

Korean College Students' Use of Communication Strategies in Two Different Sets of Interactions*

Miyang Cha[†], Minjong Song[‡]

Namseoul University, Sungkyul University

Cha, Miyang & Song, Minjong. (2011). Korean college students' use of communication strategies in two different sets of interactions. *Modern English Education*, 12(3), 1-22.

This study investigates the communication strategies (CSs) used by Korean college students in their spoken interactions with native speakers (NSs) of English and with their peers to explore differences in CS use between the two groups. The 20 NSs and 40 Korean students (KSs) who participated in this study were divided into 20 groups, with each group consisting of one NS and two KSs, making 2 KS-NS and 2 KS-KS pairs. For data collection, questionnaires, speaking tasks, and tape recordings were used. 74 recorded conversations were transcribed and analyzed. For statistical analysis, a frequency analysis and a T-test were conducted. Results showed a limited use of CSs in general with students using direct strategies the most and interactional strategies the least. It was also revealed that students used CSs frequently due to their lack of linguistic knowledge in the target language. In addition, students used a greater number and a wider variety of CSs in communications with the NSs, utilizing all the direct, indirect, and noticeably interactional strategies and the CSs caused from all 4 types of problems (linguistic-knowledge deficit, time limit, own-/other-performance). Pedagogical suggestions were made from these findings.

[communication strategies/interactions/communicative competence/
/의사소통전략/ 상호작용/의사소통능력]

I. INTRODUCTION

The goals of English education at all levels in Korea are to improve the students'

* This research was supported by the Namseoul University Research Grant of 2011.

[†] First author

[‡] Corresponding author

communicative competence in English. These can be accomplished through their continuous and effective interactions for communication with English speakers. Currently, the policy of reinforcing public English education has allowed more opportunities for Korean college students to communicate with native speakers (NSs) of English in their school environment. Furthermore, as English has become the lingua franca following the advent of globalization, Korean college students have had increasing chances to communicate with non-native speakers (NNSs) as well as NSs outside their school environment. It has been claimed that NNS-NNS interactions can be important for second language acquisition (SLA) and the positive results of the studies (Bok-Myung Chang, 2004; Kyung-Ja Park, 2003) give support to this claim. Therefore, Korean colleges need to include the NNS-NNS interactions as well as their NS-NNS counterparts in their English teaching/learning environments.

However, many students have difficulties in acquiring proper communicative competence in English since it is learned within a restricted and artificially modified foreign language environment in Korea. Accordingly, they sometimes cannot help confronting communication breakdowns due to their language barrier when communicating in English. However, as Du-Babcock (2006) states, English speakers of any-level proficiency have the potentialities to communicate directly with NSs or NNSs. Thus, students can use their communication strategies (CSs) in such situations to avoid breakdowns and accomplish their communicative purposes. Also, according to Canale and Swain (1980), the competence of CS use is a constituent of communicative competence. Then, one of the ways to develop the students' communicative competence in English is to improve their use of CSs through instruction.

While most studies of CSs have focused on identifying and categorizing the various CS types (Tarone, 1980), there has been a lack of empirical studies comparing CS use in different sets of interactions such as NS-NNS and NNS-NNS interactions. In an attempt to explore differences in the use of CSs in different interactions, this study aims to investigate the CSs Korean college students use when communicating in English with NSs and with their peer students.

The research questions to be explored in this study are as follows:

1. What types and frequencies of CSs do Korean college students use to cope with problems when communicating in English?
2. Are there any differences in the use of CSs between their interaction with NSs and with their peers? If any, what are the differences in terms of types and frequencies?

II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

1. The Importance of NS-NNS/NNS-NNS Interactions

Research conducted so far on the effect of interactions for communication on SLA has limited its scope mainly to the NS-NNS interactions to investigate input effects from the NS's utterances. As Kyung-Ja Park (2003) and Bok-Myung Chang (2004) point out, the reason for this has been that for the NNS, the ultimate goal of learning English is to command the target language (TL) as the NS does, and to do that, he/she needs continuous feedback and support from the NS, and his/her interlanguage may not be fossilized only with the immediate corrections from the NS.

However, it has been widely supported that learners' selective awareness of linguistic inputs is very important for their SLA (Long, 1981, 1983) since the 1980s. That is, learners do not receive all the linguistic inputs but only ones for the acquisition which they selectively attend to and recognize. The two researchers (Bok-Myung Chang, 2004; Kyung-Ja Park, 2003) discuss that this may be applied to all the interactions regardless of who their interlocutors are, and therefore, not only the NS-NNS interactions but the NNS-NNS counterparts can also play an important role in SLA. And in the same studies, they both found out that the interactions in English between Korean and Japanese college students were very effective in developing the Korean students' communicative competence in it.

