HOKUGA 北海学園学術情報リポジトリ
学校法人北海学園
北海学園大学
北海商科大学

タイトル	A Study of Communication Strategies : Comprehensibility of Japanese English
著者	KOBAYASHI, Toshihiko
引用	北海学園大学人文論集, 1: 105-130
発行日	1993-11-30

Hokkai-Gakuen Organization of Knowledge Ubiquitous through Gaining Archives.

A Study of Communication Strategies: Comprehensibility of Japanese English

Toshihiko KOBAYASHI

ABSTRACT

This study investigates the possible differences in the use of Communication Strategies (CSs) by English speakers of three different proficiency levels — intermediate, advanced, and native — in terms of the types and the frequency and their comprehensibility. The speakers narrated twenty sets of pictures, and their recorded narrations were listened to by thirty Japanese and thirty English native speakers to measure their comprehensibility. One-way chi-square was utilized to see the significant differences among the frequency of CSs used by the three speakers. A Two-Way ANOVA was used to see the significant differences among the means of comprehension tests by six equal groups. The results show that the intermediate speaker used far more CSs than the advanced speaker. No use of CSs was observed in the native speaker's data. As for comprehensibility, the higher the speaker's proficiency level was, the better his narrations were comprehended. In this paper, some pedagogical implications for the teachability of CSs are also discussed.

Keywords: *communication strategies, comprehensibility, pedagogy*

INTRODUCTION

Since one of our most important professional goals in language teaching is to help learners to acquire practical oral proficiency in their

target language, we are tempted to observe their out-of-class involvement in oral communication to assess our teaching efficiency. Engaged in oral communication, the learners very often find themselves unable to achieve their communicative goals despite the fact that they have had a great deal of communicative exercise in classrooms. What leads to such a predicament? Is it because they cannot easily utilize their oral skills learned in classrooms? Or can we explain the gap in terms of the classical dichotomy of competence vs. performance? Or is it simply because their language teacher has failed to teach them something essential for real communication?

Most of the traditional and even modern language instruction that emphasizes oral communication has focused on the form of language, i.e., the memorization of sets of phrases frequently used in certain communicative situations with dialogue exercises. It is obvious that the teacher cannot teach every possible example of communication problems, nor can he/she prepare the students for them. As language is creative, so speech is limitless. There is no describing every speech setting in all language use. In order to help the learners to cope with situations in which they cannot utilize their communicative skills, the pedagogical emphasis needs to be shifted towards teaching strategies for communication that can be resorted to for any situation or predicament that may come upon them.

When learners have difficulty in achieving their goal of communication due to gaps in their linguistic repertoire, they will take the following measures (Littlewood 1984): if a learner can predict such a problem, he/she may forestall it by avoiding communication or modifying what he/she intends to say; if the problem emerges while the learner has already participated in speaking, he/she has to find an alternative way of getting his meanings across. Either way of coping with the

situation is called "communication strategies" (hereinafter referred to as CSs).

Definitions

CSs have been defined by several researchers. Corder (1977) suggests that CSs are "systematic techniques employed by a speaker to express his meaning when faced with some difficulty". Tarone (1981) defines them as "all attempts to bridge the gap between the linguistic knowledge of the second language learner, and the linguistic knowledge of the target language interlocutor in real communication situations" (p.65). Faerch and Kasper (1983) have arrived at "potentially conscious plans set up by the learner in order to solve problems in communication". Bialystok (1983) simply puts them as "all attempts to manipulate a limited linguistic system in order to promote communication" (p.102). Poulisse and et al. (1984) explain that CSs are employed by a learner "to achieve his intended meaning on becoming aware of problems arising during the planning phase of an utterance due to his own linguistic shortcomings" (p.72). Richards and et al (1985) define CSs as ways "used to express a meaning in a second or foreign language, by a learner who has a limited command of the language" (p.48).

Taxonomies of CSs

A general framework for CSs was first proposed by Tarone (1977), which consists of three major categories — paraphrase, borrowing, and avoidance. Elaborations and refinements of his framework have been proposed by others (Blum-Kilka and Levenston 1978; Bialystok and Frohlich 1980; Corder 1983; Faerch and Kasper 1983; Bialystok 1984; Littlewood 1984; Paribakht 1985; Scholfield 1987). Different researchers use different terms for the same strategies. For example,

paraphrasing is interchangeably used with description or circumlocution; approximation with substitution or synonym. For clarity and readability, I will adopt easier terms in this study.

