



The Impact of Communication Strategy Training on WTC and Strategy Use

Hyona Park*

Keimyung University

Jaeseok Yang

Daegu National University of Education

ARTICLE INFO

Received: 8 March 2021

Revised: 15 April 2021

Accepted: 10 May 2021

Examples in: English

Applicable Languages: English

Applicable Levels: Tertiary

KEYWORDS

*willingness to communicate/
communication strategies/
strategy-based instruction/
college EFL students/*

의사소통의지/

의사소통전략/

전략기반교육/

대학영어학습자

ABSTRACT

Park, Hyona, & Yang, Jaeseok. (2021). The impact of communication strategy training on WTC and strategy use. *Modern English Education*, 22(2), 22-34.

The purpose of this research was to investigate the effects of communication strategy training on tertiary EFL students' willingness to communicate (WTC) and their strategy use. The experimental group received a 7-week intervention involving communication strategy-based training. Both quantitative and qualitative data, including self-report questionnaires on communication strategy and WTC, transcriptions of think-aloud protocols, strategy logs, and short memos, were collected. Pre- and post-oral communication tasks were given to measure changes in participants' actual use of CSs. Seven strategies, including code-switching, appeal for assistance, non-verbal expression, word coinage, avoidance, circumlocution, and approximation were introduced in a college language classroom setting. The results showed that the explicit communication strategy instruction had a positive impact on both WTC and strategy use. Specifically, there was a significant increase in the participants' use of four compensatory strategies, approximation, word-coinage, code-switching, and non-verbal expression, after seven weeks of CS training. The findings suggest that the students' increase in the use of four CSs was closely related to their increase of the awareness of the CSs. Therefore, raising learners' awareness of CSs, training them to apply the strategies, and providing opportunities for practice can enhance their communication abilities.

I. INTRODUCTION

In this global era, communication skill, particularly in English, is one of the critical elements for establishing interactive linkages among countries around the world as English is the primary language used as a medium in international communications (Jackson & Stockwell, 2011).

However, achieving oral proficiency in a foreign language can take a long time, and it is very difficult for many EFL learners to speak English fluently (Alderson & Bachman, 2004). Moreover, speaking a foreign language requires not only linguistic knowledge such as lexical and grammatical knowledge, but also pragmatic knowledge of the socio-cultural rules and discourse practices of the target

* First author: Hyona Park (Instructor), Corresponding author: Jaeseok Yang (Professor)

Hyona Park (Instructor)

Tabula Rasa College, Keimyung University, 1095, Dalgubeol-daero, Dalseo-gu, Daegu, 42601, Korea

Tel: (053) 580-6962 / Email: shalala14@gmail.com

Jaeseok Yang (Professor)

Department of English Education, Daegu National University of Education, 219, Jungang-daero, Nam-gu, Daegu, 42411, Korea

Tel: (053) 620-1426 / Email: yangjs@dnue.ac.kr

language (Canale & Swain, 1980).

Effective communication skill includes the ability to use the language appropriately in cross-cultural and cross-linguistic interactions (Shumin, 2002), which requires linguistic, sociolinguistic, rhetorical, and strategic competencies (Canale & Swain, 1980; Nunan & Bailey, 2009). According to Canale and Swain (1980), strategic competence involves the ability to use strategies to overcome communication problems resulting from lack of the other competences, especially linguistic. Non-native speakers sometimes feel frustrated when transfer of their intended meaning fails due to their linguistic deficiencies. Communication strategies (CSs henceforth) may be used to address such difficulties in conveying an intended meaning or purpose (Tarone, 2005). Therefore, the effective use of CSs is vital in EFL oral communications (Firth & Wagner, 1997), and it is important for teachers to teach EFL students communication strategies so that they can maintain conversations with interlocutors whatever their level of linguistic competence (Nakatani, 2005).