Furthermore, since English is used as an international language for communication among NNSs, most communicative interlocutors in English for Korean college students have been NNSs. Accordingly, in the present situation where communicative competence in English as an international language needs to be acquired, Korean colleges should provide their students with more opportunities in which communicative competence in English can be developed by including NNS-NNS interactions in the curriculum as well as the NS-NNS counterparts which have been exclusively used until now., most communicative interlocutors in English for Korean college students have been NNSs

2. Different Perspectives on Communication Strategies

CSs have been generally defined as systematic devices employed by SL learners to express their intended meanings when they face problems in SL communication because of their limited SL knowledge (Bialystok, 1990; Corder, 1981; Dornyei, 1995; Jae-Hee Jin, 2000; Stern, 1983). Researches on CSs have been done mostly by taking a psycholinguistic or an interactional perspective, however, in this study, one more perspective, i.e., the combination of the two is presented.

Research at an initial stage (Corder, 1981; Faerch & Kasper, 1980, 1983; Poulisse, Bongaerts & Kellerman, 1987; Stern, 1983; Tarone, 1977) mostly took the psycholinguistic perspective, which views CSs as the results of a person's inward cognitive processes for solving problems in planning or actualizing utterances, and therefore, they limited the use of CSs to the concept of personal problem-solving activities for which the given interlocutor's help is not necessary. The researchers with this perspective classified the CSs into avoidance or achievement strategies, analyzing the learners' motives for selecting the given strategies.

Tarone (1980, 1983) introduced the interactional perspective, which views CSs as mutual attempts for negotiating meaning when the meaning structure (linguistic and/or sociolinguistic structure) is not shared between a SL learner and a TL interlocutor in a communication situation, and therefore emphasized the social aspects of communication. She classified the CSs into paraphrase, borrowing, and avoidance.

Dornyei and Scott (1997) approached CSs with a newer perspective which combines the concept of learner-orientedness with the interactional perspective. They viewed the CSs as a conscious technique to be used for achieving communicative purposes, discussing that those who use the CSs are aware of communication problems, and by using the CSs intentionally, they can negotiate meaning with their interlocutors and reach the mutual understanding. The researchers classified the CSs into three categories (direct, indirect, and interactional strategies), and related each category to the four types of communication problems (linguistic-knowledge, time-limit, own-performance, and other-performance problems).

3. Studies on Communication Strategies in a Foreign Language

Some studies have shown that there is a relationship between a learner's linguistic proficiency level and his/her frequency of CS use. As the learner's level goes up, his/her CS use decreases (Labarca & Khanji, 1986; Poulisse & Schils, 1989). Dornyei (1995) conducted an experiment on "the educational potential of strategy training" (p. 55), and found out the possibility of improving both the effectiveness and the frequency of learners' use of some CSs through focused teaching. Brett (2001) presented a project in which some specific CSs were taught to beginners in German, finding out that most of them could learn a series of strategic phrases successfully. Sang-Ho Han (1997) tried to identify the developmental stages of CS use displayed by basic ESL and EFL learners and found that their CS use developed in a relatively invariant order. He also suggested an effective instructional model for Korean learners of English. Jae-Hee Jin (2000) examined the process of CS use with learners of Korean as a foreign language. She described the potential effectiveness of CS use for developing communicative competence, suggesting a

promising instructional model for teaching the CS use. Bok-Myung Chang (2004) investigated the CSs used between Japanese and Korean university students, finding out that communication among NNSs can be very effective for developing communicative competence of the Korean university students. Jee Hyun Kim (2007) tried to develop a teaching methodology focused on the use of CSs in a task-based Korean speaking class, and proved through an experiment that the speaking class using CSs had positive effects on improving the learners' speaking ability. Miyang Cha (2007) explored the CSs used in the spoken discourse of six business meetings among 15 Koreans and multinationals, arguing the role of CSs in the language learning process and suggesting the specific teaching of them.

Like this, most of the studies mentioned above found out the importance of teaching CS use to students for improving their speaking ability, also some suggesting instructional models.

III. METHOD

1. Participants

Twenty native speakers of English and 40 Korean college students participated in this study. The participants were from two different colleges located near Seoul (10 native speakers and 20 students from each school). The native speakers of English, consisting of 16 males and 4 females, were from America, Britain, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand, respectively, and 18 of them were Caucasian. They were all teaching at either of the two colleges.

The students, with 21 males and 19 females, were all Korean. They were from various majors and years, ranging from ages 19 to 29. They had learned English for 8 to 15 years, with 6 having studied abroad for 9 months to 2 years. According to the NS participants who evaluated the students' English proficiency, the students were considered to be at the intermediate level in ACTFL OPIC test. All participants volunteered for this research.

2. Instruments

In this study three types of instruments were used – questionnaires, speaking tasks, and tape recordings. The questionnaires were prepared to seek the participant's background information (See Appendix A). In order to elicit different types of conversational discourse, three kinds of speaking tasks were carried out: an information gap activity (Task 1), a description of the given topic (Task 2), and an interview (Task 3) (See Appendix B). All

conversations were tape recorded, and there was no rehearsal for and/or control over the task performance.

