Modern English Education, Vol. 15, No. 3, Fall, 2014

Gender Effect on the Use of Communication Strategies in Case of Korean College Students

Min-Jong Song
Sungkyul University

Song, Min-Jong. (2014). Gender effect on the use of communication strategies in case of Korean college students. *Modern English Education, 15*(3), 43-63.

To investigate differences in the use of communication strategies (CSs) between different genders, this study explored the CSs used by Korean college students when interacting with their peers. The 40 students who participated in the study were divided into 20 same-gender pairs, with each pair consisting of 2 females or 2 males. For data collection, a questionnaire, a speaking task (an interview), and tape recordings were employed. Those 10 female-female and 10 male-male pairs had 2 interviews, each, and the 40 interviews were recorded, transcribed, and analyzed. For statistical analysis, a frequency analysis and a t-test were administered. As a result, it was shown that in general, the students used a limited variety of types, adopting direct strategies the most and interactional strategies the least, and, between the two genders, both female and male students appeared to use the same types and frequencies. Accordingly, it was concluded that no gender-related significant effect was identified on the use of CSs with Korean college students. Suggestions were made about increasing opportunities for interaction between the students themselves and training them in the use of CSs, especially focused on the interactional strategies and the other infrequently used ones in this study.

**[communication strategies/gender effect/types and frequencies/
의사소통전략/성별 효과/유형과 빈도수]**

I. INTRODUCTION

The purpose of English education in Korea is to develop the students' communicative competence (CC) in English. This can be achieved through their continuous and effective communications with English speakers. As English has become an international language due to globalization, Korean college students have had increasing chances to communicate with non-native speakers (NNSs) as well as native speakers (NSs) both within and without

their school environment, and it was supported (Foster & Oath, 2005; Mayo & Pica, 2000; Pica, Lincoln-Porter, Paninos, & Linnell, 1996) and substantiated (Bok-Myung Chang, 2004; Kyung-Ja Park, 2003) that not only the NS-NNS interactions but the NNS-NNS counterparts can also play an important role in second language acquisition. Accordingly, in the present situation where CC in English as a lingua franca needs to be acquired, Korean colleges should offer their students more opportunities to develop it by including student-student (NNS-NNS) interactions as well as native teacher-student (NS-NNS) counterparts in their curriculum.

However, many Korean students have had limited speaking proficiency within a restricted English-learning environment. So, to communicate with each other with their deficient linguistic ability, they need to turn to some strategies which can make up for it. Those strategies are called communication strategies (CSs) and the students can use them when facing communication difficulties or breakdowns. In other words, with the CSs, they can get their meaning across successfully to the peer interlocutors when problems arise in their interaction. Accordingly, as they become more and more mastering the use of the strategies, they may communicate with other students more and more competently. A similar discussion on the importance of NNS-NNS interactions and the nature of CSs can be found out in the study of Mi-Yang Cha and Min-Jong Song (2011).

By the way, it has been shown that males and females tend to use their language differently (Lakoff, 1990; Mulac, 1989; Tannen, 1990) even to the extent that communication between them can be regarded as cross-cultural communication (Kelley, 1996). According to many researchers, the language difference can derive from their biological difference, cultural difference, and/or the difference between their social role and power. Like this, if males and females have been believed to show differences in the use of language, they are also likely to be different from each other in the use of CSs. Little research has been done to examine the influence of gender on CSs in L2 learning, and little information is available about CSs used by Korean learners of English. Therefore, this study explores the effect of gender on the production of CSs of Korean college students while they are interacting with their peers. Specifically, the study examines the types and frequencies of CSs Korean students use when they interact with their same-gender interlocutors and whether there are any differences between the two genders in their use of CSs. Accordingly, the research questions 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 male-male and female-female communications?

II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

1. Different Gender and Different Use of Language

The literature on language and gender interaction has shown that males and females tend to differ in their use of both spoken and written language (Lakoff, 1990; Mulac, 1989; Tannen, 1990). Samar and Alibakhshi (2007) discuss that for men and women different norms may have been set up, which affects their own speech style perceptions. With reference to Ik-Hwan Kim (2007), this section discusses mainly three (deficit, cultural difference, and dominance) theories on the different language use between genders.

According to the deficit theory, Jespersen (1925, as cited in Ik-Hwan Kim, 2007) states that females' speech is characterized with a smaller amount of vocabulary, simpler sentence structure, and as less thoughtful than males'. In other words, the former is imperfect when compared with the latter. In the same line, Lakoff (1975) also regards females' speech as rather inadequate when compared to that of males. She specifies the features of females' speech with three points. First, females use more tag questions than males in their speech. The use of them may weaken the content of a declarative sentence and give an impression that the speaker is not confident in her message and her point or argument is not clear. Second, females finish their declarative sentence by using a rising intonation instead of a falling one, leaving a trailing note on their uttered content. Third, females prefer the order with a requesting note to the direct order, as the former sounds less authoritative than the latter. For example, they tend to give orders with "Would you mind closing the window?" rather than "Close the window.".