Some researchers attempt to categorize individual strategies into some categories depending upon their nature. Bialystok (1980) argues that CSs can be divided into two types depending upon the nature — L1 based strategies and L2-based or IL (interlanguage)-based strategies and concludes that L2-based strategies are more effective than L1-based strategies and that proficient L2 speakers tend to use the former strategies more often than the latter strategies. Haastrup and Phillipson (1983) support Bialystok's argument, adding that L1-based strategies nearly always lead to partial or non-comprehension, while L2-based strategies often lead to full comprehension.

Faerch and Kasper (1983) focus on the dichotomy that groups CSs into reduction strategies and achievement strategies. The former CSs are used by the learner who abandons, totally or partially, his/her message, while the latter CSs are used to achieve his/her communicative goals. One of the motivations for categorizing CSs seems to have come from the various research purposes empirical CSs studies hold.

Poulisse, et al. (1984) adopted both dichotomies and combined them, although they replaced L1 strategies and L2 strategies by Interlingual Strategies and Intralingual Strategies, respectively. I would like to propose another category — universal — to cover reduction strategies and some non-verbal communication. Figure 1 shows examples of CSs with some new CSs.

Interlingual achievement

Literal translation: The learner translates word for word from his/her L1. A Japanese learner may say, "I have three insect teeth" (for

Figure 1 Examples of Communication Strategies

	achievement	reduction
Interlingual	Literal translation Language switch Bilingual dictionary Translation machine SOS cards	
Intralingual	Substitution Antonym Word creation Description Spelling	
Universal	Gesture Pointing objects Picture drawing	Topic avoidance Semantic avoidance Message abandonment

decayed teeth). Studying any samples of literal translation available in interlanguage data will provide us deep insight into the linguistic and cultural traits of the L2 speaker's native language.

Language switch (code switch): The learner uses his/her L1 term without bothering to translate. This CS seems to succeed only when the interlocutor can understand the L1 of the speaker. This often happens when the students with the same L1 speak an L2 to practice conversation.

Bilingual Dictionary: The learner may consult a bilingual dictionary from his/her native language to the target language while communicating with his/her interlocutor(s). He/she may consult it to retrieve the word from his/her memory or simply to find a translation. If he/she uses a bilingual dictionary from the target language to his/her native language or a monolingual L2 dictionary to convey his/her meaning, it would be appropriate to categorize the CS into L2-based strategies.

Translation machine: Thanks to today's developments in the area

of electronics, the use of pocket translation machines is spreading, especially, among tourists. The device may replace the inconvenient bulk of the dictionary and facilitate L2 communication in the future, provided it can fulfill the user's need as functionally as the timely help of the traditional dictionary.

SOS cards: Some tourists carry hand-made cards that show various target language expressions for various situational functions with L1 translations on the back. Travelers can use the cards very conveniently to achieve their communicative goals even without speaking the target language at all. When they want to go to the bathroom, they simply show the card which says: Where is the bathroom? — Thank you.

Intralingual achievement

Substitution (or approximation, synonym, or semantic contiguity): The learner often uses a word in L2 which does not convey exactly the intended meaning but may satisfy the speaker's communicative goal. For example, the learner may say 'chair' instead of 'stool.'

Antonym: The learner may use the antonym of the word he/she wants to express with the combination of negative "not." The learner is likely to use this CS, especially, in describing the characteristics of a certain object with adjectives and adverbs. When the learner does not know or has forgotten "shallow," he/she may simply say "not deep."

Word creation (word coinage, transliteration): The learner often creates a word or phrase not available in the target language. This needs to be explicitly distinguished from *Literal translation* since both CSs similarly involve the process of creating a word or phrase. Whereas *Literal translation* is made by literally translating the elements in L1, *Word creation* refers to creating a word or phrase "out of second language material, with no apparent influence from the mother

tongue" (Littlewood 1984: 85). The ESL tourist in Hawaii might say, "Please show me how to get to the "fish zoo." (for aquarium)

Description (paraphrasing, circumlocution): The learner may "describe the characteristics or elements of the objects or action instead of using the appropriate target language item or structure" (Tarone 1983: 63). Bialystok (1983) exemplifies three types of information indicated by the CS — "general physical properties, specific features, and interactional/functional characteristics" (p.106). It should be noted, however, that this L2-based strategy frequently contains "items or expressions which reflect the use of L1" (p.106). For example, a Japanese learner may say "I want to go to a doctor who can see my insect teeth." In this example, the speaker wants to describe a dentist but the noun phrase contains the literal translation.