3. Data Collection

The 60 participants were divided into 20 groups, with each group consisting of one native speaker of English (NS) and two Korean students (KS). To have an equal number of the KS-NS and the KS-KS interactions in each group, four paired conversations took place: KS1-NS, KS2-NS, KS1-KS2, and KS2-KS1. Also, in each group were four tape recordings on a conversation 1) between KS1 and NS on the Task 1, 2) between KS2 and NS on the Task 2, 3) between KS1 and KS2 on the Task 1, and 4) between KS2 and KS1 on the Task 2. Likewise, the students' speaking performances on the same tasks between KS-NS and KS-KS interactions were compared. Depending on a given group, instead of Task 1 and 2 being used, Task 1 and 3 or Task 2 and 3 were used. In each conversation task, the NS played a role in eliciting the KS's utterances as much as possible and therefore, most of the utterances in conversations were produced by the students. 80 conversations took place in total and they were tape recorded each at different times. The length of recorded time ranged from 3.04 to 10.53 minutes with an average of 4.18 minutes. Out of the 80, 74 recordings (37 KS-NS and 37 KS-KS conversations) were transcribed and used for analysis as the other 6 were unusable due to some damage in the recording process.

4. Data Analysis

As the length of recorded time varied among the 74 conversations, only the first 3 minutes of each conversation was selected for analysis, in order to negate the differences caused by time variations and therefore make an impartial analysis possible. Therefore, 222-minute conversations were analyzed in total. In the analysis, the participants' whole utterances were considered instead of phrases or clauses since whole utterances contained more content information.

To identify and categorize the types of CSs and to discuss the problems causing their use, Dornyei and Scott's (1997) classification system was adopted. Of the total 33 types of CSs in the system, 26 were employed for the analysis in this study. Those 26 types identified were each categorized into direct, indirect, or interactional strategies, and these strategies were each also related to problems of linguistic knowledge, time limit, own performance, or other performance. The definitions of the strategies and the CS types each are provided together with an example extracted from the corpus. For convenience, the name and the discourse sample of each type are in underlined italics.

1) Direct Strategies due to Linguistic-Knowledge Problems

Direct strategies are those with which the speaker tries to solve his/her communication problem directly: The speaker tries to deliver his/her intended message to the interlocutor successfully with an alternative to the needed target language (TL) item. Most of CSs belong to these strategies. In this study, 17 types of these strategies were found.

(1) *Message abandonment* is leaving a message unfinished due to the lack of linguistic proficiency.

NS 09: So, why do you think it was love?

KS 14: ... *Uh.. at first he.. said.. he make me, at first he make me.. me make.. I don't know.*

(2) *Message reduction* is shortening a message by shunning problematic structures or topics, or by omitting some intended parts due to deficient linguistic resources.

NS 15: And, if you use train, how long is it going to take?

KS 25: *Use KTX, two hour?* [If I use the KTX, it takes about two hours.]

(3) *Topic avoidance* is avoiding topic areas or concepts which pose language difficulties.

KS 11: Why you split, split, split up?

KS 16: split?

KS 11: split.

KS 16: *I don't know. Next question.*

(4) *Restructuring* is leaving an intended message unfinished because of language difficulties and delivering an alternative message.

KS 30: And.. I have a .. *sore ... ah, throw up...* when I take a bus.

[And.. I have a *stomachache* when I take a bus.]

(5) *Circumlocution* is showing, explaining, or delineating the attributes of the target object or action.

NS 18: Ahm, why is it important for you to study English?

KS 29: ..., and English is *the most common language I can use all around the world..*,

[..., and English is a global language....]

(6) Approximation is using a substitute like a hypernym or a related word, which has common semantic features with the target word.

NS 16: Ahm, when you were together, what sort of things did you do together?

KS 28: Umm, specially, we liked to go, umm, mart.

[Umm, specially, we liked to go, umm, shopping.]

(7) Use of all-purpose words is using general, meaningless words in the place where specific words are lacking.

KS 34: ..., we used to go to restaurant and then we go to see a movie, and then.., usually go to.. Karaoke, and.. something like that. [activities like these]

(8) Word-coinage is making up a TL word which does not exist by applying a supposed TL rule to a TL word which exists.

KS 19: What is her ambition?

KS 18: Uhm.., she's ambition is.. to buy a Rolls.. Rossi.

[Uhm.., her ambition is.. to buy a Rolls.. Rossi.]

(9) Literal translation is translating a vocabulary, a compound word, an idiom, or a sentence structure literally from L1 to TL.

NS 15: Why do you like autumn best?

KS 25: I hate cold and hot. [I hate the cold and hot weather.]

(10) Foreignizing is using an L1 word by adapting it to TL phonology and/or morphology.

KS 03: I like to watch terevi in the evening time.

[I like to watch television in the evening time.]

(11) Code switching is using L1 words when speaking in TL.

KS 20: Uh... what are her interests, yoga, horses, and what?

KS 37: Swimming.

KS 20: Umm... da-eum, Flemming Larson..? [Umm... next, Flemming Larson..?]

(12) *Use of similar-sounding words* is replacing a word whose form or pronunciation the speaker is unsure of with one which sounds like the target word (whether it exists or not).