Some studies have provided positive evidence of the teachability of CSs and modified patterns of using CS (Faucette, 2001; Nakatani, 2005; Rossiter, 2003; Salomone & Marsal, 1997) and their role in oral proficiency (Dornyei, 1995). However, the impact of CS training on learners' willingness to communicate has not been tested. Thus, present study is an examination of the effects of CS training not only on the use of CSs by Korean EFL students, but also on their willingness to communicate in the target language.

II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

1. Communication Strategies

Coined by Selinker in 1972, the term "Communication Strategies" generally refers to linguistic approaches or devices that language learners can readily employ to reach particular communicative goals and to overcome linguistic deficiencies or problems in interlanguage communication (Dornyei & Scott, 1997; Mei & Nathalang, 2010; Mesgarshahr & Abdollahzadeh, 2014; Sukirlan, 2014). However, scholars have discussed CSs without a consensus on a rigorous definition (Mei & Nathalang, 2010). In the present study, CS is defined as "a conscious attempt to communicate the learner's thought when the interlanguage structures are inadequate to convey that thought" (Hua et al., 2012, p. 834). In other words, CSs are particular tactics that language learners employ to maintain and improve the effectiveness of active communication (Brett, 2001).

Cervantes and Rodriguez (2012) describe CSs as "a mutual attempt of two interlocutors to agree on a meaning in situations in which they do not share the requisite [linguistic] meaning structures" (p. 114). They identify such strategies for bridging the communication gap between an L2 learner and his/her interlocutor as approximation, non-verbal expression, and circumlocution.

Several scholars (Cervantes & Rodriguez, 2012; Faerch & Kasper, 1984; Hua et al., 2012) classify CSs as either achievement or reduction strategies. Achievement strategies allow language learners to pursue their communication through an alternative plan using the linguistic resources that are available (Cervantes & Rodriguez, 2012; Hua et al., 2012). They consist of compensatory strategies and retrieval strategies, including word coinage, code-switching, interlingual transfer, paraphrasing, approximation, circumlocution, appeal for assistance, and time-gaining maneuvers.

In contrast, reduction strategies entail giving up the original communication goal without solving the communication problem (Cervantes & Rodriguez, 2012; Hua et al., 2012). Reduction strategies include meaning replacement, message abandonment, and topic avoidance. Of the specific strategies mentioned above, seven strategies, including code-switching, appeal for assistance, non-verbal expression, word coinage, avoidance, circumlocution, and approximation, were introduced in a college language classroom setting as will be further discussed in later sections. Except for avoidance, all of the strategies are considered as achievement strategies.

With regard to the frequency of uses of CSs, Hua et al. (2012) found that code switching was most frequently used by low proficiency learners, and self-repair by high proficiency learners, and both used word coinage the least. Sukirlan (2014), however, found that circumlocution was the most frequently used CS, pointing out that is a particularly efficient not only for bridging gaps in communication but also for maintaining the flow of conversation. Sukirlan also found that word coinage was used the least by the language learners. In a pre- and post-test study, Teng (2012) also found that in the pre-test, circumlocution was the most frequently used and word coinage the least frequent strategy. In the post-test, however, appeal for assistance was the most frequently used strategy and word coinage remained the least used. Across these three studies, the only consistent finding was that word coinage was marked as the least frequently used strategy.

2. Studies of Teaching Communication Strategies (CSs)

The effectiveness of teaching CSs has been the subject of controversy (J. Han & K. Lee, 2012; Mesgarshahr & Abdollahzadeh, 2014). Many scholars (Brett, 2001; Cervantes & Rodriguez, 2012; Dornyei, 1995; Dornyei & Thurrell, 1991; Ellis, 1984; Faucette, 2001; Maleki, 2007; Sukirlan, 2014; Tarone, 1984; Teng, 2012) advocate for the teaching CSs. In particular, Faucette (2001) has described CSs as devices that "empower students to participate in communication by helping them to not give up in the conversation" (p. 27) and emphasized language teachers' responsibility to provide students with such tools. Referring to the positive outcomes of previous studies (Dornyei & Thurrell, 1991, 1994; Faerch & Kasper, 1983, 1984; Tarone & Yule, 1989; Willems, 1987) Maleki (2007)

concludes, “CS teaching is conducive to the development of strategic competence” (p. 585).

