguage resources and their communication needs. On the other hand, it could be argued that the better one's proficiency in the foreign language, the greater his/her communication ambitions. For this reason, one might still expect a fair number of strategies even in the speech of advanced learners. Nayar (1988) also

conducted one of the first empirical studies, which investigated the effect of learner's proficiency level in relation to the use of communicative strategies using natural unelicited data. Data were collected from seminar discussions of ESL learners. The participants had varied levels of proficiency classified as intermediate, advanced, and high advanced. Activities in the seminars allowed the learners to communicate their ideas freely and to exchange real information; in comparison to structured drills tasks as most studies on communicative strategies does. The strategies were analyzed across proficiency levels in terms of their range, frequency of occurrence, and popularity. The results revealed that in general, learners from all the three levels of proficiency employed linguistic, interactional and non-linguistic strategies. The more advanced learners used less communicative strategies and their dependence on the non-target language-based strategies was also reduced.

Bongaert and Poulisse (1989) showed that when speakers are faced with communication problems, they overcome it regardless of their L1 or L2. A total of 45 Dutch students; 15 junior high school students, 15 high school students and 15 Dutch university students of English participated in the study. They were divided into three groups (advanced, intermediate, and low) depending on the number of years of their English study, school report marks and teacher judgments. It was concluded that the same type of communicative strategies were used regardless of language level. Poulisse and Schills (1989) worked with three different groups of learners characterized as advanced, intermediate and beginning learners of English. They were tested individually across three oral tasks: (1) picture description; (2) story-retelling task, and (3) a twenty minutes interview with a native speaker of English. A process-based taxonomy that distinguished between conceptual and linguistic strategies was used to investigate the types of compensatory strategies used by the subjects. It was

recorded that the higher the proficiency level of the learners, a smaller number of communicative strategies was used and that there was no consensus between the proficiency level and the strategies employed. Rather, it was the nature of the task that determined the communicative strategies used.

Iwai (1995, 2000) investigated the relationship between linguistic proficiency and communicative strategies choice in the learner's first language (L1) and his/her second language (L2). Thirty-two college students participated in this study, and were divided into two groups; a high-level English proficiency group and a low-level English proficiency group according to TOEIC (Test of English for International Communication) scores administered. First, they were asked to describe nine abstract pictures in Japanese. The pictures were the same used in Bongaerts and Poulisse (1989). Three of the pictures were distracters, and six were used for the analysis of the data. One week later, participants were asked to perform the same task in English. All utterances were recorded and transcribed and linear perspectives were used when they break a shape up into its ultimate components such as lines and angles. The study found that proficiency level did not influence communicative strategies choice either in L1 or in L2. In another instance, Stewart and Pearson (1995) conducted a study to examine communicative strategies in a negotiation task involving eight university students who were divided into native speakers and non-native speakers of Spanish. The results of the study suggest that certain types of communicative strategies can be a valuable aid to communication.

The most successful interaction revealed that clarification requests clearly articulated in the target language by the non-native speakers coupled with rephrasals in a more simplified form on the part of the native speakers were the most effective communicative strategies. The study had very important implications for language

teaching. The researcher explained that communicative strategies can enhance communicative ability, and providing assistance to learners in accessing CSs may aid them in their quest for L2 proficiency. As these strategies form part of the overall communicative competence of all native speakers, many of them are applicable for use by learners in the target language as well. The two researchers strongly believe in providing students at all levels with access to any or all tools to foster interactional ability. Target language proficiency is one of the researched variables that affect communicative strategies. It has been suggested that the speakers' choice of the communicative strategies and their level of target language proficiency may be related (Corder, 1983; Tarone, 1977). The findings of some research studies suggest that less-proficient learners use more communicative strategies (e.g. Liskin-Gasparro, 1996; Poulisse & Schils 1989), prefer reduction strategies to achievement strategies (Ellis, 1985), and rely more on L1 strategies compared to more proficient learners (Bialystok 1983; Paribakht 1985).

Chen (1990) focused on the relationship between linguistic proficiency and communicative strategies choice. Poulisse and Bongaerts (1994) and Iwai (1995, 2000) investigated communicative strategies of students' first language (L1) and their second language (L2). Nakano (1996) and Poulisse and Bongaerts (1994) researched into tasks and communicative strategies choice. These studies have provided a good understanding of how the use of CSs might change as learners master the target language. Nevertheless, some studies focused on the notion that communicative strategies are also used by L1 speakers (e.g. Faerch and Kasper, 1983; Trosborg, 1982). Rababah and Bulut (2007) investigated the communicative strategies used in the oral discourse of second year students studying Arabic as a second language (ASL). The study examined the various strategies used by 24 male learners who were

all high school graduates from 8 different countries. The participants were audio-recorded while performing two tasks: an interview and a role-play. The data were transcribed and analyzed. The results showed that the students used a range of communicative strategies in their oral production. Moreover, there were differences between the individual learners' strategies according to their native language. The findings of the study showed that ASL learners were risk-takers, and they expanded their limited linguistic resources to achieve their communicative goals.

Darhower and Martinez (2002) examined how learners and their interlocutors manage to communicate meaning through the use of communicative strategies. Data analyzed in their study were collected from university students through a task-based experiment, which was both audio and video recorded. Thirty-two students were paired on four different dyad conditions. The results obtained showed different kinds of communication grounding techniques. In some cases, communicative strategies were accepted by the addressees (acknowledgments, displays and demonstrations, initiation of a relevant next contribution and continued attention) while in some others, the initial communicative strategies uttered by the learner was not accepted and had to be followed by a negotiation of meaning process. Ting and Phan (2008) examined how the use of communicative strategies was influenced by the target language proficiency of speakers of English as an Additional Language. The oral interaction data from 20 participants in Malaysia were analyzed to identify the choice of communicative strategies and the type of communication strategy category, using an integrated framework comprising psycholinguistic (Faerch & Kasper, 1980), interactional (Tarone, 1980) and discourse perspectives (Clennell, 1995). The results showed that the two groups did not differ in the total number of communicative

strategies used, and the preference was for strategies based on the second language (L2).

2.11 Assessing Strategic Competence

Even though strategic competence has been included in various models of communicative language ability, it has received less attention in the field of L2 assessment. Strategic competence was first included as an important element of Canale and Swain's (1980) model of communicative competence. According to them, strategic competence is defined as the use of "verbal and non-verbal strategies that may be called into action to compensate for breakdowns in communication due to performance variables or to insufficient competence" (p. 30). The concept of strategic competence was further explained by Bachman and Palmer (1996) when they defined strategic competence as "a set of metacognitive components, or strategies, which can be thought of as higher order executive processes that provide a cognitive management function in language use as well as in other cognitive activities" (p. 70). According to this definition, the role of strategic competence comprises metacognitive strategies (goal setting, assessment, and planning) and their interaction with topical knowledge (real world knowledge) and effective schemata in language use.

Apart from Bachman and Palmer's (1996) framework of strategic competence components, Saif (2002) included the components of strategic competence in her description of the speaking ability components in a test construct. According to Saif (2002), strategic competence is the "ability to set goals for the communication of intended meanings, assess alternative linguistic means (especially when there is a linguistic preventing the speaker/hearer from completing a default task) and to draw upon the areas of language knowledge for the successful implementation and completion of a chosen task" (p.150). Based on the definition, the ability components

of strategic competence are divided into five main areas; goal setting, use of verbal strategies, use of non-verbal strategies, achievement of communicative goals through production, and achievement of communicative goals through comprehension. The most recent empirical study on assessing strategic behaviours in the field L2 testing is Haung (2013). This study aimed to investigate the strategic behaviours that test-takers used when taking the International English Language Testing System (IELTS) speaking test. The participants were 40 Chinese-speaking, English-as-an additional-language students at both intermediate and advanced levels. The data were collected by using stimulated verbal reports and observation of the actual production in order to examine the strategic behaviours of those that were taking the speaking test in a non-testing situation. The results showed that the participants used 90 different individual strategies during the speaking test. Overall, there were 2,454 instances of strategy use in the participant's performance of the three tasks. Of the six strategy categories, metacognitive, communication and affective strategies were used most frequently and social strategies were used least frequently.

As has been noted, researchers have proposed components for strategic competence and have elaborated on each component. They integrated communicative strategies with the strategic competence that language learners should master in order to cope with communicative problems and to achieve their communicative goals. Since this research also aims at examining communicative strategies, it will not be out of place to integrate communicative strategies with strategic competence that students and tutors in the Colleges of Education should master in order to cope with communicative problems and to achieve their communicative goals.

2.12 Conclusion

After reviewing studies about communicative strategies, most of these studies focused on the types and identification of communicative strategies used by learners of a second or a foreign language. It also threw light on the link between these strategies and learner's proficiency levels. The results of such studies may provide additional insight into the nature of learner's ability and the construct of language proficiency itself. Communicative strategies were defined by many researchers in the reviewed studies; they generally consider them as devices used to solve problems in communication or to fill gaps in the speakers' second language proficiency. However, there is still no universally accepted definition of communicative strategies. Perhaps because of the problems of the definition, there is no generally agreed upon typology of communicative strategies. The review of the literature showed that there were many kinds of communicative strategy taxonomies, most of which were rather similar, such as the taxonomies that have been proposed by Bialystok (1990), Faerch and Kasper (1984), and Tarone (1980).

From the reviewed literature, research has shown that there is a relationship between the frequency of communicative strategies use and proficiency level. When the proficiency level of a learner increases, the number of CSs used decreases (Labarca & Khanji, 1986; Poulisse & Schils, 1989). Thus, low proficient learners do not have the linguistic resources to use many of the communicative strategies, and high proficient learners do not need to use them. Although there has been extensive research into communicative strategies on native and EFL learners, few studies were carried out on Arab learners of English or on Arab Students using the Arabic language (Rababah, 2005; Rababah & Bulut, 2007; Rababah & Seedhouse, 2004). Whatever theoretical approach may be adopted; one thing is certain: communicative strategies

are an undeniable phenomenon of language use. Even though their existence is particularly salient in the speech of L2 learners, it has been shown to be used by L1 speakers as well (Faerch & Kasper, 1983; Kellerman, 1991; Wagner, 1983; Yule & Tarone, 1990, 1997).

Another issue that increasingly gains ground in communicative strategies research is the growing skepticism about the major criterion of *problematicity* (and the related issue of consciousness) as definitional to communicative strategies (Bialystok, 1990; Brown & Levinson, 1987; Kellerman, 1991; Wagner, 1983; Wienmann & Daly, 1994). These scholars agree on the fact that communication is strategic in nature; in the sense that learners, like native speakers, strategically select on a continuous basis from a wide range of available resources those which optimally and cost-efficiently achieve their communicative intentions. They also acknowledge the fact that much communication is conducted without any indication of problematicity, either because it is concealed (cf. Faerch & Kasper, 1983, p. 235; Hinnenkamp, 1987, p. 150) or inaccessible to self-inspection (Seliger, 1983).

Nevertheless, there is a growing consensus among researchers that relying on one method of communicative strategies identification, derived from either strategy marked data or retrospective verbal report, is risky and susceptible to research misinterpretations. The use of both methods is, therefore, strongly recommended (Kasper & Kellerman, 1997, p. 4). In line with the recent convergence of opinion that problematicity alone does not lead to the unequivocal identification of communicative strategies, similar overlapping views are applicable to the *classification* of some of these strategic behaviours. In spite of apparent differences, most taxonomies are centred on the learner's intention or desire to „either tailor his message to the resources he has available, that is, adjust his ends to his means. Or he can attempt to

“increase his resources by one means or another in order to realize his communicative intentions” (Corder, 1983, p. 17). This dichotomy between the intended meaning (ends) and the means of expression (means) suggested by Corder is also found in other subsequent taxonomies. Thus, Varadi’s adjusted meaning (ends) versus adjusted form (means), for instance, reflects Corder’s classification. Similarly, Tarone’s taxonomy seems to capture this distinction.

For Tarone, communicative strategies are a joint endeavour between the learner and the native speaker. When the cooperative effort between the interactants fails to solve a communicative problem, the speakers may resort to either avoid or reduce their intended communicative goals (ends) or try to achieve them through some other medium or means (e.g. paraphrase, conscious transfer, or mime). As noted earlier, Faerch and Kasper propose more or less the same distinction. When faced with the challenge of conveying a message, the learner has a choice between two approaches: he can circumvent or avoid the problem by adjusting his ends to his means (reduction strategies) or confront the problem and try to achieve his communicative goal by adjusting his means to his ends (achievement strategies).

This dichotomy is also found in the taxonomy proposed by the Nijmegen group. The learner has a choice to either manipulate or adjust the *concept* (ends) through a description of its distinctive features or manipulate or adjust the communicative medium or *code* (means) through neologism, a switch to L1, mimetic gestures and the like. However, as noted earlier, the Nijmegen group limited their typology to compensatory strategies. Appeal for assistance, which is considered as a compensatory strategy by Faerch and Kasper (1983), and reduction strategies like topic avoidance and message abandonment are excluded from their typology. The same distinction appears to capture the cognitive processing system posited by

Bialystok (1990). As mentioned previously, two processing components are believed to have an upper hand over language use and consequently over Communicative strategies. These components are analysis of linguistic knowledge and control of linguistic processing: Communicative strategies reflect the ways in which the processing system extends and adapts itself to communicative demands, so that either *analysis-based* or *control-based* strategies are used. The first strategy involves the manipulation of the concept or the intended meaning, capturing Corder's ends. The second strategy concerns the manipulation of the form or means of expression, capturing Corder's means.

Muhammad (2014) found that students encountered communication problems as a result of their target linguistic inadequacy. In order to overcome the problems, the students resort to several types of communication strategies. The findings also show that students' use of communication strategies is not a sign of communication failure, conversely, communication strategies surfaced as they realize that they have problems of expressing their intended meaning and they need to solve the problems. The more communication strategies the students have, the more opportunities they have to solve communication problems. Therefore, explicit instruction on the use of communication strategies is necessary to help the students communicate their message when target linguistic resources are inadequate. Considering the above arguments, discussions and analysis in the various literatures reviewed, it is evident that it has direct relationship with the topic under discussion and will influence this research work positively.

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

3.0 Introduction

This section discusses the general research design. It covers the population, sample and sampling techniques, research instrument, procedure for data collection, how the data was analyzed as well as ethical considerations.

3.1 Research Design

Burns (2000) define a research design as a blueprint for conducting a study with maximum control over factors that may interfere with the validity of the findings. Amedahe (2002) has noted that in every research study, the choice of a particular research design must be appropriate to the subject under investigation, and that the various designs in research have specific advantages and disadvantages. Kothari (2004) noted that different research designs can be conveniently described if we categorize them as: (1) research design in case of exploratory research studies; (2) research design in case of descriptive and diagnostic research studies, and (3) research design in case of hypothesis-testing research studies.

The qualitative design, specifically the case study design was employed in this study. Case study is one of the qualitative approaches which allows an investigation to real-life event or the conduction of in-depth analysis, usually over a limited period of time, and focuses upon a limited number of subjects (Yin, 2003). Using the Case Study approach advances the field of study and the knowledge base of a particular area under study. The data collected and the subsequent analysis using Case Study gives a rich description of the data. A deeper understanding of meaning is gained

through the Case Study approach that can improve practice, influence and inform policy, and have an impact on future research (Merriam, 2009).

The premise of the case study approach is that any unit of investigation that involves people can only be understood through the perspectives of those involved in the investigation. This view ensures that the very nature of the phenomenon that is being researched into is quite unique and not open to generalization beyond the study participants (Pring, 2004). By seeking to understand as much as possible about a single subject or small group of subjects, Case Study helps in getting „deep data“, or „thick description“ information based on particular contexts that can give research results a more human face. This emphasis can help bridge the gap between abstract research and concrete practice by allowing the researcher to compare their first-hand observations with the quantitative results obtained through other methods of research (Cohen et al, 2007).