KS 31: Uh, made or single? [Uh, married or single?]

KS 32: Married.

(13) *Omission* is leaving a space when not knowing a given word and continuing to deliver the following words as if it has been said.

NS 08: Ok. How long have you been dating?

KS 12: Ahm... Maybe, six and eight months.

[Ahm... Maybe, between six and eight months.]

(14) *Retrieval* is saying a series of incomplete or wrong words or structures before reaching an optimal lexical item or structure.

NS 12: Ah, why? Why do you prefer the train?

KS 18: Because I think it's.. conve..., ah,... convenient. [Because I think it's convenient.]

(15) *Use of derivationally-related words* is creating incorrect words, which are etymologically related to the target ones in meaning or form.

KS 11: What he was like?

KS 16: He is very handsome... and acting is very good.

[He was very handsome... and action was very good.]

(16) *Self-rephrasing* is repeating an utterance not quite in the same way but by adding something or using a paraphrase. Of the direct strategies, this one is exceptionally due to own-performance problems.

KS 18: Uhh..., where is she from? Hometown?

(17) *Other-repair* is correcting something in the interlocutor's utterance. Of the direct strategies, this one is also exceptionally due to other-performance problems.

KS 30: And, if you hoped to marry her?

KS 29: Did I hope to marry her?

2) Interactional Strategies due to Own/Other-Performance Problems

Interactional strategies are those with which the interlocutors work together to try and solve their communication problems to successfully reach the communicative purposes. In this study, 7 types of these strategies were found.

(1) Appeal for help is turning to the interlocutor for help by asking an explicit question about a needed TL item or expressing lack of it with a rising intonation and/or a pause.

NS 07: Ok, what's the question?

KS 16: How... long... ahhhh...

NS 07: How long has she been a pop singer?

KS 16: Yeah...

(2) Comprehension check is asking questions to check whether the interlocutor understands what has been said.

KS 10: Emm, we ... usually .. go.. together.. to the PC bang.

NS 06: PC bang!

KS 10: Do you know that?

NS 06: Ya, ya, ya, I know PC bang.

(3) Own-accuracy check is checking whether what one has said is correct by asking a concrete question or repeating a word with a rising intonation.

KS 32: Ya, he... he was cadet. Cadet?... cadet?

NS 19: Ya, a cadet, ya.

(4) Asking for repetition is requesting a repetition when one has not heard or understood something properly.

NS 18: Ah, what sort of things did you do together?

KS 30: Sorry?

NS 18: What sort of things did you do together?

(5) Asking for clarification is requesting an explanation about an unfamiliar meaning structure.

NS 05: You know what a Rolls Royce is?

KS 08: What's like a Rolls Royce?

NS 05: It's really, really an expensive car.

(6) Asking for confirmation is requesting confirmation on what one has heard or understood.

KS 39: What she was like?

KS 34: You, you mean the, her shape?

KS 39: Yes.

(7) Response confirmation is confirming what the interlocutor has said or proposed.

NS 07: What's the best birthday present ever received?

KS 11: Present..

NS 07: Ya, birthday.

KS 11: Ummm..., money.

NS 07: Money! How much?

3) Indirect Strategies due to Time-Limit Problems

Indirect strategies are those with which the speaker tries to achieve his/her communicative purpose indirectly by making an environment for mutual understanding. In this study, 2 types of these strategies were found.

(1) Use of fillers is using gambits to fill pauses, delaying, and playing for time at difficulties in order to keep the communication going.

KS 14: Ohhhh.. and.. uhm.. did you go out together?

(2) Repetition is repeating an utterance immediately after it was said or repeating something the interlocutor said to gain time.

KS 07: If, if you hoped to marry her?

KS 06: No, uhm..., we were very young. We were very young.

All types of the CSs the students used in the 74 conversations were identified and quantified. Then, the types and frequencies of CSs identified were compared between KS-NS and KS-KS conversations. For statistical analysis, a frequency analysis and a T-test were carried out.

IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

1. Overall Use of Communication Strategies

The number and types of CSs used by Korean college students in the 74 conversations were examined, and a total of 26 CS types with 2815 occurrences were identified. Students used more CSs in conversations with native interlocutors (1574 occurrences-55.91%) than with their peers (1241 occurrences-44.09%), as illustrated in Table 1.

Table 1

Total Number of CS Use

| CS category | Types | KS-NS interaction | KS-KS interaction | Total |
|--------------------------|-------|-------------------|-------------------|---------------|
| Direct strategies | 17 | 727 (46.19%) | 685 (55.20%) | 1412 (50.16%) |
| Interactional strategies | 7 | 270 (17.15%) | 118 (9.51%) | 388 (13.78%) |
| Indirect strategies | 2 | 577 (36.66%) | 438 (35.29%) | 1015 (36.06%) |
| Total | 26 | 1574 (55.91%) | 1241 (44.09%) | 2815 (100%) |

The identified 26 types were classified into three CS categories (direct, interactional, and indirect strategies). Of the three categories, direct strategies were used the most (1412 occurrences-50.16%), indirect strategies the second most (1015 occurrences-36.06%) and interactional strategies the least (388 occurrences-13.78%). This pattern of the use of CS categories occurred in both KS-NS/KS-KS paired interactions.