However, some scholars do not advocate teaching CSs but put more weight on the underlying cognitive processes of learning languages, including many similarities between L1 and L2 learning. According to Faucette (2001) and Maleki (2007), Bialystok (1990) expressed negative opinions about teaching CSs, stating, “what one must teach students of a language is not strategy, but language” (p. 147). Cervantes and Rodriguez (2012) discussed a similar perspective on teaching CSs, arguing that most adult language learners at all levels of proficiency are already aware of how to use CSs in their L1. Thus, if the language learners do not feel differences in cognitive processes between L1 and L2, teaching CSs is meaningless (Kellerman, 1991), because the language learners are already fluent in using CSs in their L1. Thus Bialystok (1990) and Kellerman (1991) emphasize the importance of teaching the language itself rather than strategies for negotiating insufficiencies.

Despite the controversy, CSs have been discussed from a pedagogical perspective (Faucette, 2001; Maleki, 2007) as a legitimate aspect of language instruction. However, given that many language teachers are not well-prepared to teach CSs, a topic often not included in training programs (Cervantes & Rodriguez, 2012), there is a need for research on CSs and related pedagogical issues, including the role of CS instruction in language education. The current study is a quantitative investigation of the impact of teaching CSs on young adult EFL learners’ Willingness to Communicate (WTC henceforth), and qualitative exploration of learners’ perspectives on the seven strategies taught in the intervention.

3. Willingness to Communicate (WTC)

Li (2005) has identified willingness to communicate as a significant factor affecting foreign language communication skills. Derived from the concept of unwillingness to communicate (Burgoon, 1976), the notion of WTC was conceptualized by McCroskey and Baer (1985), McCroskey and Richmond (1987) and McCroskey (1992) with regard to L1 communication (Li, 2005; MacIntyre et al., 1998). MacIntyre et al. (1998) borrow McCroskey and Baer’s (1985) conceptualization of WTC as “the probability of engaging in communication when free to choose to do so,” adding that WTC reflects “the stable predisposition” to initiate communication in given situations (p. 546). While MacIntyre (2007) and MacIntyre et al. (1998) consider WTC a personality trait rather than a variable dependent upon situations, Mesgarshahr and Abdollahzadeh (2014) describe WTC as “a dynamic system changing from moment to moment” (p. 54, referenced from MacIntyre & Legatto, 2011).

Factors that MacIntyre et al. (1998) claim influence WTC include communication apprehension, perceived communication competence, introversion-extraversion, and self-esteem, and so forth. Mesgarshahr and Ab-

dollahzadeh (2014) focus on two of these as the most immediate precursors of WTC: communication apprehension and self-perceived communicative competence. Li (2005) and Yashima et al. (2004), furthermore, discuss MacIntyre’s (1994) notion that WTC is a combination of self-perceived communicative competence and communication apprehension.

Mesgarshahr and Abdollahzadeh (2014) explain communication apprehension is “an individual’s level of fear or anxiety associated with either real or anticipated communication with another person or persons” (p. 54; cited in Burroughs et al., 2003, p. 231). The anxiety generally comes from language learners’ experience and negatively affects their self-perceived communication competence, which makes them reluctant to communicate and over time hinders the development of their communication skills in given situations (Li, 2005).

Self-perceived communicative competence refers to language learners’ perceptions of their competence as communicators (Burroughs et al., 2003). Whereas perceiving themselves as competent encourages learners to interact with others and thereby develop communication skill, according to Mesgarshahr and Abdollahzadeh (2014), perceiving themselves as lacking competence makes learners, regardless of their actual level of competence, reluctant to communicate and prefer to remain silent.