Based on the cultural difference theory, Tannen (1990, 1993) claims that females' speech is different from males' as they both have lived in different peer groups of language community since childhood. According to her, girls grow up in an atmosphere of cooperation, equality, and close friendship. Therefore, they use a cooperative, interactional, and encouraging language such as questioning and/or soliciting talking style in their conversation. Also, they are good at sensing their interlocutors' subtle feelings and implied meanings. On the other hand, boys grow up in an atmosphere of hierarchy and dominance. Therefore, they use a competitive and authoritative language such as imperative talking style in their conversation, and they are accustomed to getting surface factual statements. In addition, female speech is usually more polite and gentler than male speech. Women use more operators which build a sense of community between the interlocutors like 'maybe we could', and 'would you'. Also, when telling a story, they talk about others more often than about themselves, use indirect styles more often, and are more inclined to listen during a conversation than to interrupt. And they are likely to propose action by using an imperative mood with the first person plural, while men often issue orders directly to one

another with the first person singular. All these aspects lead to the distinction between female 'rapport talk' and male 'report talk'. In the same vein, Colley and Todo (2003) and Rosseti (2005, as cited in Samar & Alibakhshi, 2007) examined email messages from men and women and found that males are more inclined to write in an aggressive and competitive style, whereas females tend to be far more supportive and intimate in their writings.

In the dominance theory, the differences between females' and males' conversational style are due to their differential social authority. Henely and Kramarae (1994) discuss that males tend to have a longer speech than females, initiate new topics rather than keep the same topic going on, and pay little attention to implied meanings behind factual statements. Similarly, Freed (2003) points out that the differences in conversational style between girls and boys are due to power relations. Boys' competitiveness derives from male domination in a society, whereas girls' cooperativeness does from female subordination in it. Furthermore, females get to learn the harmonization between their and others' feelings/actions since they lack self-autonomy. Also, Erickson, Lind, Johnson and O'Barr (1978) discuss the linguistic device women generally use is a powerless speech style laced with intensifiers (e.g., 'so', 'very'), hedges (e.g., 'I think', 'kinda'), hesitations (e.g., 'uh', 'well'), hypercorrect grammar, questioning forms (use of rising, question intonation in a declarative form), polite forms, and gestures. However, men with a high status rarely use these powerless forms and employ the powerful style.

In sum, from the deficit theory, females' speech is regarded as inferior to males' due to their biological differences; from the cultural difference theory, females' speech is not regarded as inferior to males' but just their expressions are different from each other; from the dominance theory, the difference between females' and males' speech is regarded as deriving from their differential social role and power. And these three theories are not mutually exclusive but interrelated to one another.

Besides from these three, as the main driving force in men's and women's linguistic behavior, Trudgill (1972) focuses on prestige norms. He argues that men and women respond to opposite sets of norms: men to covert, vernacular prestige norms and women to overt, standard language counterparts. Covert prestige attaches to masculine, rough and tough qualities, whereas overt prestige, refined qualities as concerned with the cosmopolitan marketplace and its standard language.

2. Perspectives on CSs

Since Selinker (1972) introduced the notion of 'communication strategy', various definitions and taxonomies have been developed. CSs have been generally defined as systematic devices used by second language (SL) learners to express their intended

meanings when they have problems in SL communication because their communicative ends have outrun their communicative means (Bialystok, 1990; Corder, 1981; Dornyei, 1995; Jae-Hee Jin, 2000; Kocoglu, 1997; Stern, 1983).

According to the psycholinguistic perspective, CSs are viewed as the outcomes of an individual's inward cognitive processes to solve problems in planning or executing utterances. And therefore, in this perspective, the use of CSs is restricted to the idea of personal problem-solving activities for which a given interlocutor's help is not needed. The researchers with this perspective (Corder, 1981; Faerch & Kasper, 1980; Stern, 1983; Tarone, 1977) categorize the CSs into reduction (topic avoidance, message abandonment, and semantic reduction) or achievement strategies (substitution, circumlocution, word-coinage, literal translation, code switch, foreignizing, appeal for assistance, approximation, and repetition).

On the other hand, from the interactional perspective, CSs are regarded as reciprocal attempts to negotiate meaning when the meaning structure (linguistic and/or sociolinguistic structure) is not shared between a SL learner and a target language (TL) interlocutor in an interaction. And therefore, in this perspective, social aspects of communication are focused. Following the perspective, Tarone (1980, 1983) sorts the CSs into paraphrase (approximation, word coinage, and circumlocution), transfer (literal translation, language switch, appeal for assistance, and mime), or avoidance strategies (topic avoidance and message abandonment).