3.2 Population of the Study

According to McMillan and Schumacher (2001), a population is a group of elements or causes, whether individuals or objects or events, that conform to specific criteria and to which one intends to generalize the results of the research. A population can be defined as a group of individuals or people with the same characteristics and in whom the researcher is interested (Kusi, 2012). Population refers to the group of people the researcher used to get the results of the study (Orodho, 2004). The population of a study can affect its generalizability. The narrower the population, the more limited its generalizability, despite the fact that it saves time, effort and probably money. The study population comprised tutors of English and students from selected Colleges of Education in the Bono and Ahafo Regions of

Ghana namely, Berekum College of Education, ST Joseph's College of Education and ST Ambrose College of Education.

3.3 Sample Size and Sampling Techniques

A sample size is always selected from a population that eventually defines the characteristics of the population. Creswell (2002) described a sample size as the unit that provides a practical and efficient means of collecting data as it serves as a model of the population under study. Sampling describes all the processes involved in reaching the respondents. It includes the stages the researcher uses to select the sample of respondents for a study. Purposive sampling technique was adopted by the researcher to select three (3) tutors of English and five hundred (500) students from the selected Colleges of Education from the Bono and Ahafo Regions for the study. Creswell (2002) stated that, in purposive sampling, researchers intentionally select individuals or groups and sites to learn or understand a phenomenon.

Cohen, Manion and Morrison (2007) also assert that purposive sampling enables researchers to handpick the cases to be included in the sample on the basis of their judgment and typicality. In this way, the researcher builds up a sample that is satisfactory to specific needs. To this end, the researcher used his own judgement to select participants whom he felt would give him the desired or accurate information (Bryman, 2004)). The purposive sampling technique was chosen because it is less costly and less time consuming and is free from bias. Purposive sampling technique gives better results if the investigator is unbiased and has the capacity of keen observation and sound judgment while ensuring intensive study of the selected items (Babbie, 2005). A total of five hundred and three (503) participants were used for the study, comprising five hundred (500) students, and three (3) tutors of English.

3.4 Research Instruments

The researcher used audio recorder and observation as instruments for data collection. Based on the assumption that speech is more spontaneous than writing and studying speech helps us to get closer to real communication, the researcher chose to study spoken language in order to detect communicative strategies. Considering the research aim and questions, the researcher gathered information on the nature of communicative strategies used by tutors and students in the selected Colleges of Educations. Observation is the primary technique of collecting data on non-verbal behaviour. I took advantage of being in the field and took as much as I can sketchy notes of my observation or information relay to me that directly about the communicative strategies. After each visit I rewrote my notes, however this time in more detail to be used later in the analysis.

The fact of being a researcher may have had an impact on the reliability of the data gathered, the findings presented and the conclusions drawn however, research in development also carries the risk that informants say what they think the researcher wants to hear or that they refuse to share critical opinions. However, observation can be particularly useful to limit the impact of these risks, as findings enabled the researcher to interpret the social word in the way that the members of that particular world do, hence, the use of observation in addition to the audio recording. The researcher had tape-recorded three different lecture sessions from three Colleges of Education in the Bono and Ahafo Regions.

The first tape recording was done at Berekum College of Education, a lecture for level 100 students in oral essay / conversation. The tutor asked the students to talk about social media, specifically Facebook, that is those who use it, why they use it, and its implications. The essence of this essay was to build students' fluency skills.

The students that were involved had a Facebook account and were familiar with the features of Facebook. This made them feel comfortable speaking about it. The second and the third tape recordings were done at ST Ambrose's and ST Joseph's Colleges respectively. All the two lecture sessions were on the sounds of English (vowels and consonants)

3.5 Validity

Validity is important to trustworthiness because it establishes the research study's findings as consistent and repeatable. Researchers aim to verify that their findings are consistent with the raw data they collected. They want to make sure that if some other researchers were to look over the data, they would arrive at similar findings, interpretations, and conclusions about the data. This is important to make sure that there was not anything missed in the research study, or that the researcher was not sloppy or misguided in his or her final report (Tom, 2017).

3.6 Trustworthiness

Lincoln and Guba (1985) stated that the concept of trustworthiness is very important because it is necessary to estimate the accuracy of qualitative study. Therefore, a study is trustworthy only if the reader of the research report judges it to be so. Trustworthiness has been further divided into credibility, which corresponds roughly with the positivist concept of internal validity; dependability, which relates more to reliability; transferability, which is a form of external validity; and confirmability, which is largely an issue of presentation (Best & Khan, 2001; Lichtman, 2010). The quality of the research is related to the trustworthiness and integrity of the research study. Validation also depends on the quality of the researcher's work during the investigation. According to Denzin and Lincoln (1994), write that fairness is an important factor, and is described as the deliberate attempt to

prevent marginalisation, and act affirmatively with respect to inclusion so that all participants' voices are heard and their stories treated with fairness and balance. By way of ensuring credibility the researcher followed this procedure:

1. The lectures were conducted using language that was understood by both the researcher and participants to avoid misunderstanding between the researcher and the respondents.
2. The lectures took place at a quiet and serene environment void of distortions.
3. The supervisor for this study's regular inspections through constructive criticisms helped the researcher to check for flaws and problems in the study.
4. Finally, the trustworthiness of this study is enhanced by including participants differing viewpoints, giving more credibility to the findings.

3.7 Data Collection Procedure

According to Creswell (2002), the site where research takes place and gaining permission before entering a site is very paramount in research. Base this assertion, an introductory letter was obtained from the Department of Applied Linguistics, University of Education, Winneba, stating the aims and purpose of the study and the need for the participants to give their consent and co-operation. All the study participants were visited and a letter of introduction was delivered and read to them. The researcher arranged with the participants a week before the recording to explain the purpose of the research and also seek their permission to record them.

The purpose of the recording and observation was to obtain description of the lived experiences of the students and tutors with respect to the interpretations of the meaning of the described problem (Kvale, 2009). With the observation, it was possible to ask follow-up questions in order to get richer information. Informants were available to clarify immediate concerns and unclear statements (Gall, Gall

& Borg, 2007). Also, through the establishment of trust and rapport with the participants, a researcher is likely to get more information by using observation and recording compared to other methods of data collection. Therefore, interactions were made possible before the recording and observation session to build trust and rapport with the informants. The recording and observation were carried out in three level 100 classes. The time for each recording was approximately two hours. An audio-tape recorder was used in order to maintain the original data. The audio recording provides a complete verbal record, and can be studied much more thoroughly, and it speeds up the process (Gall, Gall & Borg, 2007). The idea behind the observation and recording were formulated on the basis of the research questions. On completing the observation and recording, the researcher showed his appreciation to the participants for their cooperation and participation.

3.8 Data Analysis

Data analysis is the practice of extracting useful information from raw data. It is the process of organising the data collected into categories (Kothari, 2008). It is important for interpreting these raw data, in order to obtain the meaning and pattern from data (Bell, 2005). All data collected through the observation and recording schedules were analysed qualitatively. Data analysis in qualitative studies should begin immediately after the first data collection process to discover if there is any information that is necessary or missing. In this study the data analysis was done after every observation and recording to check if there was any information necessary for the study that was missing. When the process of data collection was over, the raw data were transcribed. According to Creswell (2009), transcription is the process of converting audio tape recordings or field notes into text data. Here, the researcher listened to each tape repeatedly to familiarize himself with the conversations and

carefully wrote them down in the words of the participants. Thematic analysis was used to organize the transcribed data. Thematic organization and analysis is the process that identifies analyses and reports the occurrence of themes in the data collected from the research areas. According to Kusi (2012), that this analytical strategy requires the researcher to organise or prepare the data, immerse herself in and transcribe the data, generate themes, code the data, and describe them. This strategy required the researcher to organise the data across all the participants and their responses so as to identify consistencies and differences. According to Braun & Clarke (2006), thematic analysis follows six basic steps.

1. Familiarizing with the data through thoroughly reading the transcriptions. This helps the researcher to have in mind what exactly is in the data.
2. Generation of initial codes. Putting labels or descriptions on a list of ideas developed from the transcription as already read by the researcher.
3. Searching for themes. Related codes are organized under different themes.
4. Reviewing the themes. The themes developed are reviewed for their relevance and legitimacy of being called themes.
5. Defining and naming themes developed. Defining the overall content of the themes and the message it carries in it before producing a report
6. Producing a report. Researcher is already satisfied with the themes developed.

Reporting direct statements from research participants is important, because it helps to maintain the originality of data collected (Cohen, Manion & Morrison, 2007). Also, researchers' views based on the informants' answers were given backed up by literatures reviewed. The researcher transcribed the recording and looked for situations where the students and the tutors used communicative strategies to help

each other and to keep the conversations going. There is a total of 366 utterances in the transcription.

3.9 Ethical Considerations

Ethical consideration is part of the research works, and cannot be avoided (Bryman, 2004). Participants were ensured their protection from harm, exposure and anonymity. Ethical guidelines and legal rules should be considered by the researcher (Holloway, 1997). According to Bailey, Hennink and Hutter (2011), ethical issues have the following considerations:

1. Informed consent. Individual should be provided with sufficient information about the research, in a format that is comprehensible to them, and make a voluntary decision to participate in a research study.
2. Self-determination. Individuals have the right to determine their own participation in research, including the right to refuse participation and also pull out at any time.
3. Minimization of harm. Researchers should not do any harm to participants or put them at risk.
4. Anonymity. Researchers should protect the identity of research participants at all times.
5. Confidentiality. Researches should ensure that all data records are kept confidential at all times. From considerations, it should be noted that the consent of all participants were obtained prior to the commencement of the study. The researcher met participants and discussed the purpose of the research, the expected time commitments and the procedure for the research activities. All participants were given a guarantee of confidentiality and anonymity in reporting the information provided for the study. The researcher used the letters „T“ and „S“ (T for Tutors and S for Students) to identify the respondents to avoid disclosure of their identity.

3.10 Conclusion

In this chapter the researcher has described his research design to explain the research process, the methodology and the direction of the study and the various approaches to follow in analyzing the data collected. The next chapter will present the findings, discussions and analysis of data.



CHAPTER FOUR

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

4.0 Overview

This chapter presents the results obtained from the analysis of data. The objectives were to identify the types of communicative strategies use by both tutors and students, the reasons for their use and their effects in the English language classroom in selected Colleges of Education in the Bono and Ahafo Regions of Ghana. The audio-recording and the observation notes were examined using content analysis. In all, 366 utterances were transcribed. Out of this, 104 were identified as communicative strategies. Out of the 104 communicative strategies, 67 were used by the tutors while 37 were used by the students. The analysis will be looked at from this perspective.

4.1 Types of Communication Strategies

It was discovered that the most common communicative strategies used by the tutors and students in the Colleges of Education arepausesand hesitation, question, code-switching, message abandonment, all-purpose words, restructuring, literal translation, repetition, and appeal for assistance. These types are discussed as follows:

4.1.1 Pauses and hesitation

This part of the study analyses the use of pauses and hesitation devices as communication strategies among second language learners and tutors. The patterns of pauses and hesitation usage among the learners as part of their strategies in communication are seen in class discussions. In situations where the students do not know how to proceed in the conversation while speaking, they can use pauses and hesitations in order to get their meaning across. Pause and hesitations are good tools

for speakers to plan what they want to say next, and how to do so. Faerch and Kasper (1983), who are among the psycholinguistically-oriented researchers, claim that certain performance features such as pauses and hesitations can be used as evidence between four different types of pausing: articulatory pauses which may be because of stop consonants, pauses for breathing, conventional pauses, which are necessary for interpreting an utterance, and last hesitation pauses. Hesitation pauses are the only pauses which indicate underlying speech planning. A distinction is often made between unfilled (silent) pauses and filled pauses involving non-lexical activity such as err, ermm, oh, or turn-based starters such as well, I mean, you know, I don't know. Pauses and hesitations are not strategies used by Tarone, however, her definition of appeal for assistance has some similarities with unfilled pauses since using the phrases „you know what I mean“, „you know what I'm trying to say, it is an indicator for the speaker to use his listeners for help to get his meaning across. However, it is not always the case that a speaker uses pauses and hesitations with the intention of signaling for help. The researcher identified that the tutors in the Colleges of Education make use of filled and unfilled pauses as a communicative strategy. These are used to avoid non-fluency situations and to buy themselves some time to think about what to say next. In Extract 1, the tutor wanted to find out how often the students log into their Facebook account. After the student had answered, the tutor in an attempt to call another student hesitated. Extract 1 illustrates this assertion:

Extract 1

9 T: How often do you log into the account?

10 S: Once every three weeks (Laughter)

11 T: Okay, that's alright, **eerr** what about you?

12 S: **Err** (pause) what I use Facebook? Why?

13 T: How often?

14 S: How often? **Err**, I don't really know.

In Extract 1, the researcher observed that there is a filled pause used by the tutor. In line ten (10), a student gives an answer to a question posed by a tutor. In an attempt to ask a different student a question (line 11), the tutor uses a filled pause “eerr” to buy himself time to think of what to say next but still the conversation was sustained. In another instance, filled and unfilled pause were also used by the tutors in the Colleges of Education. This is seen in Extract 2. In this extract, the tutor gave the students some sound of English and asked them to give words which contained these sounds. In trying to do that, the tutor realized that the students were rather giving words that sound like the names of the English alphabet. In trying to explain to the students that names of the letters of the alphabet are different from the sounds of the alphabet, it became necessary to use a filled pause. This is illustrated in Extract 2

Extract 2

273 T: Let's get examples of the words each with these sounds

274 S: Heart / a: /

278 S Car / a: /

279 S: Man / α /

280 S: Mat /α/

281 S: Akoko (Laughter)

282 T: English is not a phonic language

283 T: The names of the alphabet are not in line with.....eerr the sounds. The alphabets are deceptive.

One can clearly see that in utterance 283, the tutor used unfilled pause (silent) before a filled one “eerr” to buy himself sometime to think about whatever he wanted

to say and also to avoid non-fluency situation. From this, it can reasonably be said that in situations where the tutors do not know how to proceed in the conversation while speaking, they use pauses and hesitations in order to make time to think about what to say next. Sometime, it may be an articulatory pause which is caused by a stop consonant, pause for breathing or conventional pause for interpreting an utterance. It has been realized that students in the selected Colleges of Education use filled and unfilled pauses just like their tutors, in order to avoid non-fluency situations, to buy themselves some time to think about what to say next and in certain situations and to signal for help from others. This can be linked to Færch and Kasper's (1983), achievement strategy where the speaker does everything not to break the communication and also to reach a particular communication goal. Out of the thirty-seven (37) cases of communicative strategies identified in the utterances of the students, six (6) instances of pauses and hesitation representing 16.22% were made by students. Extract 3 shows this:

Extract 3

9 T: How often do you log into the account?

10 S: Mmmm Once every three weeks (Laughter)

11 T: Okay, that's alright, eerr, what about you?

12 S: Err (pause) what I use Facebook? Why?

13 T: How often?

14 S: How often? Err, I don't really know.

One can see from Extract 3 that there are both pauses and filled hesitations. In the Extract above, the tutor wanted to find out from the students how often they log into their Facebook account. In answering the tutor's question, the student hesitated or used a filled pause „mmm“ to think what to say and to keep the conversation going.

In the same Extract, another student who spoke in line 12 seems to have forgotten the question and begins by using a filled pause „Err” followed by an unfilled pause (silent). What we see in line 12 is that the student seems to have encountered a problem which seems to be the reason for hesitating, which indicates to the tutor and the other students that he needs some assistance to answer the question. In line 14, the student answers the question by using both lexical and non-lexical activity or a filled pause “err” and a turn-based starter “I don’t really know”, however, not with the intention of appealing for assistance. This can clearly be linked to Varadi’s (1973), interactional approach where the two interlocutors do everything possible in order to reach a particular communication goal.