Spelling: When the learner has difficulty pronouncing a certain word, he/she may spell the whole word or a part of it. A Japanese learner of English is likely to say "I want a light: L-I-G-H-T, not RIGHT" to overcome the L-R distinction. This also can be used when the learner knows the spelling but not the meaning.

Universal achievement

Gesture (mime): This is a universal feature of human communication. People use gestures either consciously or unconsciously. In the framework of CS, the conscious gesture works to get the learner's meaning across. When the learner cannot come up with the English word *monkey,* he/she may mimic the face of the monkey or walk like a monkey.

Pointing to objects: This simply refers to the learner's action of pointing or taking out from drawers or somewhere the objects which he/she intends to refer to. The learner can express a certain color

which he/she cannot say in the target language by pointing out the same color somewhere around the speaker and the listener.

Picture drawing: When paper and a pen are available, the learner may draw the object which he/she cannot mimic because of its complexity. This CS may be used to facilitate other CSs. For example, the learner may draw a picture of a water melon while saying "a round, green vegetable with black lines, we eat in summer."

Appealing: The learner may ask somebody else "to supply a form of lexical item or asks if a form or item is correct" (Tarone, Cohen, and Dumas 1983: 10). The learner may ask his/her interlocutor "What do you call it in English?" If a speaker of his/her L1 is present, he/she may ask the peer in his/her native language to get the translation. In this case, it would be more appropriate to categorize this strategy as L1-based

Universal Reduction Strategies

Topic avoidance (avoiding communication): Learners may avoid certain topics when they know that they cannot talk about them in L2 or they don't want to bother to use other CSs such as description or substitution. Learners may avoid speaking about some past events because they do not know the inflection of past conjugation.

Semantic avoidance (Message adjustment): If the learner cannot come up with a certain word, he/she may say something slightly different from what he/she intended but still broadly relevant to the topic of discourse (Corder 1983: 17). He/she may say 'bird' when he/she fails to remember 'crane' in conversation.

Message abandonment: The learner may try to talk about a certain topic but give it up midway through the conversation when he/she finds it difficult to continue talking about the topic This may simply derive

from some linguistic difficulty or because he/she finds it undesirable or meaningless to continue talking about it. For instance, we often hear native and nonnative speakers, saying "...well but, forget it, OK."

Types of Research

Research interested in this area is relatively new. For instance, most of the empirical studies of CSs have been carried out in the past decade and vary greatly "in their theoretical frameworks, methods of data collection and analysis as well as in the types of learners and the language involved" (Faerch and Kasper 1983: 75). Ellis (1985) attempted to categorize these numerous approaches into four types.

1) comparing learners' performance on identical tasks in their L1 and L2 (Varadi 1973; Tarone 1977; Palmberg 1979)
2) comparing the performance of a group of native speakers with that of L2 learners on an identical task (Hamayan and Tucker 1980; Ellis 1984)
3) describing a specific item (Bialystok 1983; Dechert 1983; Paribakht 1985)
4) the analysis of interaction between native and non-native speakers, or between non-native speakers (Haastrup and Phillipson 1983; Firth 1989)

This study adopted the third elicitation method, namely, picture narration, since pictures enable speakers "to avoid any ambiguities, and to provide a uniform basis for description" (Paribakht 1985). Among those possible variables which can be investigated in this kind of research, 1) the learners' proficiency level, 2) the nature of the problem source, 3) the learner's personality, 4) the learning situation, the first variable was chosen for investigation in relation to the types of CSs, the frequency, and the comprehensibility for this study. Paribakht (1985),

while pointing out that little empirical research had been done on this issue, investigates the relationships between the learner's proficiency and their choice of CS and their frequency, concluding that speakers' use of CS and their level of target language proficiency are related.

