CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter provides the theories of communication strategies to support the analysis. This chapter provides the theoritical framework of communication strategies from Dornyei and Scott and the taxonomy was proposed by them.

A. Introduction

The notion of strategies of communication was first introduced into Second Language Acquisition research in the early 1970s. When learners are faced with linguistic difficulties in the L2, they resort to certain strategies in order to avoid breakdown communication and to compensate for the deficiencies in their L2 linguistic resources. However, there is no one definition of communication strategies which has been accepted and, consequently, many difference taxonomies of communication strategies have been proposed.[4]

B. Different Approaches to Conceptualizing Cs

1. Traditional view

Communication Strategies is verbal or non-verbal first-aid devices used to compensate for gaps in the speaker's L2 proficiency. It is used by individual to overcome and solve the crisis or language problem that present to reach communicative goal.[5]

---

[4] Delamere Brigid, *Communication Strategies of English-speaking Learners of French on a Business Studies Course*, (Dublin: Dublin City University, 1998) p 3.

[5] Dornyei, Z., & Scott, M. L, Communication strategies in a second language: Definitions and taxonomies, *Language Learning*, Vol 47, No 1, (March, 1997), p 175.

2. Tarone's interaction perspective

Tarone defines CSs as a systematic strategy used to joint negotiation of meaning between the both of interlocutors that attempt to agree with the meaning in achieving communicative goal.[6] This definition reflected from her statement;

> *"Relate to a mutual attempt of two interlocutors to agree on a meaning in situations where requisite meaning structures do not seem to be shared."[7]*

This interaction perspective allowed for the inclusion of various repair mechanisms, for example, clarify the intended meaning rather than correcting the linguistic error. These strategies were provided on the Tyrone's taxonomy.

Tarone's taxonomy was built in the earlier research by Tarone, Cohen and Dumas in 1976.[8] The taxonomy is presented in five main categories (strategies); avoidance, paraphrase, conscious transfer, appeal for assistance and mime or non-linguistic strategies.

3. Psychological Approach

The different conceptualizations were described above share one thing; they follow a primarily linguistic approach to defining CSs. Different with the conceptualizes above, these researchers adopt psycho-linguistic approach. Here are the researcher on the CSs with psychological approach;

---

[6] Dornyei, Z., & Scott, M. L, Communication strategies in a second language: Definitions and taxonomies, *Language Learning*, Vol 47, No 1, (March, 1997), p 178.

[7] Ibid

[8] Delamere Brigid, *Communication Strategies of English-speaking Learners of French on a Business Studies Course*, (Dublin: Dublin City University, 1998), p 9.

a. Farech and Kasper

Farech and Kasper define communication strategies as *"potentially conscious plans for solving what to an individual presents itself as a problem in reaching a particular communicative goal."* They adopt a psychological approach, viewing communication strategies as the L2 learner's individual mental response to a communication problem.[9]

Farech and Kasper suggested that there are two phases included in speech production: the planning phase and the execution phase.[10] Farech and Kasper found that in the process planning phase, speaker retrieved some item from linguistic system.

A plan results from the planning phase, then followed in the execution phase in order to achieve the intended communicative goal. The speaker selects the rules and items which he considers most appropriate for establishing a plan, the execution of which will lead to verbal behavior which is expected to satisfy the original goal.

The execution phase consists of neurological and psychological process. When non-native speaker encounter a problem due to the lack of linguistic knowledge in speech production, they resort either to avoidance behaviour (adopting

[9] Delamere Brigid, *Communication Strategies of English-speaking Learners of French on a Business Studies Course,* (Dublin: Dublin City University, 1998), p 6.

[10] Rababah Ghaleb, *Second Language Communication Strategies: Definitions, Taxonomies, Data Elicitation Methodology and Teachability Issues,* (EDRS, 2002), p 16.

avoidance strategies), or to achievement behaviour.[11] And the final aim of using communication strategies is to achieve the communicative goal.

b. Bialystok (1990) and The Nijmegen Group

Another researchers that have similar approach with Faerch and Kasper are Bialystok (1990) and the Nijmegen Group (Bongaerts, Kellerman, and Poulisse). But they have different view in approaching CSs research.[12] They argue that focusing only on the surface verbalization of the underlying psychological process is not enough. It can lead to doubtful validity.

They also criticize the preview studies on CSs, they claimed that previous studies put too much emphasis on the linguistic form that results from a strategy instead of concentrating on the process that leads up to it.[13] They argued that CSs are inherently mental procedures. Therefore, the CSs research should adopt a new analytic perspective, focusing on the cognitive "deep structure" of strategic language behavior and investigating on the mental process involved in the production of strategies. In the Bialystok taxonomies there are three main categories; L1 based strategies, L2 based strategies and non-linguistic strategies.[14]

---

[11] Rababah Ghaleb, *Second Language Communication Strategies: Definitions, Taxonomies, Data Elicitation Methodology and Teachability Issues*, (EDRS, 2002), p 17.

[12] Dornyei, Z., & Scott, M. L, Communication strategies in a second language: Definitions and taxonomies, *Language Learning*, Vol 47, No 1, (March, 1997), p 180.

[13] Delamere Brigid, *Communication Strategies of English-speaking Learners of French on a Business Studies Course*, (Dublin: Dublin City University, 1998), p 19.

