

The Use of Communication Strategies in International Business Settings¹⁾

Miyang Cha
(Namseoul University)

Cha, Miyang. (2007). The use of communication strategies in international business settings. *Modern English Education*, 8(2), 19-39.

The present study attempts to explore communication strategies used by Koreans in international business settings to cope with difficulties in their oral communication in English. It also intends to provide a proper perspective on Koreans' use of English in the multinational workplace. Fifteen Koreans posted at the overseas branch offices of three Korean corporations in Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia, were involved in this study. For data collection, three types of instruments were used: questionnaire, tape-recording and interview. The spoken discourse of six business meetings held in English among Koreans and multinationals was tape-recorded and transcribed for a conversational analysis. The results of the study showed that the participants perceived a good command of English to be crucial for their work and tended to make up for their lack of English proficiency by using a wide range of strategies in order to accomplish their communicative intents. To have the job done, communication breakdowns were by all means avoided as far as possible. The findings of this study yielded some pedagogical implications for English teaching in Korea.

Keywords: [communication strategies/international business/oral communication/의사소통 전략/국제 비즈니스/구어의사소통]

1. Introduction

With the advent of the globalization era, international business has led to

¹⁾ 이 논문은 2006학년도 남서울대학교 학술연구비 지원에 의하여 연구되었음.

multilateral relations, opening many markets around the world. With an ever-increasing role in world markets, English is strengthening its position as the world's prominent linking language (Crystal, 1997) and as a global language in international business communication. English speakers of varying competency have the potential to directly communicate with and relay messages to native or nonnative English speakers in international business contexts (Du-Babcock, 2006).

In order to function effectively in international business settings, Koreans are undoubtedly required to possess English language competences of the kind which will enable them to enter the formalized discourse of business profession, which involves them in regular and important interactions with a multilingual, multicultural workforce. However, it is an arduous job to acquire such English communicative competences in Korea where English is learned within limited and artificially modified EFL settings. It is thus not surprising that most Koreans in the international business environment would face difficulties communicating in English because of their language barrier. Nevertheless, they are seen to be successful and have managed to thrive in business throughout the world using their limited English.

The purpose of this study is to investigate communication strategies used by some Koreans in international business settings to function efficiently at work. It also aims to provide a proper perspective on the nature of Koreans' use of English in the multinational workplace.

As English teaching in Korea has shifted to place emphasis on attaining communicative competence, more attention has to be paid on the practical application of English knowledge. While some attempts have been made to identify specific strategies for successful communication in second language learning (Bialystok, 1990; Dornyei & Scott, 1997; Lafford, 2004), research on foreign language communication strategies (Faerch & Kasper, 1980) is still in its infancy. Moreover, the investigation of communication strategies among Koreans is unprecedented not only in international business contexts but in any kind of international settings. It is thus hoped that this study of the use of communication strategies of Koreans in the international workplace would yield a better understanding of the communication problems, and provide English

teachers and practitioners with some useful pedagogic insights into the preparation of English programs for more practical applications.

This study explores the following research questions:

- 1) What are the participants' perceptions of their English language abilities required at work?
- 2) What problems or difficulties in English communication do Koreans encounter while working at the international business workplace?
- 3) What strategies do Koreans use to cope with problems in their international business communication?
- 4) Does the overseas work experience correlate to the use of communication strategies?

2. Literature Review

2.1 Definitions of Communication Strategies

The study of the strategies used by L2 learners to convey meaning in the face of communication breakdown started to gain its importance in the early 1970s. The term *communication strategy* (CS) within an L2 context was coined by Selinker (1972) in his account of the process responsible for interlanguage. Studies (Bialystock 1990; Faerch & Kasper 1983; Tarone 1977) have shown that L2 learners rely on, select, and avoid the target language by means of strategies that help them carry out and succeed in communication. Early definitions of CSs referred to learners' abilities to communicate their ideas in an L2 when faced with a communication gap caused by the learners' inability to understand their interlocutors or to express their ideas in the L2 (Lafford, 2004). By the early 1980s, CSs had been regarded as devices that can help L2 learners overcome linguistic inadequacies in communicative exchanges (Corder, 1983), and this view of CSs as problem-solving procedures (Sharwood Smith, 1979) had been prevailing in the research.