Then, Dornyei and Scott (1997) suggest CSs with a newer perspective which integrates the idea of learner-orientedness with the interactional perspective. With them, CSs are regarded as a conscious technique to be used for achieving the learners' communicative purposes. According to them, those learners who use CSs are conscious of their communication problems, and, by using the CSs intentionally, they can negotiate meaning with their interlocutors and achieve their shared understanding. The researchers group the CSs into three categories, i.e., direct, indirect, and interactional strategies. Specifically, to the direct strategies, 19 types belong: message abandonment, message reduction, message replacement, circumlocution, approximation, use of all-purpose words, word coinage, restructuring, literal translation, foreignizing, code switching, use of similar-sounding words, mumbling, omission, retrieval, mime, self-rephrasing, self-repair, and other-repair. To the interactional strategies, 10 types belong: appeals for help, comprehension check, own-accuracy check, asking for repetition, asking for clarification, asking for confirmation, guessing, expressing non-understanding, interpretive summary, responses. And to the indirect strategies, 4 types belong: use of fillers, repetitions, verbal strategy markers, and feigning understanding.

3. Gender Studies on CSs

The factors influencing the use of CSs have been found to be language users' proficiency, their cultural and learning background, their interlocutor's native language, and the nature of tasks (Bialystock, 1990; Chen, 1990; Mi-Yang Cha & Min-Jong Song, 2011; Paribakht, 1985). Then, can there be any differences in the use of CSs between males and females since the two genders have been believed different in their use of language?

Concerning this issue, some scholars (Conrad, 1991; Korabik, Baril, & Watson, 1993) do not believe that gender significantly impacts CSs at all. Specifically, Hongling (2010) explored gender effects on the use of CSs with 36 Chinese college students and found out that no significant effect was identified on the frequency and types of CS use between different genders. On the contrary, the findings of other gender studies on NSs (Edelsky, 1981; Fishman, 1983) and NNSs (Gass & Varonis, 1986; Pica, Holliday, Lewis, Berduci, & Newman, 1991; Wang, 1993) revealed that the gender of interlocutors have an important impact on the use of CSs, mostly females tending to use more strategies than males. Concretely, Hou (1998) showed female EFL learners tend to use more appeal for help strategies than the male counterparts in an interactional task since females are more field-dependent than males. Also, Wang (2008) found out that female learners use more code-switching strategies than males.

III. METHOD

1. Subjects

40 students from a Korean college participated in this study. The students, 20 males and 20 females, were all Korean, mostly belonging to the first year across various major fields of study. All of them shared some common features: age (around 20), monolingual (Korean), learning from the same instructional mode (the eclectic mode) and textbook, roughly the same period of learning English (8-10 years), placed at an intermediate level in their English proficiency, and the similar cultural and social background. All of them took an English class from the researcher in the spring semester, 2011 and volunteered for this research.

2. Instruments

In this study, three types of data-gathering methods were used – a questionnaire, a speaking task (an interview), and tape recordings. The questionnaire (See Appendix A) was

prepared to seek the participants' background information. As a speaking task, an interview (See Appendix B) was carried out. The questionnaire and the interview were both adopted from those used in the study of Mi-Yang Cha and Min-Jong Song (2011), because their contents each were appropriate to be used also for the present study. All the contents of the 40 interviews were tape recorded, and there was no rehearsal for the task performance.

3. Data Collection

The 40 subjects were divided into 20 (10 male-male and 10 female-female) pairs, with each pair consisting of 2 male (M) or 2 female (F) students. In each pair, two interviews took place and there were two tape recordings: one on an interview between M1 (interviewer) and M2 (interviewee), and the other between M2 (interviewer) and M1 (interviewee). To the female-female pair, the same cases applied. Like this, on the same interview, male-male and female-female speaking performances were compared between themselves. In each interview, mostly there was no extra elicitation of the interviewer besides the questions themselves, so most of the utterances were produced by the interviewee. 40 interviews took place in total and they were all tape recorded each at different times. The length of recorded time was on average 4 minutes. 40 recordings on 20 M-M and 20 F-F interviews were transcribed and used for analysis.

4. Data Analysis

Only the first three minutes of each interview were selected for analysis. Therefore, 120-minute interview in total was analyzed. In analysis, firstly CSs were identified in the transcribed utterances. To identify and categorize the types of CSs, Dornyei and Scott's (1997) classification system was adopted. In this study, of the total 33 types of CSs in the system, 18 were employed for the analysis (See Appendix C). Those 18 CS types the students used in 40 interviews were identified and quantified.