A frequency analysis was carried out to find the total frequency of CS categories the students used in conversations. The results are summarized in Table 2. The number of CS types used was 10.11 per case on average, which was less than half of the total 26. This shows that although the students in this study possessed a wide repertoire of CSs, they seemed to use the same CSs repetitively, leaving most of the other CSs used infrequently. Upon examining the frequency of each CS category used per case, direct strategies were used 19.08 times, interactional strategies 5.21 times, and indirect strategies 13.71 times on average. In this study, 17 types belonged to the direct strategies, 7 types to the interactional

strategies, and 2 types to the indirect strategies. It was calculated that each type that belonged to the direct strategies was used 1.12 times, each of the interactional strategies, 0.74 times, and each of the indirect strategies, 6.86 times on average per case. This means that indirect strategies were used most repetitively and the interactional strategies, the least repetitively in every conversation. In other words, students employed indirect strategies, such as the use of fillers and repetition, frequently when facing communication gaps in order to keep the communication going and/or to gain time. On the other hand, they might have possessed deficient interactional skills in accomplishing the communications efficiently as intended by cooperating with the interlocutors.

Table 2
Frequency of CS Use

| CS category | Mean | SD | Minimum value | Maximum value |
|--------------------------|-------|------|---------------|---------------|
| Direct strategies | 19.08 | 7.07 | 6.00 | 34.00 |
| Interactional strategies | 5.21 | 4.89 | .00 | 30.00 |
| Indirect strategies | 13.71 | 5.08 | 5.00 | 31.00 |
| Number of CS types used | 10.11 | 2.51 | 1.00 | 14.00 |

n=74

Also, the frequency of each CS type used per case was investigated, and the most frequently-used 8 types are reported in Table 3. Fillers were seen as the most frequent, constituting 29.3% (820/2815) of the total occurrences. They were used 11.08 times on average, which was a much higher frequency than those of the other 25 types. Following the use of fillers, retrieval (M=5.11), message reduction (M=3.76), use of derivationally-related words (M=3.68), response confirmation (M=2.99), repetition (M=2.63), self-rephrasing (M=2.01), and appeal for help (M=1.07) were also frequently used, that is, used more than once in a conversation. In contrast, most of the other CS types identified were seldom used, each constituting less than 1% of the total number of CSs used.

Next, the 8 CS types used most frequently were related each to communication problems that caused the use of such CSs, i.e., linguistic-knowledge, time-limit, own-performance, or other-performance problems. Of the 8 types, 4 types (retrieval, message reduction, use of derivationally-related words, and appeal for help) were due to linguistic-knowledge problems, and 2 (use of fillers and repetition) were related to time-limit problems. The other 2 (self-rephrasing and response confirmation) were caused by own/other-performance problems. This reveals that the Korean students used the CS types caused from linguistic-knowledge deficit most variously, and the average frequency (3.41)

of those 4 types caused from linguistic-knowledge problems was much higher than that of other types caused by other problems respectively (2.01, 2.99, 2.63), except that of fillers (11.08). It is assumed that the students made use of various CSs when facing their inability to express ideas in the target language. Additionally, the use of fillers and the use of derivationally-related words were found to have large standard deviations (4.41 and 3.44, respectively), indicating that the use of these two strategies largely differed among the students and the conversations.

Table 3
Most Frequently-used CS Types

| CS Type | Occurrences | Mean | SD |
|-------------------------------------|--------------|-------|------|
| Use of fillers | 820 (29.13%) | 11.08 | 4.41 |
| Retrieval | 379 (13.42%) | 5.11 | 2.55 |
| Message reduction | 279 (9.91%) | 3.76 | 2.88 |
| Use of derivationally-related words | 272 (9.66%) | 3.68 | 3.44 |
| Response confirmation | 223 (7.92%) | 2.99 | 2.69 |
| Repetitions | 195 (6.92%) | 2.63 | 2.33 |
| Self-rephrasing | 148 (5.25%) | 2.01 | 2.02 |
| Appeal for help | 79 (2.80%) | 1.07 | 1.95 |

n=74

2. Comparison of CS Use between the Two Interactions

A T-test was conducted in order to compare the frequencies of the CS categories used in two (KS-NS and KS-KS) paired interactions and verify the significance of differences between the pairs. Table 4 shows that a greater number of CS types were used per case in KS-NS conversations than in KS-KS conversations. In KS-NS conversations, 11.05 types were used on average, while an average of 9.16 types were used in KS-KS interactions. The difference between the two (1.89) was statistically significant ($p < .01$). Accordingly, CSs were seen to be used more variously in KS-NS conversations, revealing that the Korean students employed a larger variety of CS types when conversing with their native interlocutors. That is, the students appeared to have experienced more breakdowns in communication and tried to overcome them by adopting more various CSs in interactions with NSs, compared to those with their Korean peers.