Tarone (1980) introduced an interactional perspective in which CSs are seen

as tools used in a joint negotiation of meaning where both interlocutors are attempting to agree as to a communicative goal. This perspective includes those strategies that are used to correct forms as well as those used to clarify the meaning of both learner's and interlocutor's speech. Bialystock (1990) characterizes CSs as (i) effective as they are related to solutions in specific ways, and they are productive in solving the problem for reasons which theorists can articulate; (ii) systematic as learners do not create or stumble upon the best strategy for solving a problem but uncover the strategy from their knowledge of the problem and employ it systematically; and (iii) finite as a limited number of strategies can be identified. Dornyei & Scott (1997) view a CS as a conscious technique used to achieve a communicative goal. They believe that individuals using CSs are aware of the communication problem and intentionally use CSs to negotiate meaning and arrive at a mutual understanding with their interlocutors. They provided a classification system of CSs incorporating notions of learner-orientedness with interactional perspectives: (i) resource deficits-communication breakdown caused by speakers' lack of knowledge; (ii) own performance problems- realizing that what the speaker has said is incorrect; and (iii) other performance problems- perceived as problematic because of lack of understanding.

2.2 Different Perspectives on Communication Strategies

2.2.1 The Interactional Perspective

Sociolinguists regard communication as a social interactive activity. As Corder (1983) puts it, our knowledge of a language determines not only the way a communicative exchange develops, but also our current assessment of the interlocutor's linguistic competence and his knowledge of the topic of the discourse. Tarone (1980) introduced an interactional perspective in which CSs are seen as mutual attempts of both interlocutors to solve L2 communication problems, emphasizing social aspects of communication. When faced with communication breakdown, both interlocutors try to devise a CS to overcome their lack of shared meanings. In this perspective, CSs are regarded as tools used to bridge the gap between the linguistic knowledge of the L2 speaker and

the linguistic knowledge of the interlocutor in real communication situations. This perspective allowed Tarone to include as CSs those strategies that were used to clarify the meaning of both learner's and interlocutor's speech. Tarone (1980) provides a classification of CSs: paraphrase, borrowing and avoidance. Paraphrase consists of subsets of approximation, word coinage and circumlocution. Borrowing involves four strategies: Literal translation, language switch, appeal for assistance and mime. Avoidance includes topic avoidance and message abandonment.

2.2.2 The Psycholinguistic Perspective

Unlike the sociolinguistic perspective, the psycholinguists deal with CSs as psychological processes. Faerch and Kaspers (1983) concentrate on the individual's response to interaction difficulties more than on the involvement of different people in communication exchanges. This suggests that the learner may try to solve his communicative problem by appealing for assistance from his interlocutor, but this is not a necessary condition. The learner may also decide to find a solution himself, without the cooperative assistance of the interlocutor. Faerch and Kasper (1983) focus on the psychological dimension of what is in the L2 speaker's mind. L2 speakers want to express something through the target language but encounter a problem. To get round this psychological difficulty, they resort to CSs. Faerch and Kasper incorporate the notions of problem-orientedness and consciousness in this perspective. However, they have difficulty in deciding empirically whether a strategy is conscious or not. So they discuss CSs in psycho-linguistic terms as the mental phenomena which underlie actual language behavior. In this context, CSs are viewed as potentially conscious plans to solve what an individual presents as a problem in reaching a particular communicative goal. Faerch and Kasper (1983) divide CSs into two main groups: avoidance strategies and achievement strategies. The former consists of topic avoidance, message abandonment and semantic avoidance, while the latter category can be subdivided into compensatory strategies and retrieval strategies.

In sum, according to the interactional approach, CSs are cooperative as the speaker and the interlocutor are aware of there being a communication problem

which they then attempt to solve on a cooperative basis. This implies that both the problem and its solution must somehow surface in the performance. In the psycholinguistic perspective, the focus is on the speaker or the problems the speaker experiences in speech reception and in the planning and execution of speech production. Consequently, the strategy employed by the speaker may be cooperative such as appealing for assistance from his interlocutor or the speaker may try to overcome the difficulty by himself without the cooperative assistance of the interlocutor.