Extract 4 is another instance where pause and hesitation are used by students and tutors. In these utterances, the tutor pointed to a student to answer a question he posed. In the course of asking the question, the tutor hesitated before pointing to a student. From the observation, it was realised that he did that in order to think of whom to call. In an attempt to answer the question posed by the teacher the student also both filled and unfilled as can be seen in the Extract below:

Extract 4

- 11: T: Okay, that’s alright, eerr what about you? (Point to a student)
12. S: Er (Pause) What I use Facebook? Why?
13. T: How often?
14. S: How often? Eerr, I don’t really know.
15. S: Always when he is bored.
15. S: Always when you are bored
- 16 S: Yes, yes, I logged in on my phone. When it make the sound “kwan”, it means
Something is happened on Facebook. (laughter)

17 T: So always, what of you?

18 S: Er, Sir, when I am not doing anything.

In line 15, another student interprets the other student's hesitation in Extract 3 (line 14) as need for help and answers the question for him. This compelled the other student who initially hesitated to come back and answer the question as seen in line 16. As mentioned earlier, a distinction is often made between unfilled (silent) pauses and filled pauses involving non-lexical activity such as mmmm

er, erm, as seen in extracts 1-4. Again, pauses and hesitations mostly serve as an indicator that the speaker needs assistance to be able to finish his turn.

4.1.2 Questions

Asking questions is a natural feature of communication, but also one of the most important tools which teachers have at their disposal. Questioning is crucial to the way teachers manage the class, engage students with content, encourage participation and increase understanding. Typically, teachers ask between 300-400 questions per day; however the quality and value of questions varies. While questioning can be an effective tool, there is both an art and science to asking questions. Every question demands a response (except in the case of requests and suggestions), so that questions inevitably generate communication. However, the quantity of questions asked needs to be considered in relation to general time constraints and the need to keep teacher talking time to a minimum while maximising learner contributions. Using questions is a good what is meant by way for us to link our conversations together and keep them. This assertion of Yule was confirmed from the analysed data. During lesson, tutors used questions to lead discussions as Yule (2010) posits that asking question is a natural part of our conversation with other people and as a way for us to start a conversation. An example of such is shown in

Extract 5. In this Extract questions were used by both students and the tutors. The tutors wanted to find out from the students those who possess a Facebook account and what is meant by speech sounds.

Extract 5

1. T: Do you have Facebook account?
2. S: Yes
3. S: Yes, I do
4. T: Ok, why do you use it?
- 214 T: What are speech sounds?

In line 1, the tutor asked a student if he had a Facebook account. The student replied „yes“. Another student also replied *yes* in line 3. In line 4, the tutor continued with another question „*ok, why you use it?*“ Extract 5 shows the beginning of conversation with a tutor taking initiative and starting the conversation by asking questions. This affirms Bloom’s assertion that “the major purpose in constructing taxonomy of educational objectives is to facilitate communication”. It was also realized that tutors kept asking questions in order to buy themselves time and to keep the communication going. This is illustrated in Extract 6:

Extract 6

- 17 T: So always, what of you?
- 21 T: What of when you are in school?
- 31 T: Like what?
- 50 T: So you begin to write or - - ?
- 180 T: Dislike what?
- 214 T: What are speech sounds?
- 217 T: He said they are sounds produced by what?

233 T: What brings about the difference between them? Yes, what brings about their differences?

In the extract, the tutor asked questions and from the discussions, we see that the tutors used them to keep the conversation going. In other words, these questions were used by the tutors to buy themselves some time and to avoid non-fluency situation. For instance, in utterance 180, the conversation could have ended 179 when the student said, „dislike“. However, because the tutor wanted the conversation not to break, he posed a question which prompted the students to talk. Again, in **233**, when the tutor posed the question and realized that the answer to the question was not forthcoming, he repeated the question in order to breach the communicative gap that the silence on the part of the students would have created.

Question as a communicative strategy was dominant in the communicative strategies used by the tutors and students. This clearly shows that questions as a communicative strategy is very popular among tutors in the Colleges of Education. The findings above are in consonance with Yule (2010) who concurs that asking questions is a natural part of our conversations with other people. It is a way for us to start a conversation, keep it interesting and sometimes to change the topic. Asking questions signals that we want to retrieve some kind of information and by using this interrogative structure we perform what is called a direct speech act. Even though, students use questions in the College of Education as a communicative strategy, the rate of usage is not as frequent as that of the tutors. The researcher came to realize that as posited by Yule (2010), asking questions is a natural part of our conversation with other people and as a way for us to start a conversation. Just like the tutors, the students also kept asking questions in order to start a conversation, to keep it interesting, to change the topic, ask questions, signal that we want some information,

to keep the conversation going and also to avoid break in the communication process.

One of such is seen in Extract 7:

Extract 7

11: T: Okay, that's alright, eerr what about you? (Point to a student)

12: S: Eerr...(pause) what use Facebook? Why?

14:S: How often? Err, I don't really know

198 S: Perceived? Perceived?

In line 12, 14 and 198, the students were trying to answer the questions posed by the tutors but they did that by using questions. The students used the questions to buy themselves time to think about what to say next and to avoid break in the communication process. Just like their tutors, questions were the most common communicative strategies used by students in the selected Colleges of Education. This assertion is based on the fact that out of the 37 communicative strategies use by the students 17 representing 45.95% were questions, as can be seen from the discussion. This confirms the assertion that questions are popular communicative strategies among students in the Colleges of Education.

4.1.3 Code-switching

Code-switching occurs a speaker knows more than one language. That is why the study of code-switching can be seen as a part of the study on bilingualism (Romaine, 1989), Code-switching is certainly a communicative strategy, but it is also the case that code-switching is a category on its own, outside the study of communicative strategies. Code-switching is used as a specific L2 feature by bilingual learners. Researchers in the field of code-switching have focused on identifying what kind of situations L1 influences the L2. From the data, it was realized that code-switched was sometimes used as a communicative strategy. However, this was not

done with the intention of buying themselves time, but to fill a linguistic gap or to show ethnicity. This assertion is based on the evidence from Extract 8 as follows:

Extract 8

- 334 T: What is place or articulation?
335 S: Where we make sounds.
336 T: How? Can you explain further?
337 S: Me nhunusedeemenkyere mu. (Laughter)
338 T: „Kyerε mu, Yeretiewo“
340 T: „Merekasamo ho oo“
240 T: eyeasemoo

In the 338, the tutors switched from the target language to the L1. The tutor asked the students to explain place of articulation. After posing the questions, he realized that it was only one student who made an attempt to answer and even that one the answer was a bit telegraphic. When the tutor asked the student to explain his answer, he switched from the target language to L1. The rest were quiet. This compelled the tutor to also switch from the target to the L1 in order to maintain the conversation. He did not switch to L1 not because he lacked the appropriate register but may be because he wanted to sustain the conversation. This can be related to the work of Littlewood on communicative on strategies when he posits that „The speaker resorted to the native language because he/she realized that the listeners had the same native language with the speaker“ (Littlewood, 1989). Another interpretation that can be given to this might be that despite the fact that these tutors are second language users of English, they feel they do not need to use words and phrases from their first language (L1) in order to make themselves understood. This means that the tutors of the Colleges of Education are very familiar with English as a language. When a

speaker alternates between two or more languages, then code-switching has occurred. Here, the speaker relies on another language than the target language. When a speaker starts a sentence in one language and ends the sentence in another without mixing the languages, code-switching has taken place (Muysken, 2000). For instance, in Extract 9, in the course of the discussion about friend request on Facebook, a student made the remark that he had never send a friend request to any of his friends, but rather it is his friends who send him request. One of his Facebook friends who wanted to challenged him that what he said was not true because he sends him a friend request quickly switched from the target language to L1 as shown below

Extract 9

159. S: Yeah oh very interesting (Pause) all my friend on Facebook its always them whosend me that friends“ request. I have never sent a friend request to anyone.

160. S: Hei, you send one to me

161. S; Did I?

162. S: „Aane“. Yes

163. S: Uuuuei!

162 S::Aane” Yes

Here, after the student had code-switched, he quickly came back and repeated same in the target language. This clearly shows that the student used it for using sake, but not because he lacks its linguistic equivalent to this in English. Again, Extract 10 shows another instance of code-switching. In this Extract the tutor, was trying to explain to the pupil that it is only human being that uses speech sound. That is speech sounds are the properties of human being and that it not possible animals to use speech sounds.

Extract 10

223. T: Good. It's only human beings that produce speech sound.
224. T: What animal can produce the sound /p/?
(Laughter)
- 225: T: It will be a big problem to get any goat to make the sound /p/ after you.
- 226 S: "Ankaebeyehu"
(Laughter)

By looking at the extract, nothing shows that the student uses it to buy himself time or to keep the conversation going. This same situation was seen with the tutors. One interpretation that one can give to this might be that, despite the fact that these students are second language users of English, they feel they do not need to use words and phrase from their first language (L1) in order to make themselves understood as mentioned earlier. Although the students do not use code-switching because of lack of its linguistic equivalent in the L2, they use it more frequently than the tutors. This shows that code-switching is popular among the students than the tutors of the selected Colleges of Education.

4.1.4 Message abandonment

Message abandonment is one of the avoidance strategies; it is simply leaving the message unfinished because of language difficulties. In Extract 11, a tutor asked the students to share with the class what they write or share on Facebook. A student tried to explain something he usually writes on Facebook. In the course of narrating what he usually shares on Facebook, he suddenly abandoned the message. It was observed that he was struggling to get the appropriate register for the explanation hence decided to abandon the message as seen in Extract 11.

Extract 11

42. T: So what do you share on Facebook?

43. S: I don't write anything oo

44. S: I just look

(Laughter)

45. T: Look at what?

46. S: I write something on Facebook

47. T: What of you? Do you write on Facebook?

48. S: Sir, I my head is paining me

(Laughter)

48S: Sir, my head is paining me

The student never got to the point of explaining what he really writes but abandons the message. A possible reason can be that he lacks the right linguistic materials, hence, decides to abandon the message and leaves the intended meaning. Another instance of message abandonment can be seen in Extract 12. In this Extract, both the tutor and the students were trying to find out from their colleagues where they denial some people's request on Facebook. A student was trying to answer the question of why she denied her mother's friend request. She started but abandoned the message as can be seen in utterance 127, Extract 12:

Extract 12

107. T: So friend request ignoring, have any of you ever ignored a friend's request?

108. S: Err, Yeah, I have

109. S: Yes, sir

110. S: A lot

111. T: Indeed
112. S: Yes, indeed, I did her something.
113. T: You are proud of it
114. S: Oh yes
115. S: Yeah, for instance I have deny my sister
117. S: Why
118. S: Because I don't want her to find out everything I'm doing on Facebook and what'sgo on and so on
126. T: Can you explain to us why you deny people's request. (pointing to a student)
- 127 S:** Yes, I want privacy, because pain in the ass

In the extract, the student began the second part of his statement with "because" as if he was about explaining why he wants privacy but abandoned the idea and spoke about something else. This action might have been necessitated by the lack of appropriate linguistic inputs, hence, the use of that message abandonment. Extract 13 is another indicator of message abandonment in this study.

Extract 13

141. S: You can mean when you
142. T: Why should you?
143. S: But so, if you deny it, they could think that
144. S: Why do you deny me?
- 145 S:** Because, let's continue this discussion tomorrow.

In this Extract too, the student began to explain to his colleagues why he denied his friends' request on Facebook, but suddenly abandoned that idea and suggested the discussion should be postponed to the next day. It was observed from his actions that

one of the possible reasons for his action might be that he wanted to buy time for himself to be able to search for the appropriate vocabulary to explain to them why their friendship requests are denied. From this, one can say that message abandonment is also used as a way to retrieve the intended message and start all over again. This can be link to Bialystok's notion of message abandonment, which is said to occur when a learner begins to talk about something, but is unable to continue and stops in mid-utterance. (Bialystok (1990:80). Although message abandonment is used as a communicative strategy among the students of the selected Colleges of Education to be able to search for the appropriate vocabulary, it is not very popular among the students.

4.1.5 All-purpose words

The use of all-purpose words refers to the use of words or phrases having general meaning instead of specific words to convey the utterances. Extract 14 is an example of this. In this Extract, the tutor was introducing the topic for the lesson. In the cause of the introduction, he used the word „something“ which has a general meaning instead of specific as shown below:

Extract 14

213T: Today we are coming to talk about *something* right now. The topic for today is speech sounds.

214. T: What are speech sounds?

216. S: They are sounds produced by speech organs.

217. T: He said, they are sounds produced by what?

In the case above, the tutor employed all-purpose words, namely “**something**”. He first mentioned the word “something” to describe the point they were about discussing in class. In the next utterance, he mentioned the word “topic” to replace the word

“something”. It would be much better if he had directly used a specific word like “the topic” instead of the word “something” that has multi-purpose meanings, such as event, situation, or act.

4.1.6 Restructuring

Restructuring strategy is employed when speakers experience the communication problem and then they solve it by abandoning the execution of a verbal plan, leaving the utterances unfinished, and communicating the intended message according to an alternative plan. Language learners restructure their input to facilitate efficient communication. An example of restructuring can be found in Extract 15:

Extract 15

230. T: Vowels and consonants. Good
231. T: What bring about their differences between them?
232. T: Yes, what brings about their differences?

In the extract, the intended meaning of the tutor is to let the students tell the difference between vowels and consonants but **“What bring about their difference between them?”** . After realizing that he made a mistake, he restructured his sentences to become **“Yes, what brings about their differences?”** This was done to make the meaning clear to the students so that the discussions could be sustained.

4.1.7 Literal translation

Literal translation is direct translation word for word translation without conveying the sense of the original whole. This is illustrated in Extract 16 when the tutor wanted to introduce the topic for the day’s lesson, he translated it literally from the L1 into the target language as shown below:

Extract 16

213 T: Today we are coming to talk about *something* right now. The topic for today is speech sounds.

214. T: What are speech sounds?

216. S: They are sounds produced by speech organs.

217. T: He said, they are sounds produced by what?

In the example, the tutor made use of literal translation. He directly translated from L1 into L2. His intended meaning in L1 is “**eneyerebekabiribi ho asemseziara**”. When it was translated into L2, it should be „The topic for this lesson is consonants“

4.1.8 Repetition

The speech production mechanisms are hierarchically organized processes in which the information changes while passing from one level to another. The speech production includes four main processes: a) the conceptualization or the planning of the content; b) the formulation, which includes the grammatical, lexical and phonological coding of messages; c) the articulation, which is the production of words; and d) the monitoring which involves the verification of the accuracy or appropriateness of the produced utterance. The processes follow one another in accordance with the above described order. Whereas the planning of the message in the production of the native language (L1) requires attention, the formulation and articulation of messages are automated processes, which can work in parallel without the speaker's conscious attention. However, despite the automated nature of the native language, the speakers do not produce perfect speech; on the contrary, they hesitate, restart and repeat some erroneous parts. In this case, both the students and the tutors employed self-repetition by repeating their previous words/phrases frequently while gaining time to think for appropriate words/phrases to continue their communication

in the target language. Extract 17 is an example of repetition used during lesson delivery. In this Extract, the tutor wanted to find out from the students how often they visit their Facebook accounts. It was observed that while they were thinking about what to tell the tutor, they repeated the questions in order to get time to think and at the same time sustain the discussion.

Extract 17

13 T: How often?

14 S: How often?

231 T: What is the main difference between vowels and consonants them?

232 T: Yes, what is the main difference between them?

In the extracts above, both the tutors and students employed the strategy of repetition by repeating the extracts **“How often? and What is the main difference between vowels and consonants?”** respectively before continuing their speech. In utterances above, they chose to repeat the previous utterances in order to find the target word in communicating their ideas and also used to fill the silence that would have been created in the speech.

4.1.9 Appeal for assistance

The process of communication occurs between speaker and interlocutors (Dyner, 2010). The speaker communicates meanings and the interlocutors make suitable conclusions. Moreover, the aim of communication in the context of language itself is to communicate efficiently and use the language accordingly. Students should be able to communicate in three types of discourses: interpersonal, transactional, and functional. In Extract 18, a student exhibited this by appealing to his notes. In this Extract, the tutor asked the students to explain to the class what is meant by bilabial sounds. In an attempt to explain, the student realised that he needed help to be able to

give the correct answer to the question so he referred to his notes for such assistance as illustrated in Extract 18 below:

Extract 18

349 T: What are bilabial sounds?

350 S: Sir, “bi” means two and labial means lips so I think bilabial means two lips

351 T: Is that all? Continue

352 S: Sir, that is how understand it.

353 T: That’s a good attempt. Any other?

354 S: Sir, two lips consonants. Sir, it means (stop for a while and look into his notes) consonants produced by bringing the two lips together.