Table 4
Comparison of Frequency of CS Categories between KS-NS/KS-KS Pairs

| CS category | Interaction | No. of cases | Mean | SD | t-value |
|--------------------------|-------------|--------------|-------|------|----------|
| Direct strategies | KS-NS | 37 | 19.62 | 6.62 | .655 |
| | KS-KS | 37 | 18.54 | 7.54 | |
| Interactional strategies | KS-NS | 37 | 7.24 | 5.59 | 3.896*** |
| | KS-KS | 37 | 3.19 | 2.97 | |
| Indirect strategies: | KS-NS | 37 | 15.59 | 5.21 | 3.40** |
| | KS-KS | 37 | 11.84 | 4.24 | |
| Number of types used | KS-NS | 37 | 11.05 | 1.56 | 3.475** |
| | KS-KS | 37 | 9.16 | 2.92 | |

* p< .05, ** p< .01, *** p< .001

Direct strategies were used 19.62 (KS-NS) and 18.54 (KS-KS) times on average, however, the difference between the two (1.08) was not statistically significant (p= .655). On the other hand, interactional strategies were used 7.24 (KS-NS) and 3.19 (KS-KS) times, and this difference (4.05) was statistically significant (p< .001). Also, indirect strategies were used 15.59 (KS-NS) and 11.84 (KS-KS) times, and the difference (3.75) was statistically significant (p< .01) as well. It would mean that the students utilized a significantly larger number of interactional and indirect strategies in KS-NS conversations than in KS-KS interactions.

Here, it is noticeable that the students used more than twice as many interactional strategies in conversations with the NSs than in those with their peers, and the difference between the two groups was statistically the most significant. In interactional strategies, participants cooperate in troubleshooting exchanges and the resulting mutual understanding is a function of the successful execution of both parts of the exchange (Dornyei & Scott, 1997). It could be possible then that interacting with NSs who had the different socio, cultural, and linguistic background imposed different kinds of communication problems requiring the students to work together with their native interlocutors in solving their communication problems and successfully reaching the communicative purposes.

The frequencies of each CS type usage per case were also compared between the two pairs. Of the 26 types, only 8 showed statistically significant differences between the two paired groups and they are tabulated in Table 5. Of these 8, most types were more frequently used in KS-NS conversations except in the use of similar-sounding words. Similar-sounding words, the only type used far more repeatedly in KS-KS conversations, were used 0.84 (KS-KS) and 0.08 (KS-NS) times on average, and the difference between

the two (0.76) was statistically significant ($p < .001$). Additionally, despite the statistically insignificant difference, the same phenomenon occurred in the word-coinage, that is, the students used a greater number of this strategy in conversations with the Korean interlocutors (27 occurrences) than in those with the native counterparts (8 occurrences). In view of this fact, it would seem that when encountering the difficulties in communication with Korean peers, students tended to come up with similar sounding words or make up nonexistent words for their intended messages because they realized that their peer interlocutors were also the same learners who possessed the limited linguistic knowledge in the target language. Interestingly, the use of these strategies was successful in getting their communicative intents across.

Table 5

Comparison of 8 Significant CS Types between KS-NS/KS-KS Pairs

| Types of CS | Interaction | Occurrences | Mean | SD | t-value |
|-------------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------|------|-----------|
| Use of similar-sounding words | KS-NS | 3 | .08 | .36 | -3.995*** |
| | KS-KS | 31 | .84 | 1.09 | |
| Self-rephrasing | KS-NS | 113 | 3.05 | 2.08 | 5.158*** |
| | KS-KS | 35 | .97 | 1.30 | |
| Other-repair | KS-NS | 31 | .84 | 1.28 | 2.635* |
| | KS-KS | 9 | .24 | .49 | |
| Appeal for help | KS-NS | 57 | 1.54 | 2.53 | 2.132* |
| | KS-KS | 22 | .59 | .93 | |
| Own-accuracy check | KS-NS | 11 | .30 | .57 | 2.073* |
| | KS-KS | 3 | .08 | .28 | |
| Response confirmation | KS-NS | 150 | 4.00 | 2.71 | 3.484** |
| | KS-KS | 73 | 1.97 | 2.28 | |
| Use of fillers | KS-NS | 450 | 12.16 | 4.96 | 2.160* |
| | KS-KS | 370 | 10.00 | 3.53 | |
| Repetition | KS-NS | 127 | 3.43 | 2.55 | 3.101** |
| | KS-KS | 68 | 1.84 | 1.80 | |

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

Here again, those 8 CS types showing significant differences between the two pairs were taken into account in relation to causing problems. The analysis of the usage of those CS types demonstrated that overall, the strategies that were more frequently utilized in KS-KS conversations were mainly due to the students' lack of linguistic knowledge in the target language. On the other hand, the strategies used more often in KS-NS conversations were

linked to various causes such as linguistic-knowledge deficit, time-limit problems, and own/other-performance problems. This reveals that the students used some CS types caused from all those four problems more frequently in conversations with their native interlocutors, while they used only one type caused from linguistic-knowledge problems in conversations with Koreans. Furthermore, when communicating with their native interlocutors, they used the CSs caused from time-limit, own-performance and other-performance problems more variously than those caused from linguistic-knowledge problems. It was shown that the differences between the two groups in the frequencies of the use of the types caused from those three problems (time-limit problems 1.88, other-performance problems 1.32 and own-performance problems 1.15) were all greater than the difference on those of the type caused from linguistic-knowledge problems (0.95). This would imply that the nature of interaction with NSs might differ from that with Korean peers.