2.3 Empirical Research on Communication Strategies

Tarone (1977) compared speakers' performance on story-telling tasks in their L1 and L2. Her study revealed that the proficiency level of the speaker influenced his choice of strategy; students in low levels preferred avoidance to achievement strategies. Similarly, some studies (Ellis 1984; Hamayan & Tucker 1980) made a comparison of the performance of L1 speakers with that of L2 speakers on an identical task. Ellis (1983) noticed that the speaker who opted for avoidance strategies in the earlier stages, increasingly turned to achievement strategies as he progressed. His later study (1984) showed that ESL children relied more on avoidance strategies while native English children more on paraphrase strategies. In a similar line, Haastrup & Phillipson (1983) analyzed the video-taped conversation between L1 and L2 speakers. Bialystock (1983) made a different approach focusing on the use of specific lexical items in a picture story reconstruction task. The results of his study showed that advanced speakers used more L2-based strategies and fewer L1-based strategies than less advanced speakers. L2-based strategies are referred to those related to target language rules or knowledge such as approximation, circumlocution, etc., whereas L1-based strategies are related to mother tongue such as language transfer, code switching, etc. Besides, some studies on the use of CSs have shown that there is a relationship between the frequency of CS use and the proficiency level. As a learner's proficiency level increases, the use of CSs decreases (LaBarca & Khanji, 1986; Poulisse & Schils, 1989). In addition, more advanced speakers make greater use of L2-based CSs than L1-based ones (Bialystock, 1983;

Liskin-Gasparro, 1996).

3. Method

3.1 Participants

The participants in this study were fifteen Koreans posted to the overseas branch offices of the three Korean companies in Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia. The participants were all males ranging 36–45 in their age. They all possessed the undergraduate degrees in different majors. None of them had ever studied abroad, and they had received the similar English education in Korea despite the diverse age range. Although their English proficiency levels varied, they had some interactive skills for business related communication in English. Their work experience also varied and their overseas work experience ranged from four to eight years. In the three overseas offices at the time of research in January, 2005 were more than 30 multinationals consisting of Malaysians, Indians and Chinese. The positions of the participants included general managers, mid-level regional managers, and low-level management positions.

3.2 Instruments

For data collection, three types of instruments were used: a questionnaire, a tape-recording and interviews. A questionnaire that consisted of 23 questions was prepared in English and distributed to the participants to seek their background information and communicative needs related to English use in the workplace (see Appendix).

Six meetings held in English among Koreans and multinationals during the business hours were tape-recorded in different places and at different times. Out of fifteen participants, six (two from each company) were involved in the tape-recording:

- 1) A's discussion with a partner for about 30 minutes

- 2) B's talking to his secretary for about 15 minutes
- 3) C's conversation with a buyer for 30 minutes
- 4) D's discussion at a meeting for 20 minutes
- 5) E's interview with an applicant for 10 minutes
- 6) F's discussion at a 30 minute daily meeting

The recorded conversations were impromptu from an on-the-spot probe without any prearranged design or control. The recorded six meetings were then transcribed, and the spoken discourse was analyzed to identify CSs used by the participants to cope with difficulties in English oral communication. The total recorded time reached approximately 135 minutes, and 352 utterances were produced in total. Then, interviews were conducted to aid the interpretation of the results, and gain in-depth information about their perceptions, attitudes, influence of English skills in business communication, and so forth. The interviews were done in Korean following the participants' request.

4. Results

The spoken data was analyzed to identify the types and sources of CSs based on Dornyei & Scott's (1997) classification system. In analyzing the data, no attempt was made to break up the utterances into segments such as clauses or phrases. It was because a larger context such as a whole utterance or a single turn would yield more informative results than individual clause and phrase.

4.1 L2-based Resource Deficit Strategies

4.1.1 Word Coinage

Word coinage is interpreted as creating a made-up word or phrase which does not exist in L2 to cover up for the desired concept. The participants created non-existing English words based on a supposed rule. An example from the corpus is shown below:

B: Is Mr. Jerry meetable this afternoon four o'clock? [Is Mr. Jerry available at four o'clock this afternoon?]

4.1.2 Approximation

The participants often used a common word or a similar lexical item that shares semantic features.

C: It happened the badness on the way the uh, production regarding 30 meter. [There were production defects at 30 meters.]