The extract shows that the student used appeal for help strategy. He employed the strategy by looking into her notes about the materials that are being presented. Before looking at his notes, he stopped for a while and could not continue delivering his presentation. After looking at his notes, he continued to present the material.

4.1.10 Summary

This part of the study answered research question one which looked at the types of communication strategies use by tutors and students in the English Language Teaching Classroom at the selected Colleges of Education in the Bono and Ahafo Regions of Ghana. It has been established from the data analysed that the communicative strategies used by the students and tutors are the selected Colleges are: pauses and hesitation, question, code-switching, message abandonment, all-purpose words, restructuring, literal translation, repetition, and appeal for assistance.

4.2 Reasons for Using Communicative Strategies

This objective was intended to identify the reasons for using communicative strategies in the English language teaching classroom at the selected Colleges of Education in the Bono and Ahafo Regions of Ghana. After transcribing the audio recording, it became clear that the reasons why the tutors and students use communicative strategies are:

4.2.1 To avoid break in the communication process

The analysis showed that both the tutors and the students use communicative strategies in order to keep the conversation going and also to avoid break in the communication process. The fact of being exposed to situations in which students are expected to interact during oral communication subjects, some learners may find themselves unable to interact and produce chunks of language in some given situations. Accordingly, they may strive to make themselves as much understood as possible by their colleagues and teacher. They do this by using diverse strategies as using all-purpose words, pauses and hesitation, restructuring, literal translation, repetition, appeal for assistance. It is worth mentioning that when learners or tutors restructure; they try to elucidate their outlook or repeat, so this process is recognised as *negotiation of meaning*. Moreover, in learning a language; more particularly a foreign one, students are stimulated to communicate in classroom setting using a variety of strategies as the social ones besides their reliance on the negotiation of meaning. According to Oxford (1990), these social strategies are very imperative and important in any language learning classroom. One of these adopted strategies is asking questions; which is a medium of social interaction and communication. The benefit of asking questions is that learners are given the chance of having a clear idea of what is being discussed as topics in classroom, to buy themselves time and to avoid

break in the communication process. In Extract 19 for instance, the tutor wanted to find out from the students how often they visit their Facebook account. In trying to answer the question they use different communicative strategies like pauses and hesitations, questions and repetitions as shown in Extract 19:

Extract 19

12 S: Eerr...(pause) what I use Facebook? Why?

14: S: How often? Err, I don't really know

198 S: Perceived? Perceived?

One could deduce from the above Extract that the students used the communicative strategies (pauses and hesitations and questions) to buy themselves time, to think about what to say next and to avoid break in the communication process. The tutor wanted to find out what a student uses a Facebook account for and how often. In order to avoid break in communication and for the student to buy time for himself, he used questions to do this. This confirms the assertion that communicative strategies are used to avoid break in communication and also to buy time to think about what to say without breaking the communication process.

4.2.2 Develop learner autonomy (learner training)

The notion of learner autonomy is a direct consequence of the increasing preoccupation with learner-centeredness in educational policies and practices, a preoccupation that has had its corresponding formulation in second language acquisition (SLA) research and teaching over the last two and a half decades. Following Johnson & Johnson (1998), learner autonomy is one of a number of closely related concepts within the general paradigm of learner-centred education. It underpins the individualization of instruction, the development of patterns of self-directed learning and of methodology of self-access, as well as implying some degree

of learner training. By learner training, we mean the type of instructional intervention whose basic aim is to help learners become better language learners/users. As such, learner training involves developing the student's awareness of him/herself as a learner, of the process of language learning and use, and of the nature of the target language (Dickinson, 1988, 1992; Holec, 1987). It also involves instructing learners in the use of language learning and language use strategies (Chamot & O'Malley, 1994; Cohen, 1998; Oxford, 1990; Wenden, 1991; Wenden & Rubin, 1987; Willing, 1989).

The rationale for this second component of learner training - known as „strategy training“ or „strategy instruction“- is succinctly summarized by Cohen as follows: The strategy training movement is predicated on the assumption that if learners are conscious about and become responsible for the selection, use, and evaluation of their learning strategies, they will become more successful language learners by taking more responsibility for their own language learning, and enhancing their use of the target language out of class. In other words, the ultimate goal of strategy training is to empower students by allowing them to take control of the language learning process (Cohen, 1998). This was very clear from the researcher's observation. It was observed by the researcher that the learners were very autonomous in the sense that because they had idea communicative of strategies which they feel they can rely on, they try to speak and try to redeem themselves when they are faced with communication challenges without falling on the tutor.

4.2.3 To deepen teacher-student interaction

In any language lesson classroom, interaction is of crucial value for language learning and teaching as well. To him, provided the teacher understands how the process of interaction takes place in classroom, learning opportunities will be

facilitated to learners (Walsh, 2002) and that is why teachers should be knowledgeable and well-informed about the significance of teacher talk and the process of interaction and their relationship with learning. Actually, the nexus between second language acquisition and interaction is so strong as it was supported by many scholars working in this research literature among whom is Ellis (1990) who considers that interaction is at the core of second language acquisition. Complying with his view point, Allwright (1984) believes that successful teaching is highly correlated to successful management of interaction (cited in Walsh, 2006).

Johnson (2012) also argues in the following quotation that language acquisition is, indeed, interconnected to the good perception and understanding of interactional course by teachers and learners as well. "The teacher plays a critical role in understanding; establishing and maintaining patterns of communication that will foster to the great extent, both classrooms learning and second language acquisition." (p. 90). Therefore, the scholar emphasizes teacher's role in communication process. In actual fact, one of the greatest challenges in English as a second language classroom is the development of students' advanced speaking. Subject in which most confident students dominate the discussion and most reticent students quickly withdraw is not a healthy environment for English as second language learning. Hence, the best environment in language learning classroom is the one in which every student does not only have the opportunity to speak and interact but also feels a real need to do so.

Walsh (2006) considers the nature of second language acquisition as a social context in the same way as any other real world one. Both Ellis and Van Lier (1996) agree with this perspective claiming that language learning does not arise through interaction but in interaction (cited in Walsh, 2006). Hence, teachers will increase and promote their students' language learning provided they better understand the process

of interaction. Teachers also need to have this process as a key element in their teaching. According to Ellis (1998, p. 145) the fact of making interaction a rich process and an effective one is the role assigned to the teacher for he is the one expected to initiate, manage, and keep conversation and communication going. That is, it is the teacher who plays the crucial role in making classroom interaction significant and worthy without neglecting the noteworthy part played by learners in this intricate process. From her part, Swain (1988) sees that learners need to practice; in producing *comprehensible output* using all the language resource they have already acquired (cited in Hedge, 2000). She considers that while interacting, learners are practising the target language and this leads to fluency. Swain (1985) introduced her *Output Hypothesis* (1995, 2005) in which she sheds light on the significance of dialogues that usually take place between students and teachers, (cited in Hall & Verplaetse, 2000). Swain claims that throughout these dialogues, language acquisition is promoted.

Similarly, Long introduced his *Interactive Hypothesis* (1996) after adjusting it to take into consideration the role that negotiation of meaning and interaction play in enabling students to understand their teacher's feedback. (cited in Walsh, 2006) One of the elements which make interaction problematic to second language acquisition teachers in terms of practice and implementation is the fact that it is a challenging request. It requires time and resources to enhance the process of interaction between the teacher and students in classroom setting. Theoretically speaking, in teaching oral discussion class; which is not an easy matter, either the teacher or students bring up a given topic which would be later discussed by the whole class. Yet, practically speaking; this is not always true; mainly because most oral discussion classes are dominated and controlled by either teachers or self-assured and confident learners.

This automatically leads to the withdrawal of those introvert and reserved learners from discussion. Unfortunately, “this oral class ends up by a boring question and answer exchange between the teacher and few students” (Folse, 1996, p. 4).

Interaction develops learners’ performance in speaking a second language, since they are given the chance to develop their speaking and listening skills in classes. English teachers generally engage their students in discussions, debates, dialogues and conversations to bring about interaction. What should be kept in mind is the fact that interaction requires the engagement of students in conversations which are about situations where they interact with their teacher and classmates and this is called *instructional conversation*. Woolfolk (2004) explains: “in instructional conversations, the teacher's goal is to keep everyone cognitively engaged in a substantive discussion” (p. 334). The discussions clearly suggest that communicative strategies help students who have difficulty expressing to themselves to organize their thought to convey their message. It also helps to interpret interactions for a clearer understanding. The researcher also observed that there exists a very good interaction between the students and the tutors. This was seen when the students could freely walk to the teachers and talk and ask them for clarification on certain things. There were instances where students openly mentioned in class that they will see the tutors after class for some private discussions. This affirms the assertion by Van Lier that “language learning does not arise through interaction but in interaction” (Van Lier, 1996, p. 4)

4.2.4 Correct/reduce errors to reach the goal of communication

Students make errors at various stages of their language learning. Sometimes it may occur for the interference of first language. Others may also occur as a result of lack of appropriate linguistic resources. There are also some errors that may occur

because of grammatical dissimilarities between students' first language and target language. For example, Japanese students learning English frequently have problems with article usage (Harmer, 1998). Students sometimes overgeneralize rules, like students may use 'ed' for past form for all words, as in go- goed. Whatever the mistakes are, these errors and mistakes have some positive and constructive aspects and also point out that the students are actively participating in the language learning process. Learners and teachers have different preferences concerning error correction and giving feedback (Nunan, 1988). Similar findings have been found elsewhere (Richards & Lockhart, 1997). It is also very important to know for teachers when and how to correct errors. Allwright and Bailey (1991) note that teachers often correct a learner's utterance simply because it was not what they had expected to hear, which are referred as "error of classroom discourse". They also point out that the teachers are trying to help students move ahead in their inter language development. All the error correction procedure mentioned were used by the tutors and students as communicative strategies are shown in the Extract 20:

Extract 20

12 S: Eerr...(pause) what I use Facebook? Why?

14: S: How often? Err, I don't really know

198 S: Perceived? Perceived?

213 T: Today we are coming to talk about *something* right now. The topic for today is speech sounds.

13 T: How often?

14 S: How often?

231 T: Now, what is the main difference between vowels and consonants?

232 T: What is the main difference between vowels and consonants?

233. T: What *bring* about their difference between them? Yes, what brings about their differences?

All the extracts above clearly confirm the fact that both the tutors and the students use communicative strategies to correct or reduce errors in order to reach communication goals. For instance, in lines 12,14,198,213,13,231,232 and 233, both the tutors and the students use questions, pauses (both filled and unfilled) in order to reduce the number of errors to reach the communicative goal. In line 233 for instance, the tutor committed a grammatical error „What *bring* about their difference between them?“ but he was able to correct himself by restructuring the question to „Yes, what brings about their differences?“ A research by Hedge (2000) also supports the present study, where they find that most students under study use strategies which involve the use of first language. In their study, the students use the language switch (which is also a communicative) more often than the other strategies. The above finding suggests that students use communication strategies to be able to overcome nervousness and stress, reducing mistakes to reach the goal of communication. The tutor used the language switch and literal translation because he wanted to make sure that his message was comprehensible to the students.

4.2.5 Summary

The objective for this section was to identify the reasons why tutors and students use communicative strategies in the English language teaching classroom at the selected Colleges of Education in the Bono and Ahafo Regions of Ghana. After observation and analysis of the data, it became clear that the reasons why the tutors and students use communicative strategies are to: avoid break in the communication process, develop learner autonomy, deepen tutor-student interaction and correct/reduce errors to reach communication goals.

4.3 Effects of using communicative strategies

This objective sought to identify the effects of using communicative strategies in the English language teaching classroom at the selected Colleges of Education in the Bono and Ahafo Regions of Ghana. In the frequently quoted heuristic model of willingness to communicate, MacIntyre et al (1998) intimates that communicative competence is considered as one of the affective and cognitive variables having stable and enduring influence on willingness to talk. Communicative competence refers to a language user's knowledge of syntax, morphology, phonology as well as social knowledge about how and when to use utterances appropriately. Although a certain level of all the other competences (e.g., linguistic, discourse, sociolinguistic) is required in order for effective communication to occur, they believe that a speaker can go a long way by relying primarily on strategic competence, which is mainly the knowledge of communicative strategies. This was demonstrated when the researcher observed that any time a question is posed by either the teacher or student, almost all the students will willingly raise their hand wished to be called to speak. Mostly when they given the opportunity to speak, they sometime find it difficult to get the right linguistic resources but of the idea of communicative strategies, they are willing to speak all the time.

4.3.1 Enhances fluency

Dörnyei and Thurrell (1994) refer to conversational/communicative strategies as the invaluable means of dealing with communication "trouble spots." They hold the view that these strategies enhance fluency and add to the efficiency of communication. Knowing such strategies is particularly useful for language learners, who frequently experience such difficulties in conversation, because they provide them with a sense of security in the language by allowing extra time and room to

maneuver. (p. 44). Let us consider Extract 21. In this Extract, the tutor wanted to find out from the students if the time they spend on Facebook affects their academic performance. The level of fluency would have been affected if they had not used communicative strategies like hesitations. Because of these strategies which were adopted by the students, there was no break in the communication process and that enhanced the fluency levels of both the tutors and the students. as can be seen in Extract twenty 21

Extract 21

54. T: Err, does the time you spend on Facebook prevent you from doing your best in school?

55. S: Mmm, yes

56. S: Oh, well.

57. S: Sir, I think so

58. S: Perhaps but often you're log into Facebook in class then you.

59. S: You have nothing to do.

60. S: Exactly, it's something that you know, err so boring.

From the Extract, one can deduce that there were no breaks in the students' utterances. Where they were supposed to break, they used hesitation for the communication process to continue to flow. When the learner anticipates problems during communication, this "sense of security" can allay his fear of speaking, or language anxiety, leading to a lower level of communication apprehension as well as a higher level of one's willingness to communicate.

4.3.2 Enhances learners' willingness to communicate

The use of communicative strategies by tutors and students has a lot of effects on them as second language users. More generally, we can argue that communicative

strategies enhance learners' willingness to communicate. Communicative strategies make learners feel less communication apprehension. Communication apprehension is defined as "an individual's level of fear or anxiety associated with either real or anticipated communication with another person or persons" (Burrough et al, 2003, p. 231). Let us consider Extracts 22. In the said Extract, the tutor wanted the students to explain bilabial sounds. It was observed by the researcher that almost half of the members of the class raised their hand to answer the question. When the first student who raised his hand was called to answer the question, although he was struggling, but because of the idea communicative he was willing to speak as can be seen in the Extract below:

Extract 22

349 T: What are bilabial sounds?

(a student quickly raises his hand, without waiting for the tutor to call him began speaking)

350 S: Sir, "bi" means two and labial means lips so I think bilabial means two lips

351 T: Is that all? Continue

352 S: Sir, that is how I understand it.

353 T: That's a good attempt. Any other?

354 S: **Sir, two lips consonants. Sir, it means (stop for a while and look at into his notes) consonants produced by bringing the two lips together.**

One can conclude that even though the student was not very sure of his answer, he was willing to communicate on the assurance of the communicative strategies (appeal for assistance) at his disposal. For instance, the use of all-purpose

words affords them the opportunity to keep the communication going in spite of their limited vocabulary size. All these may lead to higher levels of their willingness to communicate. It is clear that the fear of engaging in interaction adversely affects one's willingness to communicate. This communication phobia might wither away if we attempt to eliminate the roots. Communication apprehension originates from feeling uneasy about encountering problems during interaction: not knowing the right word to convey the intended meaning not is being able to repeatedly fall silent during speaking in order to think about the words to use and not knowing how to deal with incomprehension. This fear might be alleviated when a learner feels that he is equipped with some techniques or strategies by which he can resolve any communication problem with ease. With the use of communicative strategies, the fear of both the tutors and the students was alleviated since they felt they were equipped with some strategies by which they resolve any communicative problem. Teaching Communicative strategies, in this sense, might give learners a com-forting sense of security (Dörnyei & Thurrell, 1994).