Purposes of Study

This study is intended to investigate possible differences in the types of CSs used in picture narration among three speakers of English — an intermediate Japanese speaker of English, an advanced Japanese speaker of English, and a native speaker of English — in relation to the comprehensibility by native speakers of Japanese and English. More specifically, this study tries to examine the following research hypotheses:

H1: The types of CS used by the speakers will be characterized by their proficiency level — intermediate, advanced, and native.

H2: The frequency of CS use will vary according to their proficiency level.

H3: The comprehensibility of the speakers' narrations will vary according to their proficiency and their use of CS.

Finally, some pedagogical implications will be discussed and some possible directions for teaching CSs systematically in classroom settings will be proposed.

METHODOLOGY

Subjects

The subjects involved in this study are of two kinds, speakers and listeners, since the study is made up of two parts — the elicitation of picture narrations and the testing of their comprehensibility.

Speakers

In the first part, two Japanese speakers of English with two different English oral proficiency levels and one native American English speaker participated. They were chosen on the basis of their availability at the time of the data collection and their homogeneity in sex, age, and academic status. Table 1 shows the detailed information about the subjects in this part.

The intermediate speaker was in the New Intensive Course of English (N.I.C.E.) program at the University of Hawaii at Manoa (UHM) during the summer of 1992. He was also a student at the University of Nevada-Reno (UNR) Japan Branch in Tokyo, who was transferring to the UNR campus in the United States in September, 1992. He had received 21 hours of English instruction per week for one year in reading, listening, writing, and a special discussion class before he came to Hawaii. He had been classified as belonging to an intermediate English course for his previous English training in the URN Tokyo branch, and also he was in an intermediate level class in the N.I.C.E. program at the time of the data collection.

The advanced proficiency level student was a freshman at the University of Massachusetts and taking a UHM summer session course during the summer of 1992. He attended the American school in Tokyo, Japan, from elementary through high school. He had been

Table 1 Speakers' Data

Level	Sex	age	academic status	Major	TOEFL
Intermediate	male	19	freshman	business	435
Advanced	male	19	freshman	economics	640
native	male	18	freshman	linguistics	*

receiving his school instructions all in English throughout his life.

The native speaker was an American of mixed Chinese — European heritage who attends UHM. He was born and brought up in Maui, Hawaii and graduated from a local high school in 1991. Although not heavily, he speaks the local English dialect.

Listeners

In the testing part of comprehension, 30 Japanese students from the N.I.C.E. program, and 30 native English speaking Americans were asked to participate in this study. All the N.I.C.E. program students were taking an intermediate course, and 29 of the Americans were taking UHM summer session courses and one was an applied linguistics professor of UHM. The 60 subjects were chosen mostly on the basis of their availability and their willingness to participate in this study. Each group based on the L1 (namely, the Japanese versus the Americans) was divided into three subgroups and each subgroup listened to the respective speakers' narration. Their sex and age were not counted, but the American subjects who had had previous experience of studying Japanese or staying a long time in Japan were avoided as a control variable.

Procedures

The procedures in this research involved are made of two stages. First, utterances were elicited from the three speakers through picture narrations and recorded on tape. Then, the recorded narrations were listened to by the sixty listeners to measure their comprehensibility. There are several reasons for using the recorded tape to test the comprehension of the narrations. First, the author wanted to make

the test objective under the same conditions. Second, the author wanted to involve more listeners to measure the comprehensibility at one time. Third, the recorded narration can be tested repeatedly, and thus it allows later replication.

Instrument

The instrument used for the elicitation was the Michigan Test of Aural Comprehension (Lado 1957), which consists of three versions — Form A, B, and C with approximately equal difficulty. The test was originally designed to measure comprehension of spoken English by non-native speakers of English with pictures and phrases in the test booklet. The test is composed of two parts with 60 items — 20 in the first part (pictures), and 40 in the second part (phrases). For this study, twenty picture items containing motions and vocabulary in any of the three forms, which the author of this paper judged to be adequate in terms of their difficulty, were selected. For each picture item, the listener must normally choose from among three pictures the one which best corresponds to what the speaker had read aloud on his/her own.

Narration and Recording

The speakers sat before a microphone and recorded their narrations into a tape recorder. The recordings of their descriptions were carefully made. Firstly, in order to standardize the conditions of recording, the speakers were given only short instructions for their narrations. The pictures had not been shown to them before the data collection. They were expected to speak spontaneously. They were instructed to look carefully at one picture (previously marked) among three pictures in each item, then to describe it in detail, while bearing

in mind the differences in the other two pictures.