V. CONCLUSION

In an attempt to explore the differences in the use of CSs between the types of interactions, this study investigated the CSs used by Korean college students when communicating in English with NSs and with their Korean peers. The students appeared to make use of a greater number and a wider variety of CSs in conversations with the native interlocutors than in those with their peers. It is necessary to posit what the implications are of greater and lesser use of CSs between the types of interaction. CSs are conscious attempts to overcome communication gaps (Lafford, 2004). It indicates that more communication gaps occurred when the students communicated with NSs.

As a whole, direct strategies constituted the largest portion in the use of CSs while interactional strategies were used the least. This means that the students mostly tried to achieve their communicative purposes directly by delivering their intended messages to their interlocutors with substitutes. However, they might have lacked the skills to accomplish the communications by cooperating with the interlocutors. Nevertheless, a significant difference was found in the use of interactional strategies between the KS-NS/KS-KS pairs. The students used more of said strategies in their interaction with NSs, implying that they tended to be more engaged in cooperation with their interlocutors when communicating with the NSs, compared to interacting with other Korean students.

In addition, while the CSs that were more often used when conversing with their peers were mainly due to their lack of linguistic knowledge in the target language, strategies used more frequently in interactions with NSs stemmed from a variety of causes. It can be hypothesized that communicative interactions with NSs and with peer learners might have

different natures. Also, the differences in the expectations of interlocutor roles imposed by the two types of interactions may help explain the differential use of CSs in two contrastingly paired conversations in this study.

The findings of this study yield some pedagogical implications for English teaching at the tertiary level. The competence of CS use is a constituent of communicative competence (Canale & Swain, 1980), and a successful communication depends entirely on the competence of CS use when the basic grammar and vocabulary of a target language are lacking (Dornyei, 1995). In this study, the students were found to resort to various CSs because of their lack of linguistic knowledge in the target language. As such, the direct teaching of CS use might be beneficial for the students' effective use of their interlanguage. First, students' awareness of the nature and communicative potentiality of CSs needs to be heightened. Second, students' socio-cultural and interactional understanding should be enhanced to activate two-way interaction skills. Third, students should be provided with an L2 model of using strategies such as demonstration, listening materials, and videos, and have them identify, categorize, and evaluate the strategies used by NSs or other L2 students. An alternative is to have students listen to their own recordings and analyze their own strategy use. Fourth, students should be taught specific CSs by providing certain basic core vocabulary and grammatical structure to verbalize. A good way to collect these vocabulary and grammar sets is to have students verbalize the strategies in Korean and then find out their equivalents in English. Last of all, students should be provided with opportunities to practice and automatize CSs, which will aid the development of the students' oral skills in the target language.

REFERENCES

- Bialystok, E. (1990). *Communication strategies: A psychological analysis of second-language use*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Brett, A. G. (2001). Teaching communication strategies to beginners. *Language Learning Journal*, 24(winter), 53-61.
- Canale, M., & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics*, 1, 1-47.
- Cha, Miyang. (2007). The use of communication strategies in international business settings. *Modern English Education*, 8(2), 20-40.
- Chang, Bok-Myung. (2004). A critical analysis of communicative strategies among non-native English speakers. *Modern English Education*, 5(2), 173-195.
- Corder, S. P. (1981). *Error analysis and interlanguage*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Dornyei, Z. (1995). On the teachability of communication strategies. *TESOL Quarterly*,