4.1.3 Circumlocution

Circumlocution occurs when the speaker describes or exemplifies the target object or action. Although the utterances are decoded in various ways to achieve his intent, his ideas are clearly conveyed to the interlocutor. Circumlocution appeared as one of the most commonly used strategies by the participants in this study.

A: The cost will be shared same same amount to both side. [The cost will be shared equally.]

4.1.4 Simplification

The speaker simplifies the sentence by eliminating certain elements that do not interfere with the transmission of the meaning. The participants tended to express the meaning with minimal vocabulary in order to facilitate speech. This is of the second most frequently used strategy.

E: I see.. if confirm, when can join? [I see. If it is confirmed when can you join the company?]

4.1.5 Omission

Omission is defined as leaving a gap in the middle of an utterance when the speaker does not know a word.

D: Without, the so, kind of corporate guarantee, the person in charge, he cannot *so uh uh*. So we need to get it. [The person in charge cannot *approve* without some kind of corporate guarantee.]

4.1.6 Restructuring

Restructuring is viewed as abandoning the execution of a verbal plan because of language difficulties, leaving the utterance unfinished, and communicating message with an alternative plan. The speaker restructured his utterance due to lexical or syntactic deficiencies.

C: So actually, the last three years, the stainless steel, the, uh, all together was not so good, *My personal uh, is the, uh...* I think why we cannot get good result... [For the last three years, our record in the stainless steel business was not satisfactory. My personal opinion for this result is..]

4.1.7 Similar-Sounding Words

The participants sometimes used a lexical item whose form or sound are similar to the target word.

D: If the customer bend, some problem, who take *possibility?* [If the customer runs into problems with the coil bending, who will take *responsibility?*]

4.1.8 Derivationally-Related Words

Some participants created a wrong word which is derivationally related to the target word in form or meaning.

A: But *conclusionally*, I think that the we cannot trail order because of this kind of problem. [*In conclusion*, I think that the trail order will be difficult because of these problems.]

4.1.9 All-Purpose Words

This category represents using meaningless lexical items because of

vocabulary deficits.

E: Do you have your own car or something like that? [Do you have your own transport?]

4.1.10 Message Abandonment

Message abandonment includes cases where the speaker leaves a message unfinished due to language difficulties. Switching to another topic abruptly, or a long silence indicates inability or unwillingness to proceed.

B: I mean the abnormal case, ah the, something special case, and something happening that kind of one, better discuss to Mr. Lee first before ah, ah... the, uh... Say yes something to customer. [For special cases, it is better to discuss it with Mr. Lee before confirming with the customer.]

It is noteworthy that message abandonment is marked by a lot of hesitation, and immediately after the abandonment, other strategies are used to convey the message. In the above example, the speaker abandoned the message in the mid-utterance because of the difficulties in getting the word 'confirming' and adopted circumlocution, 'say yes something to customer'.

4.2 L1-based Resource Deficit Strategies

4.2.1 Literal Translation

(1) Lexical Translation

Literal translation is to literally translate a lexical item, an idiom, a compound word or structure from L1 to L2. The participants tended to think and formulate notions in Korean first when they had difficulties expressing themselves in English, and then tried to come up with literal equivalents in English.

C: It's up to Petronas's mind and the own thinking. ("maeum gwa saengak")
[It's up to Petronas discretion.]

(2) Syntactic Translation

Syntactic translation occurs at the sentence level mainly due to the different word order in English and Korean. This is the most frequently used strategy in this study.

F: *I think 5 customer no problem we can handle.* ("Nae saengake daseot gogaekun munje eopsi darulsu ida.") [I think we can handle up to 5 customers easily.]

4.2.2 Code Switching

Code switching is identified as the use of Malaysian words in L2 utterances. Code switching took place only at the lexical level.

D: I will confirm this minimum quantity head office *satu lagi* time. [I will confirm this minimum quantity with the head office *one more* time.]

4.2.3 Foreignizing

This category involves using L1-related words by adjusting to L2 vocabulary.

C: Call me office, OK, house, OK, *handphone*, also OK. [You can contact me by calling at my office, my house or on the *mobile phone*.]

4.3 Interactional Strategies

4.3.1 Appeal for Assistance

The speaker tries to elicit help from the interlocutor by expressing lack of a needed L2 item in order to solve a linguistic problem.