To ensure the reliability of the identification, two raters were invited. The two raters, who shared the same academic backgrounds (Ph. D. in English) and teaching experience periods (10 years) at a college level, independently identified the types of CSs and subsequently mediated their decisions. The inter-rater reliability has reached .97. Specifically, in case of direct strategies, it has reached .92, interactional strategies, .92, indirect strategies, .99, and in case of the total frequencies, .97. In all the analysis, an average point between the two raters was used.

Then, a comparison was made between the CSs used in the 20 M-M students' interviews and those in the 20 F-F students' interviews in terms of types and frequencies. For statistical analysis, a frequency analysis and t-test were carried out: For the category and

the most frequently-used 8 types of CSs, total frequency of use, mean, and standard deviation (SD) were calculated, and for the comparison of those items between the two genders, t-test was administered.

IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

1. Overall Use of CSs

The types and frequencies of CSs used by the Korean college students in the 40 interviews were examined, and a total of 18 types with 1842.50 occurrences were identified. The students used more CSs in M-M interaction (1000.50 occurrences-54.30%) than in F-F interaction (842.00 occurrences-45.70%), as illustrated in Table 1.

TABLE 1
Total Frequency of CS Use

CS Category	Types	Male-Male Interaction	Female-Female Interaction	Total
Direct Strategies	15	557.00 (55.67%)	484.50 (57.54%)	1041.50 (56.53%)
Interactional Strategies	1	4.50 (.45%)	5.00 (.59%)	9.50 (.51%)
Indirect Strategies	2	439.00 (43.88%)	352.50 (41.86%)	791.50 (42.96%)
Total	18	1000.50 (54.30%)	842.00 (45.70%)	1842.50 (100.00%)

Those identified 18 types were grouped into 3 categories (direct, interactional, and indirect strategies). Of the 3 categories, direct strategies were used the most (1041.50 occurrences-56.53%), indirect strategies the next (791.50 occurrences-42.96%) and interactional strategies the least (9.50 occurrences- .51%). This pattern of the use of CS categories occurred alike in both M-M and F-F paired interactions.

A frequency analysis was administered to find out the average frequency of CS categories those students used in their interviews. The results are summarized in Table 2. On average, direct strategies were used 26.04 times, interactional strategies, .24 times, and indirect strategies, 19.79 times. This means that the direct strategies were used most repetitively and the interactional strategies, the least repetitively in every interview. In

other words, the students tried to solve their communication problems most often with alternatives to the needed target language (TL) items, whereas they might have lacked to a great extent their cooperative skills in accomplishing the communications efficiently as intended. And the number of CS types used was on average 11.35 out of the total 18. This shows that although the students in this study possessed a wide repertoire of CSs, they seemed to use the same CSs repetitively and the others were used infrequently.

TABLE 2

Average Frequency of CS Use

CS Category	Mean	SD	Minimum Value	Maximum Value
Direct Strategies	26.04	6.56	13.50	44.00
Interactional Strategies	.24	.49	.00	2.00
Indirect Strategies	19.79	10.37	2.00	63.00
Types	11.35	1.59	9.00	15.00

n=40

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 34.30%, 632.00 occurrences of the total 1842.50. They were used 15.80 times on average, which was a much higher frequency than that of the other 17 types each. Following the use of fillers, message reduction (*M*=5.84), retrieval (*M*=4.20), repetitions (*M*=3.99), code switching (*M*=3.37), derivationally-related words (*M*=3.20), approximation (*M*=2.12), and literal translation (*M*=2.04) were also frequently used, that is, used more than 2 times in each interview. Of those most frequently-used ones, the first two were the use of fillers and message reduction. The reason for it can be speculated that as most of the participants in this study were not so proficient in English, they might have the most frequently taken actions to fill pauses, postpone, or to play for time at hard times so as to keep their communication going. And second most frequently, they might have cut down their message by avoiding the problematic structures or topics or by omitting some intended parts due to their deficient linguistic resources.

TABLE 3
Most Frequently-Used CS Types

CS Type	Occurrences	Mean	SD
Use of fillers	632.00 (34.30%)	15.80	9.75
Message reduction	233.50 (12.67%)	5.84	1.89
Retrieval	168.00 (9.11%)	4.20	2.65
Repetitions	159.50 (8.66%)	3.99	3.28
Code switching	135.00 (7.33%)	3.37	2.54
Derivationally-related words	128.00 (6.95%)	3.20	2.05
Approximation	85.00 (4.61%)	2.12	1.47
Literal Translation	81.50 (4.42%)	2.04	1.55

n=40

2. Comparison of CS Use between the Two Genders

A t-test was performed to compare the frequencies of the CS categories used in two paired (M-M and F-F) interactions and verify the significance of differences between the pairs. Table 4 shows that a little more number of CS types were used per case in M-M interactions than in F-F counterparts. In M-M interactions, 11.65 types were used on average, while an average of 11.05 types was used in F-F interactions. The difference between the two (0.6) was not statistically significant (p= .24). Accordingly, this shows that the students of both genders may use the same variety of CS types.