[14] Delamere Brigid, *Communication Strategies of English-speaking Learners of French on a Business Studies Course*, (Dublin: Dublin City University, 1998), p 15.

4. Dornyei and Scott's extended view

Dornyei and Scott extended the scopes of CSs to include every potentially intentional attempt to cope with any language-related problem of which the speaker is aware during the course of communication.[15] This conceptualization aimed to cover all the different types of communication problem-management discussed in L2 literature. They explicitly conceived "communication strategies" to be the key units in general description of problem-management in L2 communication.

C. Theoretical Framework

In this study, the researcher used theory of communication strategies proposed by Dornyei and Scott as the theoretical framework. In the extended taxonomy of problem-solving strategies, Dornyei and Scott classified the CSs according to the manner of problem-management; that is, how CSs contribute to resolving conflicts and achieving mutual understanding.[16] There are three principal categories in their taxonomy; direct strategies, interactional strategies and indirect strategies. These three broad areas are defined in the following terms;

> *"Direct strategies provide an alternative, manageable and self-contained means of getting the (sometimes modified) meaning across indirect strategies, on the other hand are not strictly problem-solving devices do not provide alternative meaning structures preventing breakdowns and keeping the communication channel open. Interactional*

---

[15] Dornyei, Z., & Scott, M. L, *Communication strategies in a second language: Definitions and taxonomies, Language Learning,* Vol 47, No 1, (March, 1997), p 179.

[16] Sahar F. A., Communication Strategies in Translation: A Review on the Taxonomies, *Journal of Siberian Federal University: Humanities & Social Sciences,* Vol 6, (May, 2012), p 773.

strategies involve a third approach, whereby participants can out trouble-shooting exchanges cooperatively".[17]

And these are the following taxonomies formulated by Dornyei and Scott;

1. Direct Strategies

    a. Resource deficit-related strategies

- Message abandonment

  Leaving a message because of some language difficulties.

- Message reduction

  Reducing the message by avoiding certain language structures of topic considered problematic language-wise or leaving out some intended elements for a lack of linguistic resources.

- Message replacement

  Substitution original message by new one because of not feeling cable in execution on it.

- Circumlocution

  Exemplifying, illustrating or describing the properties of the target object or action.

- Approximation

  Using a single alternative lexical item, such as superordinate or related term, which shares semantic features with target word or structure.

---

[17] Delamere Brigid, *Communication Strategies of English-speaking Learners of French on a Business Studies Course*, (Dublin: Dublin City University, 1998), p 23.

- Use of all-purpose words

  Extending a general, "empty" lexical item to contexts where specific word are lacking.

- Word-coinage

  Creating non-existing L2 word by applying a supposed L2 rule to an existing word.

- Restructuring

  Abandoning the execution of a verbal plan because of language difficulties, leaving the utterance unfinished, and communicating the intended message according to an alternative plan.

- Literal translation (transfer)

  Translating literally a lexical item, an idiom, a compound word or structure from L1/L3 to L2.

- Foreignising

  Using a L1/L3 word by adjusting it to L2 phonology (i.e., with a L2 pronunciation) and/or morphology.

- Code switching (language switch)

  Including L1/L3 words with L1/L3 in L2 speech; this may involve stretches of discourse ranging from single words to whole chunks and even complete turns.

b. Own-performance problem-related strategies

- Self-rephrasing

Repeating a term, but not quite as it is, but by adding something or using paraphrase.

- Self-repair

Making self-initiated corrections in one's own speech.

c. Other-performance problem-related strategies

- Other-repair

Correcting something in the interlocutor's speech

2. Interactional Strategies

a. Resource deficit-related strategies

- Appeals for help

Turning to interlocutor for assistance asking an explicit question concerning a gap in one's L2 knowledge.

b. Own-performance problem-related strategies

- Comprehension check

Asking question to check that the interlocutor can follow you.

- Own-accuracy check

Checking that what you said was correct by asking a concrete question or repeating a word with a question intonation.

c. Other-performance problem-related strategies

- Asking for repetition

Requesting repetition or when not understanding or hearing something properly

- Asking for clarification

  Requesting explanation of unfamiliar meaning structure.

- Asking for confirmation

  Requesting confirmation that one heard or understood something correctly.

- Guessing

  It is similar to a confirmation request but the letter implies a greater degree of certainty regarding the keyword, whereas guessing involves real indecision.

- Expressing non-understanding

  Expressing that one did not understand something properly either verbally or non-verbally

- Interpretive summary

  Extended paraphrase of the interlocutor's message to check that the speaker has understood correctly.

3. Indirect Strategies

a. Processing time pressure-related strategies

- Use of fillers

  Using gambits to fill pauses, to stall, and to gain time in order to keep the communication channel open and maintain discourse at times of difficulty.

- Repetitions

  Repeating a word or a string of words immediately after they was said.

b. Own-performance problem-related strategies

- Verbal strategy markers

  Using verbal marking phrases before or after a strategy to signal that the word or structure does not carry the intended meaning perfectly in the L2 code.

c. Other-performance problem-related strategies

- Feigning understanding

  Making an attempt to carry on the conversation in spite of not understanding something by pretending to understand.

Their taxonomy is considered to be a summary of all the taxonomies available in CS research, but some new strategies such as use of similar-sounding words, use of all - purpose words, mumbling, as part of their main category direct strategies are added to their taxonomy. Feigning understanding is another added strategy.