MacIntyre et al. (1998) investigate WTC in L1 and L2 separately and discover that WTC in L2 is manifested differently from L1, (referenced from Charos, 1994). Based on McCroskey and Baer’s (1985) conceptualization, they define WTC in L2 communication as “a readiness to enter into discourse at a particular time with a specific person or persons, using a L2” (p. 546) and argue that an appropriate goal of L2 education is “to create WTC” (p. 547), that is, develop language learners’ willingness to seek out communication opportunities. Therefore, this present study sheds light on whether and how L2 education encourages the development of college language learners’ WTC.

4. Strategy-Based Instruction (SBI)

There are three representative models of strategy-based instruction (SBI henceforth) (Cohen & Weaver, 2006). First, Pearson and Dole’s (1987) 5-step model, including teacher modeling, guided practice, consolidation, independent practice, and application, provides a structure for teaching strategy use. Teachers introduce and demonstrate the use of target strategies, following which learners apply the strategies to new learning situations through guided exercises. Oxford, et al. (1990) proposed a 7-step model comprising language activity, discussion of strategy use, expansion of strategy repertoire, strategy practice, strategy transfer, strategy practice with new tasks, and evaluating strategy use. This model highlights raising awareness and monitoring and the strategies used by learners during language activities in the early stages. Finally, Chamot et al. (2003) suggested a model involving preparation, presentation, practice, evaluation, and expansion. The aim of

all three of these models is to increase learners' autonomy through explicit strategy training. Nonetheless, they have noteworthy differences. The first model (Pearson & Dole, 1987) focuses more on teacher modeling and learner practice, while the second model (Oxford et al., 1990) focuses on raising learners' strategic awareness but might include too many steps and activities to fit into a 50-minute class. The third model (Chamot et al., 2003) was chosen for this study because of its emphasis on both learners' awareness of strategy use and the application of CS training, which was in accordance with the existing EFL syllabus.

This study examined not only the impact of CS training on Korean EFL students' use of communication strategy and their willingness to communicate, but also their actual use of CS in the oral performance after the CS training. This study is guided by the following research questions:

- 1) How does explicit CS training affect EFL students' use of CSs and their willingness to communicate?
- 2) What communication strategies do two focal participants exhibit before and after the EFL lessons with CS training? How have these participants' uses of CSs changed after the intervention?

III. METHODOLOGY

1. Participants

The participants in this study were 51 college freshmen in South Korea who at the time of data collection were enrolled in a required EFL conversation course, including 19 (37.3%) males and 32 (62.7%) females. On a preliminary survey to gather the students' background information, most rated their proficiency in speaking English as intermediate. About two thirds (33) of the students had started to learn English as a foreign language before the age of nine, which meant they had started at least by the third grade. Twenty-nine were majoring in science education majors and twenty-two in physical education. Also, two focal participants were selected for qualitative investigation of the effectiveness of CS training. They were chosen based on their levels of English speaking proficiency. They were one male and one female. While the male student had beginner proficiency, the female student had advanced proficiency. These students participated in both the quantitative and qualitative procedures of the study.

2. Procedures

For the CS training, Chamot et al.'s (2003) SBI model involving preparation, presentation, practice, evaluation, and expansion was used. Each weekly communication strategy was introduced in the preparation and presentation phases. In the preparation phase, the researcher, who was in charge of CS training, tried to stimulate the students' background knowledge of the strategies by asking them

about experiences of using certain strategy. After that, the researcher introduced the new strategy for each week in the presentation phase. To present the strategy explicitly, the researcher clearly stated the name of the strategy, explained how to use it and when to use it, modeled it, and explained its importance as Chamot et al. (2003) suggested. Moreover, by giving the students specific examples of using the strategy, the researcher helped them to understand the use of the strategy.