B: So our steel division will prepare some format the legal department, preparing some format, which one is the most uh, uh, *what is it?*

Interlocutor: *Suitable?*

B: *Yes, most suitable* for us.

4.3.2 Comprehension Check

The speaker asks questions to check whether the interlocutor understands what he has said.

B: And then we have to the make many photos and then we cut, cut, cut, and make one big photo. *Understand OK?* [I suggest you take many photos so that we can cut and paste them into one big photograph.]

Interlocutor: Yes, I understand.

4.3.3 Own-Accuracy Check

This strategy represents the case where the speaker shows the indication of some degree of uncertainty expressed with words or just with question intonation to check whether a self-produced form is correct.

A: So they are worried about the, uh.. ah, *the scale? Is it right?*

Interlocutor: You mean the range?

A: Right, the range.

4.3.4 Response Confirmation

The speaker confirms what the interlocutor has said or suggested.

E: You need the health certificate for the, uh. animal, if animal has any, the ah, sickness or something like that, something like..

Interlocutor: Is it the veterinary health certificate?

E: Ah, yes, yes. Veterinary.

4.3.5 Asking for Confirmation

The speaker requests the interlocutor to confirm or clarify what has been said.

Interlocutor: So how firm is this 300 metric ton?

C: What do you mean how firm 250 something?

Interlocutor: That means..uh.. which has to be the minimum condition for

them to mill index.

4.4 Own Performance Problem Strategies

4.4.1 Retrieval

Retrieval represents that the speaker says a series of incomplete or wrong lexical items or structures before reaching the appropriate ones.

A: There is the many price-up in the raw tangible, uh, price increase.
[There is the price increase in raw material.]

4.4.2 Self-Rephrasing

Self-rephrasing shows that the speaker himself rephrases a term or a word already uttered by adding something or using paraphrase.

B: Your check is how reliable, if it is reliable or not, actually, can we believe it or not? [Please check to see if they are reliable.]

5. Findings

Most data-gathering instruments have revealed that English is crucial for the participants to communicate with multinationals in the international business context. All of the participants have pointed out that English is a decisive factor in their work because of the nature of the business. Among the four skills of the language, they considered the oral fluency most important for international business communication as well as for their positions since their job entailed frequent contacts with customers, and engagement in meetings, telephone conversations, presentations, instructions, negotiation, and explanation.

Most of the participants viewed themselves as poor speakers with average abilities in listening and writing skills, while rating themselves as good readers of English. Often encountering many problems and difficulties in expressing

themselves in English, they lack confidence in speaking and feel the need for a good command of English. They believed that their job efficiency could be greatly facilitated when the oral medium of communication would not be a hindrance.

Taking into account the impromptu characteristics of business dealings in which spontaneous responses are expected, the participants face great difficulties and are left with little choice but to resort to CSs. Having difficulty finding appropriate words or phrases in English, the participants employed a wide range of CSs with little difference in their frequency. In this study a total of 20 CS types with 133 occurrences were identified. The participants employed more L2-based resource deficit strategies (55.7%) than other types of CSs as illustrated in Table 1. While literal translation (27.1%) and simplification strategies (23.3%) were of the two highest frequency in use, the rest of the CSs were used quite infrequently as shown in Table 2.

Table 1
Communication Strategy Types

Communication Strategies	Total	%
Number of CS Types used	20	-
Number of Occurrences	133	-
L2-based Resource Deficit	74	55.7
L1-based Resource Deficit	41	30.8
Interactional	10	7.5
Own Performance Problem	8	6.0

Table 2
Most Used Communication Strategies

Communication Strategies	Total	%
Literal Translation	36	27.1
Simplification	31	23.3
Circumlocution	13	9.8
Approximation	10	7.5
Other CSs	43	32.3
Total	133	100

Literal translation mostly occurred at the sentence level (31 out of 36 instances). This would indicate that the participants tended to resort to their mother tongue by thinking in Korean first and then translating into English. This was also substantiated in their responses to the questionnaire that they found it difficult to 'think in English' despite their ten-year English learning and their careers in the international business sector. Strong influence of L1 transfer may explain about their frequent use of syntactic translation.