TABLE 4
Comparison of Average Frequency of CS Use between M-M/F-F Pairs

CS Category	Interaction	No. of Cases	Mean	SD	t	p
Direct Strategies	Male-Male	20	27.85	6.61	1.80	.08
	Female-Female	20	24.22	6.14		
Interactional Strategies	Male-Male	20	.22	.41	-.16	.88
	Female-Female	20	.25	.57		
Indirect Strategies	Male-Male	20	21.95	13.25	1.33	.19
	Female-Female	20	17.62	5.93		
Types	Male-Male	20	11.65	1.75	1.20	.24
	Female-Female	20	11.05	1.39		

p< .05

Concerning the category, direct strategies were used on average 27.85 times in M-M interactions and 24.22 times in F-F interactions, however, the difference between the two (3.63) was not statistically significant (t=1.80, p= .08). Also, there were no statistically significant differences in their use of both interactional (t= -.16, p= .88) and indirect strategies (t=1.33, p= .19). It would mean that the way those male students employed the strategies is much the same as that those female students used them. This result shows that Korean male and female students tend to use their communication strategies in the same way. That may be because Korean students, both males and females, have learned English in the same cultural and linguistic environment and have faced the similar kinds of communication problems. Also it may be because the gender variable has not been a major factor that could influence their choice of CSs greatly. Still it may be because if females and males are set in a similar context (in this case, data-gathering situation) to fulfill the same communicative task (an interview), much similarity will be found in their use of language as Hongling (2010) points out.

TABLE 5

Comparison of Most Frequently-Used CS Types between M-M/F-F Pairs

Types of CS	Interaction	Occurrences	Mean	SD	t	p
Use of fillers	Male-Male	340.00	17.00	12.58	.78	.44
	Female-Female	292.00	14.60	5.81		
Message reduction	Male-Male	124.50	6.22	1.96	1.30	.20
	Female-Female	109.00	5.45	1.79		
Retrieval	Male-Male	100.00	5.00	3.17	1.98	.05
	Female-Female	68.00	3.40	1.75		
Repetitions	Male-Male	99.00	4.95	3.79	1.92	.06
	Female-Female	60.50	3.02	2.40		
Code switching	Male-Male	57.50	2.87	2.20	-1.25	.22
	Female-Female	77.50	3.87	2.81		
Derivationally-related words	Male-Male	56.50	2.82	2.11	-1.16	.25
	Female-Female	71.50	3.57	1.97		
Approximation	Male-Male	49.50	2.47	1.27	1.53	.13
	Female-Female	35.50	1.77	1.59		
Literal Translation	Male-Male	38.00	1.90	1.26	- .55	.58
	Female-Female	43.50	2.17	1.82		

p< .05

The frequencies of each type use per case were also compared between the two pairs. Of

the 18 types, the most frequently-used 8 for both pairs are tabulated in Table 5. Of these 8, 5 types (use of fillers, reduction, retrieval, repetitions, and approximation) were more frequently used in M-M interactions, and the other 3 (code switching, derivationally-related words, and literal translation) in F-F counterparts. However, all the differences in the use of those 8 types were not statistically significant between the two genders. Additionally, even with the insignificant difference, the same phenomena occurred in the use of fillers and repetitions, that is, the students used a much greater number of those 2 types in male-male interactions than in female-female counterparts. Specifically, on average, M-M pairs used fillers 2.4 occurrences and repetitions 1.93 occurrences more than did F-F pairs. Viewing from this fact, it would seem that when facing communication problems, male students tend to come up with making an environment for mutual understanding between themselves with indirect strategies. And speculatively, that is because Korean males tend to be traditionally more taciturn than Korean females.

V. CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

To explore differences in the use of CSs between different genders, this study examined the CSs used by Korean college students when communicating in English with their same-gender peers. Major findings of the study are as follows.

Firstly, the students in this study used 11.35 types on average from the total 18, so they seemed not to know well enough how to use CSs variously, adopting some types (fillers, message reduction, retrieval, repetitions, code switching, derivationally-related words, approximation, and literal translation) repetitively and the others (message abandonment, topic avoidance, restructuring, circumlocution, use of all-purpose words, word-coinage, use of similar-sounding words, omission, self-rephrasing, appeal for help) infrequently. Accordingly, English instructors in the study setting hereafter need to spend more time and effort on teaching how to use the CSs with a variety, focused on the infrequently adopted ones, to those students. Then, this can help them acquire strategic competence, a component of CC in English.