In the practice phase, the students had opportunities to practice the strategy in the classroom. In a group of four or five, they were given a task (a conversation topic for each week) and each group member took turns to talk about the conversation topic for one or two minutes. As evaluation, the students had times to reflect their individual usage of each strategy in the strategy log. There were some questions, which made the students reflect themselves when using each strategy in the strategy log. The questions included "How much do you think the strategy you learned today fit you?", "What was difficult thing in using the strategy?" and "What was easy point in using the strategy?"

Finally, as expansion, they were asked to keep practicing the strategy for the rest of the week and record their usage in strategy logs. In the strategy log, some questions including "What are some situations in which you can apply the strategy you learned today?", "How can you use the strategy you learned today over the next week?", and "How did you feel when using the strategy outside of the classroom?" were listed. The researcher asked the students to use each strategy outside of the classroom and to answer those questions after using the strategy for a week in order to make sure the students applied the expansion phase in their daily lives.

3. Communication Strategies Introduced in the Course

The seven strategies, including code-switching, appeal for assistance, non-verbal expression, word coinage, avoidance, circumlocution, and approximation, are explained in Table 1.

4. Quantitative and Qualitative Data Collection Procedures

One of the researchers taught the strategy based EFL class for 7 weeks. Prior to the 7-week data collection period, the participants received approximately the same instruction. After the data collection began, CS training was offered for the last 7 weeks, which involved the introduction of target strategies and practice with one strategy each week. Before the data collection began, the participants were asked to fill out WTC and CS questionnaires; after the data collection, they completed the same questionnaires.

Qualitative data collection was initiated at the beginning of the data collection. At that time, the researchers

TABLE 1
Weekly Target Strategies and Tasks

Week	Communication Strategy	Descriptions	Tasks (Conversation topics)
1	Code-Switching	The students were allowed to use Korean when speaking in English, when they lacked knowledge of English vocabulary or grammar to understand or express themselves. That is, they could code-switch to Korean words or phrases when encountering communication problems in English. (For example, they can say “I saw <i>벚꽃</i> last week. It was so pretty.”)	What kinds of a teacher do I want to be? Why?
2	Appeal for Assistance	To maintain the flow of communication, the students could ask for assistance with such expressions as “What is this?” or “Do you know how to say this in English?” in either English or Korean. Also, the students could ask for assistance indirectly by using eye contacting.	Four different illustrations were provided to each small group. Each group member described one picture to the other group members with and appealed for assistance when encountering problems.
3	Non-Verbal Expression	The students practiced using mime, gestures, facial expressions, imitative sounds, or manipulation of objects rather than verbal expression in either English or Korean.	The same task as that given for the appeal for assistance strategy.
4	Word Coinage and Alternative Phrasing	When encountering difficulty in delivering messages in English because of lack of proper vocabulary, the learners could create alternative words or phrases based on the morphological rules of English. (For example, if they lacked the word “veterinarian” they could say “animal doctor.”)	Tell us about your best friends. Describe your memorable experiences with them, and why you are especially fond of them.
5	Syntactic/ Lexical/ Topic Avoidance	The learners were allowed to avoid using words/structures or talking about the topics or concepts, which they found difficult to discuss for linguistic reasons.	Tell us about yourself! What do you usually do in your free time? What do you usually like to eat? What else do you like? What else can you share about yourself?
6	Circumlocution	With circumlocution, students could use descriptive words and phrases to convey their meaning when they lacked a specific term in English. (For example, when they want to express a word “scissor,” they can say “you know, the thing you cut something like paper, fabric, and so on.”)	Students were given an imaginary situation and asked to describe how they would fix problems they found in it using circumlocution strategy.
7	Approximation	Approximation involved substituting a target language vocabulary item or structure, which had similar semantic features with the intended item. (For example, they could use a word “sailboat” when they wanted to express “ship.”)	Two tasks: The first was to describe how to make their favorite food and the second was to tell what their three wishes would be if they met the genie of the magic lamp.

met with the two focal participants first to engage in casual conversation with them and then to have them complete a think-aloud task, which involved a task describing pictures they were given in English, while the researchers noted whether and what CSs they employed before the CS training began. After each had finished describing, the researchers asked such questions as “What were you thinking when you describe this?”, “Why did you switch between Korean and English?”, or “Why did you pause when you describe this?” Then the researchers conducted a brief interview to elicit the participants’ personal English histories, their perceptions of learning English, and their feelings about doing the think-aloud task.