It is interesting to note that four instances of code switching to Malaysian words were detected only in the utterances produced by those who had been in Malaysia for a longer period. It seems that as they stay long, they can pick up some Malaysian language, and it becomes a part of their repertoire of CSs. In addition, the results illustrated that the participant who had never worked abroad prior to the current posting employed the most number of strategies, whereas the one who possessed the longest overseas work experience recorded the least.

6. Conclusion

The present study attempts to explore CSs used by some Koreans in international business settings to cope with difficulties in their oral communication in English. The results of the study show that the participants seem to be successful users of English despite their limited knowledge of the language. The participants perceive a good command of English to be crucial for their work and tend to make up for their lack of English competence by using a wide range of strategies in order to accomplish their communicative intents. They have benefited from employing CSs in dealing with difficulties and breakdown in communication. They resort to various CSs in the real-world situation when they cannot come up with appropriate English words or phrases. This is bound to occur under any circumstance when they speak beyond their normal vocabulary range. Also, to have the job done, communication breakdown is by all means avoided as far as possible because the need for understanding is achievement driven in the international business communication.

The findings of this study yield some pedagogical implications for English teaching in Korea. L2 speakers might benefit from instruction on how to cope with communication problems. Such instruction could include creating awareness about the specific teaching of CSs, which involves various verbal and non-verbal means of dealing with communication difficulties. These strategies form part of the repertoire of communicative competence, and can help learners use their interlanguage more effectively. Another aspect to be considered is the role of CSs in the language learning process. CSs can facilitate language learning, and the use of CSs allows learners to reach comprehensible input, which is important in the development of their interlanguage. CSs can help keep interactions going and create the opportunities for input to be generated (Larsen-Freeman & Long, 1991). Learners can adopt strategies in order to negotiate meaning and understand input. Thus, the teaching of CSs might be beneficial to L2 learners when it aims to enhance the sociocultural and interactional understanding or when it helps learners develop their oral skills in the target language. The present study is tentative and a replication of this study with a larger population may yield additional information and different insights into the use of CSs. It would also be interesting to investigate the difference in CSs between good and poor speakers or in different learning contexts.

References

- Bialystok, E. (1983). Some factors in the selection and implementation 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: Basil Blackwell.
- Corder, S. P. (1983). Strategies of communication. In C. Faerch & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Strategies in interlanguage communication*. London: Longman.
- Crystal, D. (1997). *English as a global language*. Cambridge, UK: CUP.
- Dornyei, Z., & Scott, M. (1997). Communication strategies in a second language: Definitions and taxonomies. *Language Learning*, 47, 173-210.
- Du-Babcock, B. (2006). An analysis of topic management strategies and turn-taking

- behavior in the Hong Kong bilingual environment. *Journal of Business Communication*, 43(1), 21-42.
- Ellis, Rod. (1983). *Teacher-pupil interaction in second language development*. Paper presented at the Tenth University of Michigan Conference on Applied Linguistics. Ann Arbor.
- Ellis, Rod. (1984). Communication strategies and the evaluation of communicative performance. *ELT Journal* 38(1), 39-44.
- Faerch, C., and Kasper, G. (1980). Processes and strategies in foreign language learning and communication. *Interlanguage Studies Bulletin* 5, 47-118.
- Faerch, C., and Kasper, G. (1983). *Strategies in interlanguage communication*. London: Longman.
- Hamayan, E., & Tucker, G. (1980). Language input in the bilingual classroom and its relationship to second language achievement. *TESOL Quarterly* 14, 453-468.
- Haastруп, K., & Phillipson, R. (1983). Achievement strategies in learner / native speaker interaction. In C. Faerch & G. Kasper (Eds.). *Strategies in interlanguage communication*. London: Longman.
- LaBarca, A., & Khanji, R. (1986). On communication strategies: Focus on interaction. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 8, 68-79.
- Lafford, B. A. (2004). The effect of the context of learning on the use of communication strategies by learners of Spanish as a second language. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 26(2), 201-225.
- Larsen-Freeman, D., & Long M. (1991). *An introduction to second language acquisition research*. London & New York: Longman.
- Liskin-Gasparro, J. (1996). Circumlocution, communication strategies, and the ACTFL proficiency guidelines: An analysis of student discourse. *Foreign Language Annals*, 29, 317-330.
- Poullisse, N., & Schils, E. (1989). The influence of task-and proficiency-related factors on the use of communication strategies: A quantitative analysis. *Language Learning*, 39, 15-48.
- Selinker, L. (1972). Interlanguage. *IRAL*, 10, 209-230.
- Sharwood Smith, M. (1979). Strategies, language transfer, and the simulation of the second language learner's mental operations. *Language Learning*, 29, 345-361.
- Tarone, E. (1977). Conscious communication strategies in interlanguage: A progress report. In H. Brown, C. Yorio, & R. Crymes (Eds.), *On TESOL '77*. Washington, DC: TESOL.
- Tarone, E. (1980). Communication strategies, foreigner talk, and repair in interlanguage. *Language Learning*, 30(2), 417-431.