Secondly, the students in this study used direct strategies most and interactional strategies least, which can mean that they didn't even try to interact with each other by constructing shared meaning together. Therefore, increasing the opportunities for student (NNS)-student (NNS) interactions has to be considered and administered in the English curriculum at the school setting. And teaching how to use the interactional strategies (appeal for help, comprehension check, own-accuracy check, asking for repetition, asking for clarification, asking for confirmation, and response confirmation) needs also to be seriously considered and administered. Then, these two moves may eventually contribute

to achieving those students' CC in English. Additionally, the male students in this study used more CSs in their same-gender dyads than the female students, which means more communication breakdowns might have occurred in M-M interactions. Therefore, in the classrooms, those instructors hereafter need to give their male students more opportunities to practice speaking with oral presentations and/or group leading.

Thirdly, the students of both genders in this study used their CSs in the same way, that is, both the male and the female students used the same variety of types, same categories, and almost the same frequencies, although many researchers have shown that males and females tend to use different languages. The reasons for this might be speculated that 1) all the participants, who were monolingual (Korean) and intermediate-level students in their English proficiency with the same English-learning period, learned English in the same cultural, linguistic, and instructional environment and faced the similar kinds of communication problems; 2) the gender variable was not a major factor that could influence their choice of CSs greatly as some researchers (Conrad, 1991; Hongling, 2010; Korabik et al., 1993) claim; 3) if males and females were set in a similar context (in this case, data-gathering situation) to fulfill the same communicative task (in this case, an interview), much similarity could be found in their use of language as Hongling (2010) points out .

Fourthly, the fact that the M-M pairs appeared to use much more indirect strategies like fillers and repetitions than the F-F pairs means that those male students have been customarily more taciturn. Therefore, repeatedly saying, more opportunities to practice speaking need to be given hereafter to the male students.

Finally, the limitations in this study can be pointed out in two respects: The number (40) of participants were not sufficient enough and different-gender (M-F) pairs were not included in collecting the data. So, for the following researches, more subjects need to participate and mixed-gender interactions should be involved for more certain results.

REFERENCES

Bialystok, E. (1990). *Communication strategies: A psychological analysis of second-language use.* Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

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

Chang, Bok-Myung. (2004). A critical analysis of communicative strategies among non-native English speakers. *Modern English Education, 5*(2), 173-195.

Chen, Si-Qing. (1990). A study of communication strategies in interlanguage production

by Chinese EFL learners. *Language Learning*, *40*(2), 155-187.

Colley, A., & Todo, Z. (2003). Gender linked differences in the style and content of Emails to friends. *Language in Society*, *32*(5), 381-391.

Conrad, C. (1991). Communication in conflict: Style-strategy relationships. *Communication Monographs, 58*(2), 135-155.

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.

Edelsky, C. (1981). Who's got the floor? *Language in Society, 10*(3), 383-421.

Erickson, B., Lind, A. E., Johnson, B. C., & O'Barr, W. M. (1978). Speech style and impression formation in a court setting: The effects of "powerful" and "powerless" speech. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 14*(3), 266-279.

Faerch, C., & Kasper, G. (1980). Processes and strategies in foreign language learning and communication. *Interlanguage Studies Bulletin, 5*(1), 47-118.

Fishman, P. (1983). Interaction: The work women do. In B. Thorne, C. Kramaere, & N. Henley (Eds.), *Language, gender and society* (pp. 89-110). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Foster, P., & Oath, A. S. (2005). Negotiation for meaning and peer assistance in second language classrooms. *Applied Linguistics, 26*(3), 402-430.

Freed, A. F. (2003). Reflections on language and gender research. In J. Holmes & M. Meyerhoff (Eds.), *The handbook of language and gender* (pp. 699-721). Oxford: Blackwell.

Gass, S. M., & Varonis, E. M. (1986). Sex differences in NNS/ NNS interactions. In R. Day (Ed.), *Talking to learn: Conversation in second language acquisition* (pp. 327-351). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Henley, N., & Kramarae, C. (1994). Gender, power, and miscommunication. In C. Roman, S. Juhasz, & C. Miller (Eds.), *The women and language debate: A sourcebook* (pp. 383-406). New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Hongling, L. (2010). Gender effect on the use of communication strategies. *English Language Teaching, 3*(4), 28-32.

Hou, Song-Shan. (1998). The effect of task and sex on the use of communication strategies. *The Journal of PLA of Foreign Language*, *6*, 20-25.