4.3.3 Achieve higher perception of communicative competence

Another effect of the use of communicative strategies by tutors and students is that communicative strategies help both learners and the tutors to achieve a higher perception of their communicative competence. As mentioned earlier, there exist two perspectives on an individual's communicative competence: the actual communicative competence and the perception one has of one's communicative competence. From this assertion, the researcher observed that the students' perception of communicative competence was high because as they boldly try to answer every question that will be posed irrespective of who asked it. Thus, whether student or tutor. As noted by Clément et al (2003), the latter ultimately determines the choice of

whether to communicate or not. Some experience of successfully coping with communication difficulties brings the learner a higher perception of his communicative competence. The dubiousness of this perception by no means matters.

4.3.4 Improves one's self-confidence

It improves one's self-confidence and consequently emboldens one to feel assured enough to take risks and venture into interaction in spite of the deficiency of one's actual communicative competence. Communicative strategies improve tutors' and learners' state communicative self-confidence. According to Clément (1980, 1986), self-confidence involves two key constructs: Perceived Competence and a lack of Anxiety. These constructs represent relatively enduring personal characteristics. However, as MacIntyre et al (1998) argue, some situations might entail more confidence than others depending on the characteristics of prior L2 experience. As learners see their ability to overcome communicative pitfalls during interaction, they feel much more confident about initiating and maintaining communication. Gaining psychological security (Dörnyei & Thurrell, 1991) and linguistic self-confidence (MacIntyre et al, 1998) through acquiring the strategies of communication may greatly contribute to learners' level of willingness to interact. The confidence exhibited by the students anytime they are called upon to make contributions in class as was observed by the researcher.

4.3.5 Psycholinguistically comforting

Furthermore, communicative strategies can be psycholinguistically comforting for learners so that they are willing to initiate communication. According to Skehan's (1998) dual mode system, much of language is more exemplar- rather than rule-based. This study has tried to expand the strategy of employing prefabricated patterns by learners through raising their awareness about the prevalence of formulaic sequences.

By using this strategy, learners can gradually build a reliable repertoire of highly useful prefabricated patterns on which they can draw at the time of communicative difficulties and reduce the learning burden while maximizing communicative ability (Ellis, 2008). This effect was observed when the students tried to speak but later fall back to communicative strategies any time they face communication challenges.

4.3.6 Motivates

Finally, communicative strategies motivate both tutors and learners. They can be regarded as a useful means to remove the causes of demotivation in learners. It frequently happens that when a learner, especially at lower levels, lacks a word or phrase about an idea to convey, he keeps them bottled up just because of not knowing just one word. This lack of the ability to compensate for a missing word and consequently avoiding the conveyance of the intended meaning may lead to the erosion of motivation. Being aware of the existence of a strategy such as all-purpose words, repetition etc and knowing the way to employ it might bolster the learner's confidence to venture into communication. Experience tells us that achieving success in meaning conveyance by learners can arouse their motivation and enthusiasm to initiate communication.

One point regarding communicative strategies merits special attention, namely the overuse and misuse of some strategies by learners of which both the learner and the tutors should be wary. It is exemplified by a learner who obviates the need for the use of many verbs and repeatedly resorts to the use of just one verb (e.g. get in accordance with the strategy of using all-purpose words). This is redolent of the case made by some researchers against teaching and the use of communicative strategies, where they believed that these strategies may hinder learners' language development

system, making them dependent on their strategic competence at the expense of their overall communicative competence (Thornbury, 2005).

Indeed, at beginning stages, it is only natural and we should not expect too much of learners, that is, we should not expect them to use communicative strategies immaculately. On the other hand, when they grow aware of communicative strategies, they can easily notice them in discourse. This is where the teacher might play the role of a model. He may introduce and demonstrate the appropriate use of different strategies. For instance, he can make use of restructuring devices whenever a learner asks for clarification. He can use all-purpose words for a particular new word before presenting it, which, if the learners guessing the right word may be really encouraging for them. In early stages“ learners need conscious effort to use communicative strategies. But, gradually, they become accustomed to utilizing them. They no longer need to think about what strategy to use. During interaction, the right strategy of communication automatically matches the problem at hand. The knowledge of communicative is declarative at the outset, but it gradually becomes proceduralized through repeated practice and use during communication (Anderson, 1983).

During the recording and observation of one class, a learner with a lot of class exuberance and a bundle of raised hands, in response to the tutor’s question: “Have you ever rejected a friend’s request on Facebook?” one learner started talking excitedly about an interesting incident. Her willingness to talk as well as the expertise with which she used various communicative strategies (as seen in Extract 23) was striking:

Extract 23

„Let me say this“, „let me say this“ (repetition). „Err“ (pauses and hesitation), „I did her something“ (literal translation and all-purpose word)

107. T: So, friend request ignoring, have any of you ever ignored a friend's request?

108. S: **Err**, Yeah, I have

109. S: Yes, sir

110. S: A lot

111. T: Indeed

112. S: Yes, indeed, **I did her something**

113. T: You are proud of it

114. S: Oh yes

115. S: Yeah, for instance I have deny my sister

The satisfaction she derived from sharing her experience and from coping successfully with communication problems bestowed a great sense of self-confidence and motivation upon her. Although there were some minor grammatical errors (or maybe mistakes), they hardly hindered comprehension and the meaning conveyance as well as the problem-solving processes by the use of communicative strategies seemed impeccable. She made use of strategies such as pauses and hesitation, repetition, literal translation, and all-purpose words to get her point across.

4.3.7 Summary

This question sought to identify the effects of using communicative strategies in the English language teaching classroom at the selected Colleges of Education in the Bono and Ahafo Regions of Ghana. After the analysis it was realised that the effects of using communicative strategies were: enhance fluency, enhance students'

willingness to communicate, achieve higher perception of communicative competence, improves one's self-confidence, psychologically comforting, and it motivates.

4.4 Conclusion

This chapter looks at the results obtained from the analysis of data. The objectives were to identify the types of communicative strategies use by both tutors and students, the reasons for their use and their effects in the English language classroom in selected Colleges of Education in the Bono and Ahafo Regions of Ghana. The audio-recording and the observation notes were examined using content analysis. It was realized that the communicative strategies used by the tutors and students in the selected Colleges were; pauses and hesitation, question, code-switching, message abandonment, all-purpose words, restructuring, literal translation, repetition, and appeal for assistance. It was also identified that the reasons for using communicative strategies in the selected Colleges were to: avoid break in the communication process, develop learner autonomy, deepen tutor-student interaction and correct/reduce errors to reach communication goals. The final objective was to consider the effects of using communicative strategies. As regards this objective, the following were identified as the effects of using communicative strategies: enhance fluency, enhance students' willingness to communicate, achieve higher perception of communicative competence, improves one's self-confidence, psychologically comforting, and it motivates. This clearly shows that communicative strategies have significant teaching and learning effect on both tutors and students in the Colleges of Education. This section of the study has revealed that communicative strategies are crucial skills for learning a language and applications of them in real communication contexts cannot be underestimated.

CHAPTER FIVE

CONCLUSION

5.0 Overview

This chapter highlights the main findings of the study and the overall study conclusions and recommendations.

5.1 Summary of Findings

The current research examined the use of communication strategies by tutors and students in the English language teaching classroom at the selected Colleges of Education in the Bono and Ahafo Regions of Ghana. A number of significant findings were made from the study. The findings of the present study show that students' use of communicative strategies is not a sign of communication failure, conversely, communicative strategies surfaced as they realize that they have problems of expressing their intended meaning and they need to solve the problems. The more communication strategies the students have, the more opportunities they have to solve communication problems. Additionally, the researcher discovered that, the most common communicative strategies used by the tutors and students in the Colleges of Education are: questions, pauses, code-switching, message abandonment all-purpose words, restructuring, literal translation, repetition, and appeal for assistance.

The study further disclosed that the reason why the tutors and students use communicative strategies were to avoid break in the communication process, to help interpret teacher-student interaction, reduce errors to reach the goal of communication. Finally, the study revealed that communicative strategies help reduce both tutors and learners' level of communication apprehension, help them to achieve a higher perception of communicative competence, improve their state of communicative self-confidence and psycholinguistically comforting.

5.2 The Role of Communicative Strategies in the Classroom

Communication happens in every time, situation, and places including school. School is a place where students build their connectivity and interaction with other students and also with their tutors. During teaching and learning, knowledge is transferred from teacher to students, and effective communication is needed to make sure that everything running well. In teaching English as a second language, the teacher should be communicating and delivering the material. The use of English is an effort that could make it familiar to students. Ghanaian students who speak more than one language sometimes encounter problems in speaking or communicating using English. To solve this problem, teachers must look for a way to communicating and to make the interlocutors understand what they say. The use of gesture, or sometimes mixing and switching code, are some attempts to keep the communication flowing. The use of communication strategies during classroom communication has an important role. Canale and Swain observe that oral communication strategies are verbal and non-verbal communication strategies that may be called into action to compensate for breakdowns in communication due to performance variables or to insufficient competence. Varadi further asserts that communicative strategies are seen as language devices used to overcome communication problems related to the interlanguage deficiencies.

Bialystok notes that the main communication strategy defining criterion which has been widely employed is the problematicity. Thus, the widely accepted definition containing problem-orientedness is only when a speaker perceives that there is a problem which may interrupt communication. Keeping the communication in the class running smoothly also becomes a role of communication, as asserted by Dornyei that the use of stalling strategies such as lexicalized pause-filler, and hesitation

gambits, helps speakers gain time to think and keep the communication channel open. Another study found that communication strategies have three features, **problematic**, it refers to the fact that learners use communicative strategies as they encounter communication problems. **Consciousness**, it is a potentially conscious plan for solving communication problems to reach a particular communicative goal. It also refers either to the students' awareness that the strategy is being employed for a particular purpose, or the awareness of how the strategy might achieve its intended effect. **Intentionality** refers to the learner's control over those strategies so that particular ones may be selected from the range of options and deliberately applied to achieve certain effects. In conclusion, any English Language teaching classroom that uses target language as the language of instruction is likely to face communication challenges as far as students and teachers are concerned. Based on the explanation above, it could be stated that communication strategies have an important role in classroom communication. Communicative strategies help both students and teachers in communicating; the use of code-switching, for example, could help students who lack proficiency to explain what they mean. This clearly shows that communicative strategies cannot be taken for granted as a useful tool in the classroom.

5.3 Pedagogical Implications

Effective strategies used to overcome communication difficulties are of crucial importance for second language learners. Therefore L2 learners might benefit from instructions on how to cope with such difficulties. Since the early 1970's much research has been conducted on communicative strategies, the means used to overcome some difficulty in expressing an intended meaning. Due to differing theoretical perspectives, researchers have disagreed about the question of whether such strategy training is beneficial. However, few studies have specifically considered

communicative strategies from a pedagogical point of view. Also, practicing teachers of communicative strategies may be at loss when searching for appropriate materials. Faucette (2001) presents a pedagogical perspective of the benefits of the communicative strategies to second language learners and the need to produce adequate teaching materials for the purpose. She gives an exposition of some conceptualizations of communicative strategies and discusses the controversies concerning teaching communicative strategies, arguing in favour of its teaching.

These are based on evidence from the research on: language learning strategies, listening strategies, strategy transfer second language learning, procedural vocabulary, cultural differences in language use, learning autonomy, and teaching and the teachability of communicative strategies. Faucette (2001) concludes that since non-native speakers often find themselves lacking the very resources needed to communicate their intended goal, it seems natural that language teachers should foster strategic competence among their students and provide learning opportunities to develop communicative strategies. Reacting to the issues whether learning strategy instruction is explicit or integrated as part of the regular language class. Faucette (2001) is of the view that explicit instruction is far more effective. The language presented in our coursebooks tends to bear little resemblance to real life usage, and oral activities are typically aimed at practicing speaking (e.g. role plays), rather than at enhancing speaking ability (e.g. through pre-planning task, repetition or consciousness-raising activities). Similarly interactional strategies known to be beneficial for handling real-time interaction are rarely modeled, introduced or practiced in course books (Dornyei & Thurell, 1994).

Allwright also includes speaking tips, but these do not cover interactional strategies as such and practice of these remains implicit in the material. The overall

absence of interactional strategies instruction and practice is in line with Dornyei and Thurrell's (1994) findings that interactional strategies aimed at helping learners handle real-time interaction are rarely modeled, introduced or practice in English as a Foreign Language materials. Therefore, the teaching should be done directly by explaining the types of each strategy (Dornyei & Thurell, 1998). By doing this, teachers are creating awareness towards the availability of strategies that can help learners to not to give up in English conversation. Apart from that the practice of using communicative strategies should be regarded as natural learning process because strategies in handling communication breakdowns are communicative in themselves.

The L2 learner can employ communicative strategies to cope with the problems of attempting to hold the floor, to have the time to think, and not to appear incompetent before other students. In addition to their role in overcoming problems, communicative strategies can lead to language learning by eliciting unknown language items from an interlocutor, providing the learner with more language input, and contributing to developing the learners' autonomy. Based on the authority of the pedagogy classic, some researchers write about the indomitability of teachers' authoritarian impact on the learner in the process of communication (Faucette, 2001). Thus, the issue of efficiency of pedagogical communication occupies a special place in the study of foreign languages. The learner may construct or invent new words or phrases so as to express the desired idea (Faucette, 2001). From these assertions, it is clear that pedagogically, curriculum researchers and all stakeholders of education in Ghana, specifically Colleges of Education, would not be far from right if the teaching of communicative strategies is inculcated in the curriculum so that student-teachers would be aware of their existence and use them to enhance their teaching.

5.4 Suggestions for Future Research

Future studies may be extended to other Colleges of Education in Ghana to find out if tutors and students use communicative strategies. If it is established that it is used, which types are used, their importance and the effects of their usage as well as the extent of their use by tutors and students in the English language classroom for better understanding. Again, if it is established that it is used in other colleges apart from the colleges examined and has positive effects on both tutors and students, then the result could be used to influence curriculum planners of the Colleges of Education to include communicative strategies knowledge in their teaching training programs to make both student-teachers and tutors aware of the importance of communication strategies in English language learning. Furthermore, raising students' awareness about the nature and communicative potential of communicative strategies and sensitizing them about the appropriate situations where communicative strategies could be useful, and making them realize that these strategies could actually work is highly recommended.

5.5 Conclusion

The research has shown that tutors and students tend to use various communicative strategies when they are unable to express what they want to say. Tutors and students employ communicative strategies to find other way to communicate, for example by question, pauses and hesitation, message abandonment, code-switching, restructuring, literal translation etc. Findings from the study suggest that communicative strategies allow tutors and students to continue in their conversation, which provides them with opportunities to hear more input and produce new utterances thus keeping conversations on going. It is worth noting that, the use of communicative strategies has significant teaching and learning effects on both tutors

and students. Communicative strategies are crucial skills for learning a language and applications of them in real communication contexts as revealed by the study. Finally, the finding of the present study seems to confirm that language is best learned and taught through interaction.