Secondly, they were told to finish their description in twenty seconds for each item. They were encouraged to spend the full time and to go on adding description until time was up. It was observed that the two Japanese speakers used up the twenty seconds on almost all the items, while the native English speaker often finished his descriptions midway through the given time.

Thirdly, the speakers were not rushed for their narration. Between items were they given as much time as they needed before they started describing each of the pictures. While the advanced speaker and the native speaker started their descriptions almost as soon as they saw the pictures, the intermediate speaker sometimes took more than three minutes.

Retrospective Interview

There was great difficulty identifying CSs, as is often the case with any CSs studies. Faerch and Kasper (1983) argue the CSs are potentially conscious plans. In other words, the learner must be aware of the communicative problem he/she is facing in order to operate CSs. If he/she fails to notice that his/her word or phrase is approximate due to his/her false previous instructions or input, or simply because of inattention, the use of the word or the phrase is an example of "interlanguage use" but not of a CS. To identify valid CSs, it is customary for researchers to hold retrospective interviews after the utterances are elicited from the speakers.

Soon after the recording session, each of the three speakers was interviewed by the researcher to inquire about each of the twenty items and to find out what they really intended to say whenever they were stuck or failed in describing. The intermediate and the advanced

proficiency level speakers were asked in Japanese for the sake of accuarate recollection; naturally the native speaker was asked in English.

Comprehension Testing

The tape and a cassette player were taken to several places — the hotel where N.I.C.E. students were staying, a dormitory lounge, a dormitory room, a N.I.C.E. program classroom, and a summer session classroom of ESL 670 at UHM. The subjects listened to the tape, which played without interruption, and identified the picture that the speaker was describing.

Analyses

Identifying Variables

In this study, the types of CSs, their frequency, and comprehensibility by native speakers of Japanese and English were identified as the dependent variables. The speakers' three levels of English proficiency — intermediate, advanced, and native — affected them as the independent variables. The Americans who had previous experience of learning Japanese and of living in Japan were excluded from the group of native speaking listeners.

Transcription

All speech samples were transcribed by the researcher, and then one native speaker of English checked the transcription. As my research interest focused on syntactic and pragmatic features of discourse, there were no phonetic or phonological aspects documented in the transcription. Also, since there was physical and visual separation

between the speakers and the listeners, the transcription did not describe any extralinguistic phenomena such as gestures or posture. However, anything audible that might show the speakers' state of mind, such as laughing, was contained.

Hypotheses Testing

H1: The types of CSs used by the speakers will be characterized by their proficiency level — intermediate, advanced, and native.

This hypothesis was qualitatively investigated. The first independent variables — types of CS used — were identified item by item and coded by the taxonomy of CS mentioned earlier. Some other characteristics — discourse organization, and grammaticality — found in their descriptions were also discussed

H2: The frequency of using CSs will vary according to their proficiency level.

To test this hypothesis, the second independent variable — the frequency of CS types used — was quantitatively analyzed. To see whether there were significant differences between the frequencies among the three speakers, a one-way chi-square analysis was applied with the alpha level set at. 01. Since researchers agree that CSs are manipulated in order to compensate for the learner's "limited" linguistic systems, it is sound to assume that the proficient speaker uses CSs more frequently. Thus, the hypothesis was set directional.

H3: The comprehensibility of speakers' narrations will vary according to their proficiency level.

This hypothesis was also quantitatively examined. In comprehension testing, each correct answer was given one point with the total possible 20. All the individual scores were added up to calculate group means. A two-way ANOVA (analysis of variance) was utilized to

judge whether the group means were significantly different with the alpha level set at. 01. Since it is reasonable to expect that the proficient speakers would be better understood, the hypothesis was set directional.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The types of CSs identified

Figure 1 presents CS identified in the data of the three speakers' narrations. No examples of CS were found in the native speech. The native speaker described each picture in great detail and did not fail to describe any single item in each picture. Because of the inevitable spatiotemporal separation between the speakers and the listeners, some CSs were excluded from the beginning — *Bilingual dictionary*, *Translation Machines*, and *SOS cards*, *Gesture*, *Pointing to objects*, *Picture drawing,* and *Appealing*.