Jespersen, O. (1925). *Mankind, nation and individual: From a linguistic point of view.* London: Routledge.

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.

Kelley, R. H. (1996). Communication between men and women in the context of the Christian community. *Faith & Mission*, *Fall*, 1-7.

Kim, Ik-Hwan. (2007). The effects of gender difference upon language variation. *Modern English Education, 8*(1), 56-72.

Kocoglu, Z. (1997). *The role of gender on communication strategy use.* ERIC documentation No. 409 725. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, Orlando, FL.

Korabik, K., Baril, G., & Watson, C. (1993). Managers' conflict management style and leadership effectiveness: The moderating effects of gender. *Sex Roles, 29*(5), 405-418.

Lakoff, R. (1975). *Language and woman's place*. New York: Harper and Row.

Lakoff, R. (1990). *Talking power: The politics of language*. New York: Basics Books.

Mayo, M. P., & Pica, T. (2000). Interaction among proficient learners: Are input, feedback and output needs addressed in a foreign language context? *Studia Linguistica, 54*(2), 272-279.

Mulac, A. (1989). Men's and women's talk in same-gender and mixed-gender dyads: Power or polemics? *Journal of Language and Social Psychology, 8*(3-4), 249-270.

Paribakht, T. (1985). Strategic competence and language proficiency. *Applied Linguistics, 6*(2), 132-146.

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 and Literature Teaching, 9*(1), 83-129.

Pica, T., Holliday, L., Lewis, N., Berduci, D., & Newman, J. (1991). Language learning through interaction: What role does gender play? *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 13*(3), 343-376.

Pica, T., Lincoln-Porter, F., Paninos, D., & Linnell, J. (1996). Language learners' interaction: How does it address the input, output, and feedback needs of L2 learners? *TESOL Quarterly, 30*(1), 59-84.

Rosseti, P. (2005). *Gender differences in E-mail communication.* Retrieved December 20, 2005 from the World Wide Web: http://iteslj.org/Articles/Rossetti-GenderDif. html.

Samar, R. G.,, & Alibakhshi, G. (2007). The gender-linked differences in the use of linguistic strategies in face-to-face communication. *Linguistics Journal, 3*(3), 59-71.

Selinker, L. (1972). Interlanguage. *International Review of Applied Linguistics, 10*, 209-230.

Stern, H. H. (1983). *Fundamental concepts of language teaching*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Tannen, D. (1990). *You just do not understand: Women and men in conversation*. New

York: Ballantine.

Tannen, D. (1993). *Gender and conversational interaction.* Oxford: 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.

Trudgill, P. (1972). Sex, covert prestige, and linguistic change in the urban British English of Norwich. *Language in Society, 1*(2), 179-195.

Wang, H. S. (1993). *The role of gender in interactional learner communication strategies.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Wisconsin-Madison, Madison.

Wang, Li-Mei. (2008). The gender differences in the acquisition of communication strategies. *Foreign Language and Their Teaching*, *8*, 37-41.

APPENDIX A

The Participant's Background Information

1) What is your name? _____

2) What is your age? _____

3) What is your year? _____

4) What is your major field of study? _____

5) What is your sex? 1) male 2) female

6) What is your period of learning English at both public and private schools? _____

7) Have you ever studied in the English speaking countries? If yes, how long? _____

APPENDIX B

An Interview

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?

APPENDIX C

Types, Strategies, and Example Sentences

The 18 types employed in the study were categorized each into direct, indirect, or interactional strategies. Definitions of the strategies and the types each are provided together with an example extracted from the corpus. The name and the discourse sample of each type are demonstrated with underlined italics.

1) Direct Strategies

With direct strategies, the speaker tries to solve his/her communication problem with an alternative to the needed target language (TL) item. Most CS types belong to these and, in this study, 15 types were found.

(1) *Message abandonment* is to leave a message incomplete because of the lack of linguistic proficiency.

M 08: What good quality do you have?
M 16: Uhm, my good qualities is uh, honest, uh, uhm, *because uh, um, um, sorry*.

(2) *Message reduction* is to reduce a message by avoiding structures or topics which cause problems or by leaving out some intended parts because of deficient linguistic resources.

M 10: For long trips to Busan or wherever, do you prefer the train or bus, and why?
M 09: I like train, train is not filthy and *scenery through the window*.
[… and I can see the scenery through the window.]

(3) *Topic avoidance* is to totally avoid topics or concepts which raise linguistic difficulties.

M 18: What good quality do you have?
M 15: *Next* …

(4) *Restructuring* is to leave an intended message incomplete due to linguistic difficulties and instead deliver the incomplete part with an alternative.