REFERENCES

- Abend, G. (2008) "*The Meaning of Theory.*" *Sociological Theory*: 173–199; retrieved from <https://libguides.usc.edu/writingguide/theoreticalframework>.
- Allwright, R. & Bailey, K. (1991). *Focus on the language classroom: An introduction to classroom research for language teachers*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Allwright, R. L. (1984). The importance of interaction in classroom language learning. *Applied linguistics*, 5(2) , 156-171.
- Amedahe, F. K. (2002). *Fundamental of Educational Research Methods*. Cape Coast: University of Cape Coast.
- Ammari, E. (1991). A Study of L2 Oral Discourse Strategies by EFL Jordanian Learners. Unpublished Master Thesis, University of Jordan.
- Ansarin, A. A., & Syle, P. (1999). Communication Strategies Revisited: The Influence of Proficiency on the Selection of Strategies; the Authors Out Maneuvered? *Indian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 26(1), 71-86.
- Asamoah-Gyimah, K. & Doudu, F. (2007). *Introduction to Research Methods in Education*. Winneba: U.E.W. I.E.D.E.
- Babbie, E. (2005). *The Basics of Social Research* (3rd ed.). London: Thomson Wads Worth.
- Bachman, L. F. (1990). *Fundamental Considerations in Language Testing*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bailey, A., Hennink, M. & Hutter, I. (2011). *Qualitative Research Methods*. London: SAGE Publication, Inc.
- Beauvois, M. H. (1992). Computer-Assisted Classroom Discussion in the Foreign Language Classroom: Conversation in slow motion. *Foreign Language Annals*, 25 (5), 455-464.
- Beebe, L. M. (1983). *Risk-Taking and the Language Learner*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bell, J. (2005). *Doing Your Research Project: A Guide for First-Time Researchers*. England: Open University Press.
- Best, J. W. & Khan, V. K. (2001). *Research in Education*. New Delhi: Prentice Hall.
- Bialystok, E. (1978). A Theoretical Model of Second Language Learning. *Language Learning*, 28, 69-83.

- Bialystok, E. (1983). Some Factors in the Selection and Implementation of Communication of Communication Strategies. In C. Faerch & G. Kasper (eds), *Strategies in Interlanguage Communication*. London: Longman.
- Bialystok, E. (1990). *Communication Strategies: A Psychological Analysis of Second Language Use*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Bialystok, E., & Frohlich, M. (1980). Oral Communication Strategies for Lexical Difficulties. *Interlanguage Studies Bulletin*, 5 (1), 3-30.
- Blake, C.T., & Rapanotti, L. (2001). Mapping Interactions in a Computer Conferencing Environment. In P. Dillenbourg, A. Eurelings, & K. Hakkarinen (Eds.), *Proceedings of the European Perspectives on Computer Supported Collaborative Learning Conference, Euro-CSCL*, University of Maastricht.
- Blum-Kulka, S., & Levenston, E. A. (1983). Universals of lexical Simplification. In C. Faerch & G. Kasper (eds), *Strategies in Interlanguage Communication*. London: Longman.
- Bongaerts, T., & Poulisse, N. (1989). Communication Strategies in L1 and L2: Same or Different? *Applied Linguistics*, 10 (3), 253-268.
- Braun, V & Clarke, V. (2006). *Qualitative Research in Psychology: Using Thematic Analysis in Psychology*. London: Routledge.
- Bricker, D. (1995). The Challenge of Inclusion, *Journal of Early Intervention*, 19, 179-194.
- Brown, H. D. (1994). *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching*, Englewood Cliffs: NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Brown, H. D. (2000). *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching[M]* (4th ed.). NY: Longman.
- Brown, P., & Levinson, S. (1987). *Politeness: Some Universals in Language usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bryman, A. (2004). *Social Research Methods* (2nded.). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Burns, R. B. (2000). *Introduction to Research Methods* (4th ed.). London: Sage Publications.
- Burroughs, et al. (2003). Relationships of Self-Perceived Communication Competence and Communication Apprehension with Willingness to Communicate. *Communication Research Report*, 20:3, 2030-239.
- Canale, M. (1983). From Communicative Competence to Communicative Language Pedagogy. In: C. Jack, Richards & Richard W. Schmidt (Eds.), *Language and Communication*. London: Longman.

- Canale, M., & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical Bases of Communicative Approaches to Second Language Teaching and Testing. *Applied Linguistics*, 1(1), 1-47.
- Celce-Murcia, M, Dornyei, &Thurrell, S. (1995).Communicative competence: A pedagogically motivated model with content specifications. *Issues in Applied Linguistics*, 6(2),5-3.
- Chen, S. (1990). A Study of communication strategies in Interlanguage Production by Chinese EFL learners. *Language Learning*, 40 (2), 155-187.
- Clement et al (1980, 1986, 2003). *Foreign Language Anxiety and Advanced Language Learners*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Clennell, C. (1995). Communication Strategies of Adult ESL Learners: A discourse perspective. *Prospect*, 10 (3), 4-20.
- Cohen, A. (1987). Using Verbal Reports in Research on Language Learning. In C. Faerch& G. Kasper (eds), *Introspection in Second Language Research*. Clevedon: UK.
- Cohen, A. (1998). *Strategies in Learning and Using a Second Language*. London: Longman.
- Cohen, L., Manion, L. &Morrison, K. (2007). *Research Methods in Education* (6th ed). UK: Routledge Publishing.
- Cook, V. (2008). *Second Language Learning and Language Teaching*. Fourth ed. London: Hodder Education.
- Corder, S. (1967). The Significance of Learners' Errors. *IRAL*, 5, 161-170.
- Corder, S. (1983). Strategies of Communication. In C. Faerch, & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Strategies in Interlanguage Communication*. London: Longman.
- Corder, S. P. (1983). Strategies of Communication. In C. Faerch& G. Kasper (eds), *Strategies in Interlanguage Communication*. London: Longman.
- Creswell, J. W. (2002). *Research design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods approach* (2nd ed.). London: Sage Publications.
- Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Educational Research: Planning, Conducting and Evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative Research*(2nd ed.). New Jersey: Merrill Prentice Hall.
- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approach*. London: Sage Publications.
- Darhower, M. (2002). Instructional Features of Synchronous Computer-Mediated Communication in the L2 Class: A Sociocultural Case Study. *CALICO Journal*, 19(2), 249-277. Retrieved April 14, 2019, from <http://calico.org/p-5-Calico%20Journal.html>.

- Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. (2000). *Handbook of Qualitative Research*. London: Sage Publications.
- Deutsch, W., Bruhn, N., Masche, G., & Behrens, H. (1997). Can One be More Than Two? Mono- and Bilinguals' Production of German and Spanish Object Descriptions in a Referential Communication task. In G. Kasper & E. Kellerman (eds), *Communication Strategies: Psycholinguistic and Sociolinguistic Perspectives*. London: Longman.
- Dornyei, Z. (1995). On the Teachability of Communication Strategies. *TESOL QUARTERLY*, 29, 55-85.
- Dornyei, Z., & Kormos, J. (1998). Problem-Solving Mechanisms in L2 Communication: A Psycholinguistic Perspective. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 20, 349-385.
- Dornyei, Z., & Scott, M. L. (1997). Communication Strategies in a Second Language: Definitions and Taxonomies. *Language Learning*, 47(1), 173-209.
- Dornyei, Z., & Thurrell, S. (1991). Strategic Competence and How to Teach It. *ELT Journal*, 45, 16-23.
- Dornyei, Z., & Thurrell, S. (1994). Strategic Competence and How to Teach It. *ELT Journal*, 40, 18-21.
- Drew, J., Hardman, L. & Hosp, L. (2008). *Designing and Conducting Research in Education*. USA: Sage Publications Inc.
- Ellis, R. (1985). *Understanding Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ellis, R. (1994). *The Study of Second Language Acquisition*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Ellis. (1994). *Language learning Strategies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ervin, G. (1979). Communication strategies employed by American students of Russian. *Modern Language Journal*, 63, 329-334.
- Færch, C. & G. Kasper, (1983). Plans and Strategies in Foreign Language Communication. In C. Faerch and G. Kasper (eds.). *Strategies in Language Communication* (eds.). London: Longman.
- Færch, C. & Kasper, G. (1983a). Plans and Strategies in Foreign Language Communication. In C. Faerch and G. Kasper (eds), *Strategies in Interlanguage Communication*. London: Longman.
- Færch, C. & Kasper, G. (1983b). Communication Strategies in Interlanguage Production. In C. Faerch & G. Kasper (eds), *Strategies in Interlanguage Communication*. London: Longman.

- Færch, C. & Kasper, G. (1984). Two ways of defining communication strategies. *Language Learning* 34/1, 45-63.
- Færch, C., & Kasper, G. (1980). Processes and strategies in foreign language learning and communication. *Interlanguage Studies Bulletin*, 5 (1), 47-118.
- Færch, C., & Kasper, G. (1984). Two ways of defining communication strategies. *Language Learning*, 34 (1), 45-63.
- Færch, C., & Kasper, G. (Eds.). (1983). *Strategies in Interlanguage Communication*. London: Longman.
- Faucette, P. (2001) A pedagogical perspective on communication strategies: Benefits of training and an analysis of English language teaching materials. *Second Language Studies* 19 (2), 1-40).
- Fenn, F. (2014). *The communication process*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Fernández Dobao, A. (2001). Communication Strategies in the IL of Galician Students of English: The Influence of Learner- and Task-Related Factors. *Atlantis*, 23, 41–62.
- Fernández-García, M., & Martínez-Arbelaiz, A. (2002). Negotiation of Meaning in Nonnative Speaker-Nonnative Speaker Synchronous Discussions. *CALICO Journal*, 19 (2), 279-294.
- Fidalgo-Eick, M. (2001). Synchronous on-Line Negotiation of Meaning by Intermediate Learners of Spanish. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Iowa, USA.
- Gall, M. D., Gall, J. P. & Borg, W. R. (2007). *Educational Research: An Introduction*, (8th ed. New York: Longman.
- Gass, K. Bardovi-Harlig, S. Magnan & J. Walz (Eds.), *Pedagogical Norms for Second and Foreign Language Learning and Teaching* (p. 221-39). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Company.
- Gay, L. R. (1992). *Educational Research. Competences for Analysis and Application* (4th ed.). New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.
- Glahn, E. (1980). Introspection as a method of elicitation in interlanguage studies. *Interlanguage Studies Bulletin Utrecht*, 5, 119-28.
- Grenfell, M. & Harris, V. (1999). *Modern Languages and Learning Strategies*, London: Routledge.
- Guba, E. G. & Lincoln, Y. S. (1994). 'The Countenances of Fourth Generation valuation: Description, Judgement and Negotiation'. *Evaluation Studies Review Annual*. London: SAGE Publications.
- Guillemin, E., Chau, F. N., & Lorhandicap Group (2001). Prevalence of Impairments, Disabilities, Handicaps and Quality of Life in the General Population: a

- Review of Recent Literature. Bull World Health Organ [online]. vol.79, n.11, 1047- 1055.
- Haastrup, K., & Phillipson, R. (1983). Achievement Strategies in Learner/Native Speaker Interaction. In C. Faerch, & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Strategies in Interlanguage Communication*. London: Longman.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1978). *Language as social semiotic*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Halliday, M.A.K. (1970). Language structure and language function. In J. Lyons (Ed.), *New Horizons in Linguistics* (pp. 140-65). Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Hammer J. (1998). *How to teach English*. Harlow: Longman.
- Hammond, M. & Wellington, J. J. (2013). *Research methods the key concepts*. London: New York: Routledge.
- Hedge, T. (2000). *Teaching and Learning in the Language Classroom*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hinnenkamp, V. (1987). Foreigner talk, code-switching and the concept of trouble. In K. Knapp.
- Holloway, I. (1997). *Basic concepts for qualitative research*. USA: Blackwell Science, Inc.
- Hornberger, N. H. (1989). Trámites and Transports: The Acquisition of Second Language Communicative Competence for One Speech Event in Puno, Peru. *Applied Linguistics*, 10 (2), 214-230.
- Hsieh, L. & Shannon, C. (2005). *Introduction to research in education*. Washington DC: Wadsworth, Cengage Learning.
- Huang, L. (2013). Cognitive Processes Involved in Performing the IELTS Speaking Test: Respondents' Strategic Behaviors Instigated Testing and Non-Testing Contexts. *IELTS*.
- Hymes, D. H. (1972). On Communicative Competence. In J.B. Pride, & J. Holmes (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics*. Harmondsworth, England: Penguin Books.
- Iwai, C. (1995). Second language proficiency and communication strategies in L1 and L2. *NIDABA*, 1 (24), 11-20.
- Iwai, C. (2000). *Communication strategies in L2 use*. Japan: Keisuisha Press.
- Jack, C. & Richards, (1997). *Teaching listening and speaking*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Johnson & Johnson (1998). *Human relations and your career*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

- Johnson, B. & Christiansen, B. (2012). *Educational research: Quantitative, qualitative & mixed approaches*. Los Angeles: Sage Publications.
- Jourdain, S. & Scullen, M.E. (2002). A Pedagogical Norm for Circumlocution in French. In
- Kasper, G. & Kellerman, E. (1997). Introduction: Approaches to Communication Strategies. In G. Kasper & E. Kellerman (eds), *Communication Strategies: Psycholinguistic and Sociolinguistic Perspectives*. London: Longman.
- Kasper, G. (1997). Beyond Reference. In G. Kasper & E. Kellerman (eds), *Communication Strategies: Psycholinguistic and Sociolinguistic Perspectives*. London: Longman.
- Kasper, G., & Kellerman, E. (Eds.) (1997). *Communication Strategies: Psycholinguistic and Sociolinguistic Perspectives*. New York: Addison Wesley Longman.
- Kellerman E. (1978). Giving Learners a Break: Native Language Intuitions as a Source of Predictions About Transferability. *Working Papers on Bilingualism* 15, 59-92.
- Kellerman, E. & Kasper, G. (eds.) 1997. *Communication Strategies: Psycholinguistic and Sociolinguistic Perspectives*. England: Addison Wesley Longman Limited
- Kellerman, E. (1991). *Compensatory Strategies in Second Language Research: A Critique, a Revision, and Some (Non-)Implications for the Classroom*. In R. Phillipson, E. Kellerman, L. Selinker, M. Sharwood Smith & M. Swain (eds), *Foreign/Second Language Pedagogy Research*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Kellerman, E., & Bialystok, E. (1997). On Psychological Plausibility in the Study of Communication Strategies. In G. Kasper & E. Kellerman (eds), *Communication Strategies: Psycholinguistic and Sociolinguistic Perspectives*. London: Longman.
- Kellerman, E., Ammerlaan, T., & Poulisse, N. (1990). System and Hierarchy in L2 Compensatory Strategies. In R. Scarcella, E. Anderson & S. Krashen (eds), *Developing Communicative Competence in a Second Language*. New York: Newbury House.
- Kellerman, E., Bongaerts, T., & Poulisse, N. (1987). Strategy and System in L2 Referential Communication. In R. Ellis (ed.), *Second Language Acquisition in Context*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Kelm, O. R. (1992). The Use of Synchronous Computer Networks in Second Language Instruction: A Preliminary Report. *Foreign Language Annals*, 25, 441-454.
- Kern, R. (1995). Restructuring Classroom Interaction with Networked Computers: Effects on Quantity and Characteristics of Language Production. *The Modern Language Journal*, 79 (4), 457-476.

- Khanji, R. (1996). Two Perspectives in Analyzing Communication Strategies. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 34 (2), 144-155.
- Kothari, C. R. (2004). *Research methodology: Methods and techniques* (2nd ed.). New Delhi: New Age International (P). Limited.
- Kothari, C. R. (2008). *Research Methodology: Methods and Techniques*. New Delhi: Age International (P) Ltd. Publishers.
- Kovacevic, K. C. & Kovacevic, M. (2015): Monitoring Speakers' L2 Maintenance effort. In Navracics J. & Bányi Sz. (eds). *Első- és második nyelv: Interdiszciplináry megközelítések. Pszicholingvisztikai tanulmányok VI.* Budapest: Tinta Könyvkiadó 33-47.
- Krashen, S. & Terrell, T. (1983). *The natural approach: Language acquisition in the classroom*. Oxford: Pergamon.
- Kusi, H. (2012). *Doing qualitative research: A guide for researcher*. Accra Newtown: Emmpong Press.
- Kvale, S. (2009). *Interviews: Learning the Craft of Qualitative Research Interviewing*. London: Sage Publications.
- Larsen-Freeman, D., & Long, M. (1991). *An Introduction to Second Language Acquisition Research*. London: Longman.
- Laszlo, K (2017). The Use of Communication Strategies in English Language Education. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Development Research*. 5-14.
- Lee, J. (2002, September 19). I Think, Therefore IM. *New York Times*, p.G.1
- Levenston, E., & Blum-Kulka, S. (1977). Aspects of Lexical Simplification in the Speech and Writing of Advanced Adult Learners. In Coder, S. Pit and Roulet, E. (eds), *Actes du 5ème colloque de linguistique appliquée de Neuchâtel*. Neuchâtel: Faculté des Lettres, 51-71.
- Lin, G. (2007). *A Case Study of Seven Taiwanese English as a Foreign Language Freshman Non-English Majors' Perceptions about Learning Five Communications Strategies*. USA: Boca Raton.
- Liskin-Gasparro, J. E. (1996). Circumlocution, Communication Strategies, and the ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines: An Analysis of Student Discourse. *Foreign Language Annals*, 29 (3), 317-330.
- Littlemore, J. (2001). An Empirical Study of the Relationship Between Cognitive Style and the Use of Communication Strategy. *Applied Linguistics*, 22 (2), pp. 241-265.
- Littlemore, J. (2003). The communicative effectiveness of different types of communication strategy. *System*, 31, 331-347.