Intermediate

The intermediate speaker used CSs much more frequently than the other two speakers. Of twelve CSs, ten were Substitution strategies. He called arms and legs hand and foot, respectively. He not only approximated the two words but also failed to pluralize them. The two examples could also be labelled literal translation since Japanese *te* (hand) and *ashi* (foot) are very often used as cover terms meaning both a hand and an arm, and a foot and a leg, respectively.

There are four substitution strategies that are related to the collocation of verb and object. ESL learners in general are likely to use basic verbs, which have broad meanings and go together with many objects. Make is a good example here. While these approximation

strategies are all concerned with lexicon, there are two examples that might be concerned with grammatical knowledge. One is "Pick up a paper," which expresses an action. He needed to express the state of the picture using a static verb, hold or have. The other is across for cross. This may be due to the phonological similarity of the terms.

Advanced

Two types of CSs were identified in his speech — Substitution and Semantic avoidance. The first example, chair for stool, was rather obvious, whereas the second and the third need careful analysis. Taking the example of the second, I judge that the learner avoided using the adjective bent. One may assume that he used the phrase: *The guy isn't successful... hammering nails* in order to give a general description of the picture at the beginning and go to the details later. One may also assume that he found it unnecessary to use the term *bent* because the term *successful* is enough to distinguish the marked picture from the other pictures. Likewise, in the third example, the learner may have refused to use any terms referring to the object on which a man was lying. On one hand, labelling an example of CSs entails the premise that the learner did not know or could not come up with the vocabulary that was not used in his/her speech — the awareness of problems. On the other hand, if he knew the term but did not use it, this is merely a matter of personal preference or style of description.

Discourse organization

There is a distinct difference of discourse organization among the three speakers. The intermediate speaker began with there is/are in nineteen items out of twenty. He first described every single object seen in each picture, and then referred to each object — bottom-up

Figure 1 Types of CS used

Speaker	CSs	Examples	Item No.
Intermediate	Substitution	*hand* for arms	9
		foot for legs	9
		make a house for build a house	10
		across for cross	11
		move water for pour water	14
		board for air mattress	15
		pick up a paper for hold a paper	17
		paper is broken for paper is torn	17
		sucking a mouse for have a mouse	18
	Loan word	*classic car* for classic	20
		wear casual style for wear casual cloths	1
		looks like a sadness for looks sad	3
	Description	*he doesn't hit the nail very well*	13
	Abandonment	*iiya* (That's enough.)	19
Advanced	Substitution	*chair* for stool	19
	Avoidance	The guy isn't successful.	13
		The man is on the float.	15
		(did not refer to the mattress)	

approach. The advanced learner, on the other hand, used the pattern only once. He preferred describing each single item — top-down approach. The native speaker used the top-down pattern in fourteen items. It may be generalized from the results that the non-native speakers use the single approach while the native speaker uses different approaches according to the nature of the picture.

Grammaticality

The intermediate speaker made a lot of grammatical mistakes. His major areas of errors are article, tense, third person singular, and plural. The advanced and the native speakers made almost no grammatical mistakes.

Frequency of CS

The three observed frequencies in Table 3 were significant at .01. Therefore, the hypothesis that the frequency of using CS will vary according to their proficiency is accepted.

Comprehensibility

Table 4 below shows the results of individual scores and IFs (item facilities) for each item. There seem to be no differences in IF between the items in which a CS was used and those in which a CS was not used. The results suggest that there may be other factors than the use of CS that affected comprehensibility of their narrations such as the complexity of pictures

Table 5 and 6 show that the differences among means both for L1 and proficiency were significant at.01. This shows that the more proficient the learner is, the better comprehension they receive. Therefore, the hypothesis that the comprehensibility of the speaker's narrations will vary according to their proficiency and their use of CS is partially accepted.