F 16: For long trips to Busan or wherever, do you prefer the train or bus, and why?
F 02: Uh, I like train. *Train is uh, uh, I like, um, pung-kyeong*.
[Train is good for appreciating the scenery through windows.]

(5) *Circumlocution* is to show, explain, or describe the nature of the target object or action.

M 09: What kind of job do you want after you graduate? And why?
M 20: I teaching some student. … Uhm, my major piano, uh, … *Bang-mun-hae-seo, je-ga gae-in gyo-su, gae-in teaching*. (*I like to visit them personally and give them private teaching*.)
[I want to teach some students. My major is piano, and I want to work for home class.]

(6) *Approximation* is to use a replacement like a hypernym or a connected word, which has semantic features in common with the target word.

F 07: What good quality do you have?
F 01: I have big *sou, sound*. Big *sound* is happy for person.
[I have a big voice. A big voice makes other people happy.]

(7) *Use of all-purpose words* is to use general, meaningless words in a place where specific words are not known.

M 05: Do you prefer home cooking or restaurant food, and why?
M 06: Ahm, I prefer home cooking to restaurant food because more, not expensive and I don't know why but more healthy *and so on*, ya, just …
[… more healthy, more tasty, more familiar …]

(8) *Word-coinage* is to make up a non-existent target word by applying a supposed TL rule to an existent one.

M 7: Do you prefer home cooking or restaurant food?
M 8: I prefer restaurant food.
M 7: Why?
M 8: Because restaurant food is *the taster* than home cooking.
[Because restaurant food is more tasty than home cooking.]

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

F 08: Do you use the weekends to recharge your batteries or study? And why?
F 15: *I ... weekend, use, the rest* because just *rest is like*?
[I use the weekends to rest because I just like the rest.]

(10) *Code switching* is to return to FL in some part due to TL deficiency when speaking in TL.

F 12: What good quality do you have?
F 05: Um, I … *jal ji-kin, jal ji-kin-da*.. promise. [I keep my promise well.]

(11) *Use of similar-sounding words* is to replace a target word whose form or pronunciation the speaker is not sure of with one which sounds like the word.

F 15: What good quality do you have?
F 08: Um, I, uh, always *opposite*. I have, uh, happy virus. [I am always optimistic.]

(12) *Omission* is to leave a vacant spot when a given word is not known and continue to deliver the following words as if it has been spoken.

F 20: What good quality do you have?
F 14: Uh, I think I gives comfortable ... everybody. Everybody?
[… comfortable atmosphere to everybody.]

(13) *Retrieval* is to speak a series of incomplete or wrong words or structures before reaching an optimal word or structure.

F 03: What good quality do you have?
F 11: Um, *my, I'm, I did* my best and um, for everything.
[Um, I do my best for everything.]

(14) *Use of derivationally-related words* is to create incorrect words, which are etymologically connected to the correct ones in meaning or form.

F 09: What good quality do you have?
F 10: Um, uh, I think I am *honesty*.
[Um, uh, I think I am honest.]

(15) *Self-rephrasing* is to phrase an utterance again not exactly in the same way but by adding something up or paraphrasing.

F 11: Do you use the weekend to recharge your batteries or study? And why?
F 03: Uh, on the weekend, *I think rest day* uh, because um, uh, every day we study, um, study, so on the weekend *we take a rest*.
[…, I think it is a rest day, …, we need to take a rest.]

2) Interactional Strategies

With interactional strategies, the interlocutors try to work together in solving their communication problems and thereby reaching the communicative purposes successfully. In this study, only 1 type was found.

Appeal for help is to rely on the interlocutor for help by asking an explicit question about a necessary target word or expressing lack of it with a rising intonation and/or a pause.

F 19: For long trips to Busan or wherever, do you prefer the train or bus, and why?
F 20: Um, I prefer the train. *The bus is a long time for the …*
F 19: for the what? Your destination?
F 20: Ya, destination.

3) Indirect Strategies

With indirect strategies, the speaker tries to achieve his/her communicative purpose by making an environment for mutual understanding. In this study, 2 types were found.

(1) *Use of fillers* is to use gambits to fill pauses, delay, or to play for time at difficult times in order to keep the communication going.

F 05: What season of the year do you like best, and why?
F 12: *Umm, umm*, I like ..., *uh*, season of the year, *umm*, fall, because fall is cool.

(2) *Repetition* is to repeat an utterance shortly after it was spoken or to repeat something the interlocutor spoke to gain time.

M 06: What season of the year do you like best, and why?
M 05: Uhm, I like all season, um, *I like all season*, but I love winter.

Examples in: English
Applicable Languages: English
Applicable Levels: Tertiary

Min-Jong 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 10 June 2014
Revised 6 August 2014
Accepted 20 August 2014