- Littlewood, W. (1989). *Foreign and Second language Learning; Language Acquisition research and its implication for the classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Liungman, C.G. (1975). *What is IQ? Intelligence, Heredity and Environment*. London: Gordon Cremonesi.
- Long, M. (1996). *The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition*. New York: Academic Press.
- MacIntyre et al. (1998). Conceptualizing Willingness to Communicate in L2. *The Modern Language Journal*,(261),71-86.
- Maleki, A. (2007). Teachability of communication strategies: An Iranian experience. *System* 35 (4), pp. 583-594.
- Maleki, A. (2010). Techniques to Teach Communication Strategies. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research* 1/5. 640-646.
- Mali, Z. O. (2007). Exploring Communication Strategy Use by Learners of Isizulu. In Synchronous Computer-mediated Communication (S-CMC). *Thesis and Dissertations*. Paper 142. <http://ir.uiowa.edu/etd/142>.
- Mayring, M. Q. (2000). *Qualitative research and educational methods*. London: Sage Publication.
- McMillan, J.H. & Schumacher, S (2001). *Research in education: A conceptual introduction* (5th ed.). New York: Longman.
- Merriam, B. S. (2009). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation* (3rd ed). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Mitchell, R., & Myles, F. (1998). *Second language learning theories*. London: Arnold Publishers.
- Muhammad, S. (2016) Teaching Communication Strategies in an EFL Class of Tertiary Level. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*,4(10), pp. 2033-2041.
- Muysken P. (2000). *Bilingual Speech: A typology of Code-Mixing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Nakatani, Y. (2005). The effects of awareness-raising training on oral communication strategy use. *Modern Language Journal*, 89 (1), pp. 76-91.
- Nakuma, C. (1997). A method for measuring the attrition of communicative competence: A pilot study with Spanish L3 Subjects. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 18, 219 – 235.
- Nanako, S. (1996). Communication Strategy: Communication Strategies Used by Slow Learners of English-A Retrospective Data Analysis. *The Chugoku Academic Society of English Language Education*, 25, 111-118.

- Nayar, B. (1988). *Optic glasses and hand watches: Communication strategies in ESL*. Paper presented at the TESOL convention in Chicago.
- Newmark, L. (1966). How not to interfere with language teaching, In Brumfit, C. J. & K. Johnson (eds.) *The communicative approach to language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- O'Malley, J. M., Chamot, A. U. Stewner-Mananares, G., Kupper, L. & Russo, R. P. (1985). Learning strategies used by beginning and intermediate ESL students. *Language Learning*, 35, 21-46.
- Opie, C. (2004). *Research approaches, doing educational research: A guide to first time researchers*. London: Sage Publications.
- Orodho, J. A. (2004). *Techniques of Writing Research Proposals and Reports in Education and Social Sciences*. Bureau of Education Research Kenyatta University. Nairobi: Reata Printers.
- Osakwe, R. (2019). Dimensions of communication as predictors of effective classroom interaction. *The Morden Journal*, 151-168.
- Osoez, A.R. (2003). *Jigsaw and Free Discussion in Synchronous Computer-Mediated Communication (S-CMC)*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, The University of Iowa, USA.
- Oxford, R. (1990). *Language Learning Strategies: What Every Teacher Should Know[M]*. New York: Newbury House. European Scientific Journal September 2013 edition vol.9, No.26 ISSN: 1857 – 7881 (Print) e - ISSN 1857- 7431 266.
- Paribakht, T. (1985). Strategic competence and language proficiency. *Applied Linguistics*, 6, 132-46.
- Patton, M. Q. (2007). *Qualitative research and educational methods* (5th ed.). London: Sage Publications. Routledge Falmer.
- Poulisse, N. (1990). *The Use of Compensatory Strategies by Dutch Learners of English*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Poulisse, N. (1990). *The Use of Compensatory Strategies by Dutch Learners of English*. Dordrecht: Foris Publications.
- Poulisse, N. (1993). A theoretical account of lexical communication strategies. In, S. Robert & B. Weltens (Eds.), *The Bilingual Lexicon* 157 ff.
- Poulisse, N. (1997). Compensatory Strategies and the Principles of Clarity and Economy. In G. Kasper & E. Kellerman (Eds.), *Communication Strategies: Psycholinguistic and Sociolinguistic Perspectives* (pp. 49-64). London: Longman.

- Poulisse, N. in collaboration with Bongaerts, T. & Kellerman, E. (1990). *The Use of Compensatory Strategies by Dutch Learners of English*. The Netherlands: Foris Publications Holland.
- Poulisse, N., & Bongaerts, T. (1994). First Language Use in Second Language Production. *Applied Linguistics*, 15(1), 36-57.
- Poulisse, N., & Schils, E. (1989). The Influence of Task and Proficiency-Related Factors on the Use of Compensatory Strategies: a Quantitative Analysis. *Language Learning*, 39, 15–48.
- Poulisse, N., Bongaerts, T., Kellerman, E. (1990). *The Use of Compensatory Strategies by Dutch Learners of English*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Pring, R. (2004). *Philosophy of educational research*. New York: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Rababah, G. (2002). "Second Language Communication Strategies: Definitions, Taxonomies, Data Elicitation Methodology and Teachability Issues. A Review Article." ERIC ED472698.v
- Rababah, G. (2005). Communication problems facing Arab learners of English. *Journal of Language and Learning*, 3 (1), 180–197.
- Rababah, G., & Bulut, D. (2007). Compensatory Strategies in Arabic as a Second language. *Poznań Studies in Contemporary Linguistics*, 43 (2), 83–106.
- Rampton, B. (1997). "A Sociolinguistic Perspective on L2 Communication Strategies". In Kasper, G. and Kellerman, E. (eds.). *Communication Strategies: Psycholinguistic and Sociolinguistic Perspectives*. England: Addison Wesley Longman Limited, 279-304.
- Rampton, B. (1997). Second Language Research in Late Modernity: A Response to Firth and Wagner. *Modern Language Journal*, 81(3), 329-333. *Research Reports Series*, No.1.
- Richards, J. C. & Rodgers, T. S. (1986/2001): *Approaches and methods in language teaching: A description and analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rodino, A., & Snow, C. (1997). „Y ...no puedodecir mas nada“ : Distanced Communication Skills of Puerto Rican Children. In G. Kasper & E. Kellerman (eds), *Communication strategies: Psycholinguistic and sociolinguistic Perspectives*. London: Longman.
- Romaine, S. (1989). *Bilingualism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ross, S. (1997). An Introspective Analysis of listener Inferencing on a Second Language Listening Task. In G. Kasper & E. Kellerman (eds), *Communication strategies: Psycholinguistic and Sociolinguistic Perspectives*. London: Longman.

- Russel, G., (1997). Preference and Order in First and Second Language Referential Strategies. In G. Kasper & E. Kellerman (eds), *Communication Strategies: Psycholinguistic and Sociolinguistic Perspectives*. London: Longman.
- Seliger, H. W. & Long, M. H.(eds), *Classroom oriented research in second language acquisition*. Rowley, Mass: Newbury House.
- Seliger, H. W. (1983). The Language Learner as Linguist: of Metaphors and Realities. *Applied Linguistics*, 4 (3), pp. 179-91.
- Selinker, L. (1972). Interlanguage. *International Review of Applied Linguistics and Language Teaching (IRAL)*, 10, 209-31.
- Selinker, L. (1972). Interlanguage. *IRAL*, 10, 209-231.
- Simon, M. K. & Goes, J. (2011). *Dissertation and scholarly research: Recipes for success*. College Grove: Dissertation Success.
- Smith, B. (2003). Computer-mediated negotiated interaction: An expanded model. *The Modern Language Journal*, 87, 38-57.
- Stern, H. H. (1983). *Fundamental concepts of language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Stewart, S., & Pearson, L. (1995). Development of Communication Strategies Among Foreign Language Learners. *MIFLC Review*, 5, 112-127.
- Swain, M. (1985). *Communicative competence role of input and output*. Michigan: Newbury House.
- Swanson, R. A. (2013). *Theory building in applied disciplines*. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler Publishers.
- Tarone, E & Yule, G. (1989). *Focus on language learner*. Oxford. Oxford University Press.
- Tarone, E. (1977). Conscious Communication Strategies in Interlanguage. In H. Brown, C. Yorio, & R. Crymes (eds), *On TESOL'77*. Washington, DC: TESOL.
- Tarone, E. (1977). Conscious Communication Strategies in Interlanguage: A progress report. In H. Brown, C. Yario & R. Crymes (Eds.), *On TESOL '77* (pp.194-203). Washington DC.: TESOL.
- Tarone, E. (1980). Communication Strategies, Foreigner Talk, and Repair in Interlanguage. *Language Learning*, 30 (2), 417-431.
- Tarone, E. (1981). Some Thoughts on the Notion of Communication Strategy. *TESOL Quarterly*, 15 (1), 285-295.
- Tarone, E. (1983). On the Variability of Systems. *Applied Linguistics*. 4(2): 143-163.

- Tarone, E. (1983). Some Thoughts on the Notion of 'Communication Strategy'. In C. Faerch & G. Kasper (eds), *Strategies in Interlanguage Communication*. London: Longman.
- Tarone, E. (2005). Speaking in a Second Language. In E. Hinkel (ed.) *Handbook of Research in Second Language Teaching and Learning*, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Tarone, E., Cohen, A., & Dumas, G. (1983). A Closer Look at Some Interlanguage Terminology: a Framework for Communication Strategies. In C. Faerch & G. Kasper (eds), *Strategies in Interlanguage Communication*. London: Longman.
- Thornbury, S. (2005). *How to teach speaking*. London: Pearson Education Limited.
- Ting, S., & Phan, G. (2008). Adjusting Communication Strategies Proficiency. Retrieved 2019, from http://www.ameprc.mq.edu.au/docs/prospect_journal/volume_22_no_4/TingandPhan.pdf.
- Tiwaporn, K. (2016). The Impact of Teaching Communication Strategies on English Speaking of Engineering Undergraduates *PASAA Volume 51*.
- Tom, O. (2017). *What is Dependability in Qualitative Research and How Do We Establish It?* USA.: Statistics Solutions
- Tornberg, U. (2000), *Språkdidaktik* (2nd ed). Malmö: GleerupsUtbildning AB.
- Trosborg, A. (1982). Communication Strategies: Relating Theory Practice. *Finlance*, 2, 111-136.
- van Lier, L. (1996). *Interaction in the Language Curriculum*. London: Longman.
- Varadi, T. (1973). "Strategies of Target Language Learner Communication: Message Adjustment" Paper presented at the Sixth Conference of the Romanian-English Linguistic Project in Timisoara.
- Varadi, T. (1980). Strategies of Target Language Learner Communication: Message Adjustment. *IRAL*, 18, 59–71.
- Varadi, T. (1983). Strategies of Target Language Learner Communication: Message Adjustment. In C. Faerch & G. Kasper (eds), *Strategies in Interlanguage Communication*. London: Longman.
- Wagner, J. (1983). Dann du tageneineeeee – weisseOlatte – An Analysis of Interlanguage Communication in Instructions. In C. Faerch & G. Kasper (eds), *Strategies in Interlanguage Communication*. London: Longman.
- Walsh F. (2006). *Strengthening Family Resilience*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Wanger, J. (1983). An Analysis of Interlanguage Communication in Instructions. In C. Faerch & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Strategies in Interlanguage Communication*. London: Longman.

- Widdowson, H.G. (1978). *Teaching Language as Communication*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Widiarin.(2014). Enhancing Students' Self-Confidence Through Teacher's Behaviour. *Applied Linguistics*, 22(2),PP.241-265.
- Wiemann, J., & Daly, J. (1994). Introduction: Getting Your Own Way. In J. Daly & J. Wiemann (eds), *Strategic Interpersonal Communication*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Willems, G. (1986). Communicative Strategies. *Levende Talen*, 409/410, 170-74.
- Willems, G. (1987). Communication Strategies and Their Significance in Foreign Language Teaching. *System*, 15 (3), pp. 351- 364.
- Williams, J., Insoe, R., & Tasker, T. (1997). Communication Strategies in an Interactional Context: The Mutual Achievement of Comprehension. In G. Kasper & E. Kellerman (eds), *Communication Strategies: Psycholinguistic and Sociolinguistic Perspectives*. London: Longman.
- Williams, K; & Kemper, S. (2004) Hummert ML Enhancing Communication With Older Adults: Overcoming Elder Speak. *J GerontolNurs*.30(10) :17-25.
- Woolfolk, A. (2004). *Educational psychology*. Boston: Longman.
- Yin, R. K. (2003). *Case study research: Design and methods* (3rd Ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Yule, G. (1997). *Referential communication tasks*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Yule, G. (2010). *The study of language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Yule, G., & Tarone, E. (1989). *Focus on the language learner*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Yule, G., & Tarone, E. (1990). Eliciting the Performance of Strategic Competence. In R. Scarcella, E. Andersen & S. Krashen (eds), *Developing Communicative Competence in a Second Language*. New York: Newbury House.
- Yule, G., & Tarone, E. (1997). Investigating Communication Strategies in L2 Reference: Pros and Cons. In G. Kasper & E. Kellerman (eds), *Communication Strategies: Psycholinguistic and Sociolinguistic Perspectives*. London: Longman.
- Yule, G., & Tarone, E. (1997). Investigating Communication Strategies in L2 Reference: Pros and Cons. In G. Kasper & E. Kellerman (Eds.), *Communication Strategies*, New York: Addison Wesley Longman.

APPENDIX

TRANSCRIPTION

1. T: Do you have Facebook accounts?
2. S: Yes
3. S: Yes, I do
4. T: Ok, why do you use it/?what is your motivation for using it?
5. S: I don't
6. S: (Laughter)
7. S: Some friend told me to getting in order toerr.....like that.
8. T: OK
9. T: How often do you logged into the account?
10. S: Mmmm, Once every three weeks
(Laughter)
11. T: Okay, that's alright, eerr what about you? (Point to a student)
12. S: Er (Pause) What I use Facebook? Why?
13. T: How often?
14. S: How often? Eerr, I don't really know.
15. S: Always when he is bored.
16. S: Yes, yes, I logged in on my phone. When it makes the sound "kwan" it means something
happen on Facebook. (laughter)
17. T: So, always, what of you? (Pointing to a lady)
18. S: Eerrr..], Sir when I am not doing anything.
19. T: Okay.
20. S: And Sir, when I am at home too.