CONCLUSION

The hypothesis testing showed that there are significant differences among means of the number of CSs used by the three speakers who had different English proficiencies There was also found a

Table 3 One-way chi-square

Level	Intermediate	Advanced	Native
Frequency	14	3	0

Table 4 Item facilities

Speaker Listener Item	Intermediate Japanese	 American	Advanced Japanese	 American	Native Japanese	 American
# 1	.6	1	.9	1	6	1
# 2	.9	1	.1	1	1	1
# 3	.5*	.3*	.4	1	.9	1
# 4	.9	.1	.3	1	.8	1
# 5	.6	.9	.5	1	.9	1
# 6	.2	.7	.6	.9	.8	1
# 7	.3	.9	.7	.9	1	1
# 8	.8	.8	.5	1	.8	1
# 9	.8*	1*	.9	1	.8	1
# 10	.8*	.9*	.8	1	.9	1
# 11	1*	1*	1	1	.9	1
# 12	.8	.9	.7	1	.8	1
# 13	.7*	1*	.6*	1*	1	1
# 14	.9*	1*	1	1	.9	1
# 15	.1*	1*	.9*	1*	.9	1
# 16	.1	1	1	1	1	1
# 17	.4*	1*	1	1	1	1
# 18	1*	1*	1	1	.9	1
# 19	.6*	.4*	1*	1*	.5	1
# 20	.3	.2	1	1	.4	1

* CS were used in these items.

Table 5 Group Means

Listeners	Speakers' English Proficiency. intermed.	advanced	native	
Japanese	X = 13.9 n = 10 S = 3.84	X = 14.2 n = 10 S = 3.15	X = 16.9 n = 10 S = 2.21	X = 15.5 n = 30 S = 3.2
Americans	X = 17.5 n = 10 S = 1.69	X = 19.8 n = 10 S = .6	X = 20.0 n = 10 S = 0	X = 19.1 n = 30 S = 3.5
	X = 15.7 n = 20 S = 2.3	X = 17.8 n = 20 S = 2.6	X = 18.45 n = 20 S = 3.47	Grand mean = 17.31 N = 60 S = 3.3

Table 6 Two-way ANOVA

	Source	SS	df	MS	F
L1	190.82	1	190.82	39.10*	
Proficiency	82.63	2	41.32	8.47*	
L1 × Proficiency	2.03	2	1.02	0.21	
Residual (error)	263.50	54	4.88		
Total	538 99	59	238.03		

* P<.01

significance among the comprehension scores by two different groups of L1 listeners.

It should be noted that although the results showed that the less proficient in the target language the subject is, the more CSs he/she would use, there should be no easy jumping to the conclusion that using CSs implies a negative connotation. In other words, using CSs is nothing of which to be shamed. On the contrary, CSs could be potential tools for interlanguage communication. If the intermediate Japanese speaker had not used any CSs, the subjects would never have understood him. We should know that the moment the ESL learners open their mouth, they use CSs anyway, denotative or connotative.

The results of this research suggest that the pedagogical emphasis should be shifted from the teacher-centered model versus imitation, or from overly conscious simulation or situational role plays, to more learner-centered independent skill acquisition, with which the ESL learner can survive in real international communication without any help from his previous day's classroom knowledge. Faerch and Kasper (1983) argue that "by learning how to use communicative strategies appropriately, learners will be more able to bridge the gap between formal and informal learning situations, between pedagogic and non-

pedagogic communicative situations" (p.56). In other words, CSs are universally usable and helpful tools to facilitate our intercultural communication. Therefore, CSs should be more conspicuously taught in ESL or EFL classroom settings.

Pedagogical implications

As a specific proposal, I would suggest that picture narrating could be utilized to elicit utterances from students in classrooms. The teacher should keep in mind that the students should be encouraged to manipulate any knowledge they have learned so far and should not be inhibited or interrupted by the teacher while they are narrating. The teacher's feedback on their speech should be delayed, but there should still be feedback. The teacher may need to encourage the students to keep on talking even if there is a deadlock. The method which may be useful is what I would call "introspective feedback method," in which the students recall their speech just after they finish narrating. For this purpose, their speech should be tape-recorded and played back later; then the teacher should give feedback to them while stopping the tape wherever necessary. If the teacher can speak the students' first language, he/she should ask them what meanings they wanted to express at a certain place. Then the teacher should give adequate target-like translation. However, we should keep in mind that mere provision of translation or model forms does not differ from the ordinary conversation class. The teacher should incorporate the demonstration of CSs in feedback. In other words, the correct form and compensatory means should be presented.

Because the purpose of communication is to get our message across in the target language, the focus of teaching CS should be placed on the achievement strategies. Among them, description (or para-

phrase) and substitution are most likely to be used.