- 29(1), 55-85.
- Dornyei, Z., & Scott, M. (1997). Communication strategies in a second language: Definitions and taxonomies. *Language Learning*, 47(1), 173-210.
- Du-Babcock, B. (2006). An analysis of topic management strategies and turn-taking behavior in the Hong Kong bilingual environment: The impact of culture and language use. *Journal of Business Communication*, 43(1), 21-42.
- Faerch, C., & Kasper, G. (1980). Processes and strategies in foreign language learning and communication. *Interlanguage Studies Bulletin* 5(1), 47-118.
- Faerch, C., & Kasper, G. (1983). *Strategies in interlanguage communication*. London: Longman.
- Han, Sang-Ho. (1997). A model of English instruction based on communication strategies. *Studies in Modern Grammatical Theories*, 10, 149-171.
- Jin, Jae-Hee. (2000). *A study of communication strategies for learners of Korean as a foreign language*. Unpublished master's thesis, Yonsei University, Seoul, Korea.
- Kim, Jee Hyun. (2007). *The study on Korean speaking teaching methodology using communication strategies*. Unpublished master's thesis, Yeungnam University, Daegu, Korea.
- Labarca, A., & Khanji, R. (1986). On communication strategies: Focus on interaction. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 8(1), 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.
- Long, M. (1981). Questions in foreigner talk discourse. *Language Learning*, 31(1), 135-137.
- Long, M. (1983). Native speaker/ non-native speaker conversation and the negotiation of comprehensible input. *Applied Linguistics*, 4(2), 126-141.
- Park, Kyung-Ja. (2003). A model development for English classes focused on communication for cross-cultural distance learning between Waseda and Kangwon University. *English Language & Literature Teaching*, 9(1), 83-129.
- Poulisse, N., Bongaerts, T., & Kellerman, E. (1987). The use of retrospective verbal reports in the analysis of compensatory strategies. In C. Faerch & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Introspection in second language research* (pp. 213-229). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- 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(1), 15-46.
- Stern, H. H. (1983). *Fundamental concepts of language teaching*. New York: Oxford University Press.

- Tarone, E. (1977). Conscious communication strategies in interlanguage: A progress report. In H. D. Brown, C. A. Yorio, & R. C. 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. (1983). Teaching strategic competence in the foreign language classroom. *Studies in Language Learning*, 4(2), 121-130.

APPENDIX A

The Participant's Background Information

1. The Native Speaker's Information

- 1) Name: _____ 2) Age: _____
 3) Gender: Male / Female 4) Nationality: _____

2. The Student's Information

- 1) Name: _____ 2) Age: _____
 3) Year: _____ 4) Major: _____
 5) Gender: Male / Female
 6) The Period of learning English at both public and private schools: _____ years
 7) Have you ever studied in the English speaking countries? If yes, how long? _____

APPENDIX B

1. An Information Gap Activity (Task 1)

Who's who in the Eurovision Song Contest (A Sheet)

| | | | | |
|--------------------------------|-------------|---------------|----------------|-------------|
| Name | Maria Rossi | Astrid Klempe | Fleming Larson | Paula Allen |
| Age | | 22 | | 19 |
| Home town | Milan | | | Dublin |
| Country | Italy | | Denmark | Ireland |
| Married/single | | single | single | |
| Length of time as a pop singer | 8 years | 4 years | | |
| Interests | music | | football | |
| | golf | | reading | |
| | painting | swimming | fishing | cooking |

| | | | | |
|----------------------------|-------------------------|--|--------------------|-------------------|
| Song title (in English) | | | | When You Are Gone |
| Ambition | to buy a Rolls-Royce | | to sing in the USA | |

Who's who in the Eurovision Song Contest (B Sheet)

| | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------|--|
| Name | Maria Rossi | Astrid Klempe | Fleming Larson | Paula Allen |
| Age | 35 | | 30 | |
| Home town | | Hamburg | Copenhagen | |
| Country | | Germany | | |
| Married/single | married | | | single |
| Length of time as a pop singer | | | 5 years | 2 years |
| Interests | music | yoga | | bird-watching |
| | | horses | | ballet |
| | painting | | fishing | cooking |
| Song title (in English) | You Alone | Wonderful Tonight | Rocking through the Night | |
| Ambition | | to meet the US President | | to get married and have lots of children |

2. A Description on the First Love (Task 2)

Describe your first love to your partner. Your partner is a close friend of yours. Before you start, think of the following:

- 1) your love's name
- 2) how old you were when you first met him/her and where you two met
- 3) if it was love at first sight
- 4) how long you went out together
- 5) what sort of things you used to do together
- 6) what he/she was like
- 7) if you hoped to marry him/her
- 8) if his/her parents liked you
- 9) why you split up
- 10) if you have seen him/her since

3. An Interview (Task 3)

- 1) Do you prefer home cooking or restaurant food? And why?
- 2) What season of the year do you like best? And why?
- 3) What is the best birthday present you've received?
- 4) What good qualities do you have?
- 5) Why is it important for you to study English?
- 6) Do you use the weekends to recharge your batteries(= relax & rest) or study?
- 7) Do you think that the subways should stay open 24 hours? And why?
- 8) For long trips to Busan or wherever, do you prefer the train or bus? And why?
- 9) Would you prefer a high-paying difficult job or a low-paying fun job? And why?
- 10) What kind of job do you want after you graduate?

Miyang Cha

Department of General Education

Namseoul University

21 Maejuri, Seonghwan-eup, Cheonan-si, Choongnam, 330-707

Tel: (041) 580-2558 / H.P.: 010-5533-9634

Email: miyangcha@nsu.ac.kr

Minjong Song

Department of General Education

Sungkyul University

400-10 Anyang 8 dong, Manan-gu, Anyang-si, Kyounggi-do, 430-742

Tel: (031) 467-8920 / H.P.: 010-2773-6650

Email: mjsong43@lycos.co.kr

Received 14 July 2011

Revised 22 August 2011

Accepted 4 September 2011