Appendix

(Questionnaire)

This questionnaire will solely be used for the research. Your sincere answer would be very helpful and the information you provide will be strictly confidential. Thank you for your cooperation.

A. Participants' background information

1. Name: _____ 2. Age: _____
 3. Gender: M / F 4. Degree: Bachelor / Master / Doctor
 5. Major: _____ 6. Company: _____
 7. Work experience in total: _____ years
 8. Overseas work experience in total: _____ years

B. Questions related to English use

1. Do you think English proficiency is a decisive factor for the international business?
 Yes / No
2. Do you think your English is good enough to work in the multi-national office?
 Yes / No
3. Which of the following English language skills is the most important in your workplace
 (Rank them according to importance from 1-4)
- | | |
|-----------------------|------------------------|
| Speaking skills _____ | Listening skills _____ |
| Reading skills _____ | Writing skills _____ |
4. Evaluate your abilities in the English language skills.
- | | Very Good | Good | Average | Weak | Very Weak |
|-----------|-----------|-------|---------|-------|-----------|
| Speaking | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| Listening | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| Reading | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| Writing | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
5. Which of the following aspects in English listening is the most important to you? (Rank them according to importance)
- | | |
|-------------------------------------------------|-------|
| Listening to social conversations in business | _____ |
| Listening to business discussions | _____ |
| Listening on the telephone about social matters | _____ |
| Listening to oral presentations in business | _____ |
6. Which of the following aspects in English speaking is the most important to you? (Rank

them according to importance)

Speaking in social situation in business _____

Giving oral presentations in business _____

Speaking on the telephone about specialized topics _____

Speaking to business clients in business meeting _____

7. Which of the following aspects in English reading is the most important to you? (Rank them according to importance)

Reading routine business letters and e-mails _____

Reading business reports _____

Reading specialized materials related to job _____

Reading materials to inform/instruct colleagues _____

8. Which of the following aspects in English writing is the most important to you? (Rank them according to importance)

Writing routine business letters and e-mails _____

Writing business reports _____

Translations of Korean into English _____

Writing about specialized topics related to work _____

9. How often do you speak with other people in English?

Very often ____ Often ____ Sometimes ____ Rarely ____ Never ____

10. How often do you listen to English?

Very often ____ Often ____ Sometimes ____ Rarely ____ Never ____

11. How often do you read English materials? (newspapers, magazines, etc)

Very often ____ Often ____ Sometimes ____ Rarely ____ Never ____

12. How often do you write in English? (business reports, letters, e-mails, etc)

Very often ____ Often ____ Sometimes ____ Rarely ____ Never ____

13. In what language skills do you face difficulties most often while working?

Speaking skills _____ Listening skills _____

Reading skills _____ Writing skills _____

14. For an English presentation, which technique do you use often?

Organize the report in Korean, and then put it into English. _____

Write the full report in English, and then memorize it. _____

Write down an outline in English, and then practice it. _____

Think of an outline in English and elaborate it during the presentation. ____

15. During the conversations, to what extent do you pay attention to the forms and errors you produce?

Always pay a lot of attention to the forms, and correct whenever you make an error.

Often pay attention to the forms, and only correct the big errors and ignoring the mistakes or minor errors. _____

Pay some attention to the forms, and do not correct errors unless they cause misunderstanding. _____

Never pay attention to the forms, and only interested in putting the message across. _____

Miyang Cha
Department of General Education
Namseoul University
21 Mejuri Seongwhaneup Cheonansi Chungnam
041) 580-2558
miyangcha@nsu.ac.kr

논문접수일자: 2007. 6. 10

게재확정일자: 2007. 7. 20