In teaching strategies for description, certain grammatical patterns or expressions may be taught as prefabricated forms. For example, my previous study (1989) indicates that there is a very frequent form that speakers used native or non-native alike, irrespective of their nationality. The study investigated how people would achieve their goal of communication — asking a policeman how to get to Honolulu Aquarium. The subjects were asked to pretend not to know the word aquarium. The most commonly used phrase was a *place where we can see.* This frequency suggests that relative pronoun clauses or relative adverbial clauses are considerably important expressions. If research is conducted in this direction and more common phrases or expressions are identified, we should incorporate them into our teaching materials or exercises in class. The same is true of substitution strategies. We would notice basic verbs, such as have or get, can be substituted for possess, hold, receive, or be offered... Word coinage or direct translation should be used more positively in an attempt to convey meanings in real communicative settings.

If students are always strictly instructed to say only grammatically correct or semantically accurate forms as required in writing, they will rarely participate in conversation. They will drop out of conversation if they too often fall into silence or wait until the exact word comes to mind. They should be instructed how to keep themselves in communication by expressing or responding to others. Unlike the written channel, in oral communication, speakers are allowed to compensate for their speech by adding new words and retrieving some words. The students should recognize that their utterances are not the end product, but can be transformed and improved by positively using communication strategies.

References

Bialystok, E. & Frönhlich, M. (1980). Oral communication strategies for lexical difficulties. Interlanguage Studies Bulletin, 5, 3-30.

Bialystok, Ellen. (1983). Some factors in the selection and implementation of communication strategies. In Faerch and Kasper (Eds.) Strategies in Interlanguage Communication. 100-139 London: Longman.

Bialystok, Ellen. (1984). Strategies in interlanguage learning and performance. In Alan Davies, Clive Criper & A. P. R. Howatt (Eds.), Interlanguage. Edinburgh: University Press.

Corder, S. Pit. (1983). Strategies of Communication. In Faerch and Kasper (Eds.), Strategies in Interlanguage Communication. London: Longman. 15-19

Dechert, Hans W. (1983). How a story is done in a second language. In Faerch and Kasper (Eds.) Strategies in Interlanguage Communication. London: Longman. 175-180

Ellis, Rod. (1985). Understanding Second Language Acquisition. Oxford University Press.

Faerch, Clause and Gabriele Kasper. (1983). Plans and strategies in foreign language communication. In Faerch and Kasper (Eds.), Strategies in Interlanguage Communication. London: Longman.

Faerch, Claus. (1984). Strategies in production and reception, some empirical evidence. In Davies, Criper & Howatt (Eds.), Interlanguage. Edinburgh: University Press.

Haastrup, Kirsten, and Robert Phillipson. (1983). Achievement strategies in learner/native speaker interaction. In Faerch and Kasper (Eds.) Strategies in Interlanguage Communication. 140-58. London: Longman.

Kobayashi, Toshihiko. (1989). A study of Interlocution Strategy by Americans, Japanese, and Chinese speakers of English. Unpublished paper. The University of Hawaii at Manoa.

Littlewood, William. (1984). Foreign and Second Language Learning: Language acquisition research and its implications for the classroom. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Palmberg, R. (1979). Investigating communication strategies. In R. Palmberg (Ed.), Perception and Production of English: Papers on Interlanguage, AFTIL, vol.6.

Poulisse, Nanda, Theo Bongaerts & Eric Kellerman (1984) On the use of compensatory strategies in second language performance Interlanguage Studies Bulletin Utrecht 8: 1.

Scholfield, Phil. (1987). Communication Strategies — the researcher outmanoeuvred? Applied Linguistics. 8, 219-232.

Tarone, Elaine. (1977). Conscious communication strategies in interlanguage: a process report. In Brown, H. Douglas, Yorio, Carlos A. and Crymes, Ruth (Eds.) On TESOL '77: Teaching and Learning ESL. 194-203. Washington D.C.: TESOL.

Tarone, Elaine. (1983). Some thoughts on the notion of 'communication strategy'. In Faerch and Kasper (Eds.) Strategies in Interlanguage Communication. 61-74 London: Longman.

Tarone, E, A. D. Cohen and G. Dumas. (1983). A closer look at some interlanguage terminology: a framework for communication strategies. In Faerch and Kasper (Eds.), Strategies in Interlanguage Communication. 4-14.

Richards, Jack, John Platt, and Weber Heidi. (1985). Longman Dictionary of Applied Linguistics. London: Longman.