21. T: What of when you are in school?
22. S: And you think oh
23. S: It can happen anywhere with phone.
24. T: Yeah
25. S: Oh
26. S: And you are like refreshing, yes
- (Laughter)
27. S: Yeah
28. S: Yeah, yeah
- (Pause)
29. T: Do you share private information on Facebook?
30. S: Yeah, I do, oh no maybe not
31. T: Like what?
32. S: Not much
33. S: Not much but
34. T: But
35. S: More like - - -
36. S: Maybe like relationship and such
37. S: But not like
38. T: Not like what?
39. S: Some people do like err I wanna go to the store now and do dinner after that.
40. S: No, no, not
41. S: I don't
42. T: So what do you share on Facebook?
43. S: I don't write anything oo

44. S: I just look
(Laughter)
45. T: Look at what?
46. S: I write something on Facebook
47. T: What of you? Do you write on Facebook?
48. S: Sir, I my head is paining me
(Laughter)
49. S: Sir, when I am bored, and I hear “kwan” that pops up so.
50. T: So you begin to write or-----?
51. S: No, no, it’s much more doing it on others Facebooks...
See all the comments and reactions on.
- 51: T: How much time do you spend on Facebook? We already answered that.
52. S: Yes, sir.
53. T: Oh, okay
54. T: Err, does the time you spend on Facebook prevent you from doing your bestin school?
55. S: Mmm, yes
56. S: Oh, well.
57. S: Sir, I think so
58. S: Perhaps but often you’re logged into Facebook in class then you.
59. S: You have nothing to do.
60. S: Exactly, it’s something that you know (pause)so boring.
- 61: S: And if you are not on Facebook, you are somewhere else on the internet doing something else.
62. T: Ok

63. S: Yes, sir
64. S: Yes, yes, maybe watching relationship status
65. T: Relationship status, is it important?
66. S: Yes, I think so
67. S: No, I don't think it's important
68. S: But, it's like if the, if the other person thinks (Pause) want it or-----
somethingthere) in okay with it.
69. T: Something where something means what?
70. S: If they send or message like "do you want to be"
71. T: A request or something.
72. S: Yes, a request.
73. S: You just need to say yes
(Laughter)
74. S: Sir, like no deny oo
(Laughter)
75. S: Sir, if you deny you hear things like "why no"
76. S: Oh why?
77. S: You hate me?
78. T: No, but I don't think this so important
79. S: We're not. We don't like on Facebook
80. T: Have you?
81. S: Sir, I don't think about it.
82. T: Have you watched that Joy prime episode on Facebook?
83. S: No
84. T: You have no friends

85. S: What?
86. T: The episode is called you have no friends.
87. S: You're watching it?
88. S: Yeah
89. S: Yeah and you know it's one of the guys in a certain town that's (Pause)
He's recently got a Facebook page from his friend. Friends, he didn't really want it. So you all his real friends are sending a lot of friend's requests. You know when he is ignoring that everybody hates him in real life"
Why haven't you replied on my friend request on Facebook, you hate me! So well that could **actually** happen in real life sort of
90. T: Yes, it could
91. S: You know so
92. T: It's like something it's too serious on Facebook.
93. S: Yeah
94. S: Yes
95. S: Cause you write something you don't really mean it's like....
96. T: (??)
97. S: And people take it like
98. T: Yeah
99. S: Oh my God (Pause) No
100. T: Yeah and
101. T: It can be so wrong
102. S: It's too much
103. S: And you can write something which you don't mean but the other people think it's anything

104. S: Yeah
105. S: But you don't mean it that way; can be so wrong.
106. S: Yes (pause) it's true
107. T: So friend request ignoring, have any of you ever ignored a friend's request?
108. S: Yeah, I have
109. S: Yes, sir
110. S: A lot
111. T: Indeed
112. S: Yes, indeed
113. T: You are proud of it
114. S: Oh yes
115. S: Yeah, for instance I have deny my sister
116. T: No!
117. S: Why
118. S: Because I don't want her to find out everything I'm doing on Facebook and what's go on and so on
119. S: But you do with your mother on Facebook so she don't know.
120. T: So you want some privacy?
121. S: Yes
122. S: That she doesn't know about?
- (Pause)
123. S: Yes, yes, she can be
124. S: Meaning
125. S: Mean, yes

126. S: Tell it to parent
127. S: Yes, I want privacy, because are you ok?
128. S: Yeah they know
129. S: But I hate when random people send requests.
130. S: Yeah
131. S: But I just deny it when
132. T: You get angry after them because you don't know them and they don't know you and
133. S: Yes (Laughter)
134. T: Hello
135. S: And sometimes it's like people at school that you have seen
136. S: Yeah but you never see say hello to you.
137. S: No, never and you don't even know their friends or anything.
138. S: And they just "Do you wanna be friend with one?"
139. S: Yeah
140. T: So you don't really want to deny it but still you don't want to be invited by them on Facebook?
141. S: You can mean when you
142. T: Why should you?
143. S: But so if you deny it they could think that
144. S: Why do you deny me?
145. S: Because, let's continue the discussion tomorrow.
146. S: Yeah but I get eh a friend neighbor (pause) he trying to be my friend on Facebookbut then he's about ten.
147. S: No!

148. S: You know so I just no, no
149. S: No, that's terrible
150. S: That's you know I don't actually press the deny button (??)
151. S: No
152. S: Just so they won't get sad
153. T: So you still have it there
154. S: Yes, sir
155. T: Yeah, but it's if you deny it, it's the same as if you just ignore clicking
156. S: I have friend with my mother's cousin's child on Facebook and always when he is with his, he writes to me "hi beauty what are you doing? And just „Oh go away“
157. S: Go away go away
158. S: Get off one
159. S: Yeah on very interesting (Pause) all my friend on Facebook its always them whosend me that friend's request I have never sent a friend request to anyone.
160. S: Hei, you send one to me
161. S; Did I?
162. S: „Aane”, yes
163. S: Uuuuei!
164. S: Hmmm“
165. S: Eii, Saa?
166. S: Uuuu
167. S: Oooooh
- (Laughter)

168. S: „Brofo”
(Laughter)
(Pause)
169. S: Small liar
(Laughter)
170. T: Have any of you ever posted something on Facebook that you have regretted later? (Pause)
171. S: I don't remember
172. S: „Err“ maybe
173. S: Probably maybe sometimes
174. T: Have you forgotten?
175. S: Err perhaps song or something like that (Pause)but I don't I ever posted anything wrong.
176. S: Oh, sir, yes, once there was a girl who had a boyfriend for about a year and theybroke up and she was very sad and everyone was commenting.
177. S: No
178. S: I accidentally do it
(Laughter).
179. S: Dislike
180. T: Dislike what?
181. S: Dislike friends on Facebook.
182. S: So when they request I write comment like dislike.
183. S: I wrote her a message
184. S: True?
185. S: Yeah

186. T: Well, what of when the people who are sending you the request through the time Know like links and as quick as you press the link to see what it is suddenly like it on Facebook. You know Facebook does that automatically.
187. S: Does it automatically?
188. T: Yes
189. S: If you check your Facebook log and find “Nneęma bi a wanninnye ho a”
190. S: Then you dislike / dismiss.
191. S: Yes, sir, you delete
192. T: Oh“ is that so?
193. S: Yes, sir.
194. S: Sometimes I want (pause) to quit my Facebook.
S: But that is really difficult to do?
195. T: Why is it difficult to do?
196. S: Because people will think different thing about you.
197. T: How do you think you are perceived on Facebook? (2 x)
198. S: Perceived? Perceived?
199. T: Yes, what people think of you on Facebook?
200. S: I don“t know, Sir. I think err I am very active. I think this is what people think about me on Facebook.
201. S: Me, I think I“m boring because I don“t write anything on Facebook.
I only read what people write.
202. S: I don“t put my pictures there.
203. S: Read post of others
204. T: Eęeasemoo
205. S: Sir, Facebook deę, nsempii.

- 206: S: enyε easy oo!
207. S: “Biribiarawɔhɔ bi”
(Laughter)
208. T: Alright, in our next lesson we are going to put all that you have said into writing. Thus, you are going to write on Facebook and its implication on academic work.
209. S: Sir, will it like be assignment or classwork?
210. T: Classwork
211. S: “Eii“, Y“awu”
212. T: OK, Thank you.
213. T: Today we are coming to talk about *something* right now. The topic for today is speech sounds.
214. T: What are speech sounds?
216. S: They are sounds produced by speech organs.
217. T: He said, they are sounds produced by what?
218. T: Speech organs
219. T: Shall we have examples of speech sounds?
220. S: /P/
221. S: /t/
222. S: / a: /
223. T: Good. It’s only human beings that produce speech sound.
224. T: What animal can produce the sound /p/?
(Laughter)
- 225: T: It will be a big problem to get any goat to make the sound /p/ after you.
- 226: S: Ankaεbeyε hu

(Laughter)

227. T: Alright, speech sounds are put into two main categories.
228. T: What are these categories?
229. S: Vowels and consonants
230. T: Vowels and consonants. Good
231. T: Now, what is the main difference between vowels and consonants?
232. T: What is the main difference between vowels and consonants?
233. T: What bring about the difference between them? Yes, what brings about their differences?
234. S: Sir, when you are producing vowel sound, there is no obstruction by then when producing consonants there is obstructions when the sound is coming
235. T: OK, when you talk of obstruction what do you mean?
236. S: Blockage
237. T: There is no blockage of the air that comes from the lungs Ok.
238. T: You know in the cause of the producing speech sounds, we have various passages through the air err passes.
239. T: We have movement of the air out of the lungs through the various tracks to give us certain sounds so the process of the movement of the air so the process of the movement of the air through the lungs, thus out of the lungs is termed as what? When the air is moving out of the lungs, what kind of airstream mechanism, do we have?
240. S: Egressive
241. T: Good, we refer to that as pulmonic egressive

- 242 T: What about the one in which the air goes into the lungs?
- 243 T: When the air goes into the lungs, what do we refer to?
244. T: If the one that goes out is egressive, what about the one that goes in?
- 245 S: Ingressive
- 246 T: Pulmonic ingressive, yes
- 247 T: Now, in the production of vowel sounds, the air comes out freely without any blockage or obstruction.
- 248 T: Now, take any of the vowel sounds.
249. S: /i:/
- 250 T: Let's all pronounce it / i: /
- 251 T: Do you find anything blocking the air?
- 252 S: No
- 253 T: Good. Let's pick another vowel
- 254 S: / a: /
- 255 T: Let's pronounce / a: /
- 256 T: In its production is there any blockage?
- 257 S: No
- 258 T: No
- 259 T: Another vowel
- 260 S: / u: /
- 261 T: Let's produce it
- 262 S: / u: /
- 263 T: Any blockage?
- 264 S: No
- 265 T: By the way, how many vowel sounds do we have in English?

- 266 S: Twenty
- 267 T: How many of them are considered as pure vowels?
- 268 S: Twelve
- 269 T: Twelve. So, we have twelve pure vowels and eight diphthongs.
- 270 T: What is the difference between these two vowels / a: / and / æ /?
- 271 S: The first one is long and the second is short
- 272 T: OK
- 273 T: Let's get examples of the words each with these sounds
- 274 S: Heart / a: /
- 278 S: Car / a: /
- 279 S: Man / α /
- 280 S: Mat /α/
- 281 S: Akokó (Laughter)
- 282 T: English is not a phonic language
- 283 T: The names of the alphabets are not in line with.....(pause) eerr the sounds. The alphabets are deceptive.
- 284 T: Alright, now we have seen the vowels are produced with obstruction of the air and in terms of description, we have various perimeter for description. We look the movement of the tongue. That is, does it move front, central or back, so we have the front back parameter. In the production of the front vowels, the tongue moves towards the front of the mouth. Take for example, the vowel /i: /.
- 285 T: Where does the tongue move to?
- 286 S: Front
- 287 T: Good, now take the vowel / u: /

288 S: / u: /

289 T: Where does the tongue move to?

290 S: Back

291 T: Hence, the front-back parameter

292 T: We also have the central vowels

293 T: The other parameter is the open-close

294 T: That is the closeness of the tongue to the roof of the mouth. The roof is referring to the palate. So in making the sound, you compare how or open of the tongue to the roof hence, open, half open half close and close.

295 T: Is that OK?

296 S: Yes, Sir.

297 T: The third parameter is the shape of the lip. Thus in the production of a particular sound do you have your lip rounded spread or neutral? So read any lips as I make the following sounds:

298 T: / ɔ: /

299 S: Rounded

300 T: / I: /

301 S: Spread

302 T: / ɜ: /

303 S: Neutral

304 T: / u: /

305 S: Rounded

306 T: So in describing a vowel, you start with the front back parameter, open close and the shape of the lips.

- 307 T: Let's go back to the question of the differences! One of you said there is blockage in the production of consonants while there is no blockage in the production of vowel sounds
- 308 S: Yes
- 309 T: Good, but the blockage is not the same for every sound. The blockage occurs depending on the sound. Some it occurs at the lips, some it occur in the mouth, etc.
- 310 T: Again, the manner the air is released when I make the sound / z / is different from the manner the air is released when I make the sound / t / hence the manner of articulation.
- 311 T: Then we come to voicing. Voicing simply means whether there is vibration or no vibration of the vocal cord in the production of a particular sound. These sounds that cause vibration are called Voiced sounds and those that do not cause vibration are called voiceless sound
- 312 S: Sir, so what are the parameters for consonants?
- 313 T: Voicing, place of articulation and manner of articulation.
- 314 S: Sir, can you add whether the vowel is long or short when you are describing a vowel?
- 315 T: Yes, but it is not a major parameter.
- 316 T: Back to the consonants. You test whether a particular sound is voiced or voiceless by placing your finger on the vocal cords or where we commonly called Adam's apple. If you feel vibration then, let's voiced and vice versa.
- 318 S: Sir, what is the difference between a pure vowel and a diphthong?
- 319 T: Vowel that begins with one sound but ends with a different sound.

Examples boy / bɔi /

- 320 T: Let's give more examples
- 321 S: Date, bite, fight, etc.
- 322 T: We shall look at the eight diphongs in our next meeting.
- 323 S: Beer "nsa"
- 324 T: Let's go back to the consonants. Err (pure). We have seen that there are three parameters describing the consonants. Thus, voicing, place of articulation and manner of articulation. After seeing whether the sound is voiced or voiceless
- There you come to the place.
- 325 T: How many places of articulation do we have?
- 326 S: Three
- 327 T: You've tried, but no
- 328 S: Sir, six
- 329 S: Hei, wopese wo kill yen (Laughter)
- 330 T: Quiet.
- 331 T: We have eight places of articulation.
- 332 S: Sir, what is the meaning of place of articulation? When we say place of articulation, what does that mean?
- 333 T: Good question. Yes who will help?
- 334 T: What is place or articulation?
- 335 S: Where we make sounds.
- 336 T: How? Can you explain further?
- 337 S: Me nhunusedeemenkyere mu (Laughter)
- 338 T: Kyere mu, Yeretie wo

339 T: Anyway, any idea

340 T: Merikasamo ho oo

341 S: Sir

342 T: OK, when we talk of place of articulation, we refer to where speech sounds are produced. That is, where the airstream coming out of the lungs is obstructed within the vocal tract.

343 T: OK, I mentioned earlier, there are eight places of articulation when it comes to the production of consonants.

344 T: What are these eight places? Any idea

345 S: No sir.

346 T: Alright, the places of articulations are Bilabial, Labiodental, dental, Alveolar, Palatal, palate alveolar, velar, and glottal

348 T: How we going to pick them one after the other to know what actually happens in a particular place of articulation in the production of sounds.

349 T: What are bilabial sounds?

350 S: Sir, "bi" means two and labial means lips so I think bilabial means two lips

351 T: Is that all? Continue

352 S: Sir, that is how understand it.

353 T: That's a good attempt. Any other?

354 S: Sir, two lips consonants. Sir, it means (stop for a while and look at into his notes) consonants produced by bringing the two lips together.

355 T: OK, good, but can you explain further?

356 S: Sir m'akasi (Laughter)

- 357 T: Alright, bilabial are the sounds made when the two lips are brought together in close contact (Give examples)
- 358 T: What of labiodental sounds?
- 359 S: Sounds made with lips and teeth
- 360 T: OK. Fine, but they are made with the upper teeth and the lower lip (Give example)
- 361 T: Dental sounds
- 362 S: Sound made by teeth
- 363 T: Sounds made by upper teeth and the tip of the tongue (Give examples)
- 364 T: Alright, go and read on the rest of the places of articulation and the manner of articulation. We shall talk about that in our next meeting.
Thank you.
- 365 S: Thank you Sir
- 366 T: You welcome.