The researchers and focal participants met a second

time after the CS training was completed. At this time, the participants were asked to the same task while the researchers noted their uses of CSs when speaking in English. Then, they were interviewed to determine any changes in their perceptions of CSs and learning English after the intervention. With the focal participants’ permission, all the procedures of both think-aloud protocols were recorded for analysis.

Additional qualitative data were collected from all students in the experimental group. Upon completion of each CS training, students in the experimental group write a short memo about the CS they learned for the day. Also, as requested by the researcher/instructor, they kept strategy logs to record their uses of each week’s CS. In addition,

the researchers' observations when the students were practicing CSs in the classroom provided qualitative data.

IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

1. Willingness to Communicate

A paired-samples *t*-test was employed to investigate the experimental participants' changes in degree of WTC between the pre-and post-instruction. As shown in Table 2, the mean score of WTC before the CS training was 6.96 (*SD*=1.98) while that of WTC after the CS training was 7.58 (*SD*=1.32). The *t*-test results showed a statistically significant increase in the level of WTC between the pre-and post-CS training ($t=-3.33, p=.002$).

TABLE 2
Comparison of WTC

<i>n</i> =51	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Pre-test	6.96	1.98	-3.33	.002
Post-test	7.58	1.32		

** $p < .01$

This finding implies that the CS training influenced the participants' affective factors such as self-confidence and anxiety, both of which are closely related to WTC (Peng & Woodrow, 2010). That is, using such compensation strategies as code switching and non-verbal expression might have increased participants' self-perceived communicative competence and lowered their anxiety. Thus, the participants became more willing to communicate in English as they perhaps learned strategies for coping with communicative difficulties due to limited proficiency.

Also, their broadened repertoire of compensation strategies may have influenced them affectively by lowering their communication apprehension and encouraging them to speak up in the communication practices. As the male focal student stated in the second interview,

I haven't had a chance to use the strategies in a real conversation with native speakers, but the fact that I know those strategies makes me less anxious because I know what to do.

[The male focal participant, the second interview]

2. Communication Strategies

1) The Most and Least Frequently Used CSs

As shown in Table 3, the five CS which were used the most frequently before the CS training were appeal for assistance ($M=4.08, SD=.66$), non-verbal expression ($M=3.78, SD=.95$), syntactic avoidance ($M=3.67, SD=1.24$), lexical avoidance ($M=3.63, SD=1.08$), and approximation ($M=3.47, SD=.95$). In contrast, approximation was never

TABLE 3
CS Uses before Training

	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Appeal for assistance	4.08	.659
Non-verbal expression	3.78	.945
Syntactic avoidance	3.67	1.244
Lexical avoidance	3.63	1.076
Approximation	3.47	.946
Circumlocution	3.41	.942
Code-switching	2.76	1.176
Topic avoidance	2.61	1.218
Word coinage/Alternate phrasing	2.16	.925

used by the participants in Cervantes and Rodriguez's (2012) and Surkirlan's (2014) studies. However, avoidance and appeal for assistance were two of the most frequently used strategies in Surkirlan's (2014) study, even though the most frequent one was circumlocution. To use the avoidance strategy, most students answered that they employed such phrases as "I'm sorry, next," or "hmmm..."

In the first think-aloud protocol, it was also observed that both focal participants frequently used appeal for assistance. However, there was a difference in tendency between two participants. The male focal participants whose proficiency was beginner applied appeal for assistance indirectly. When he encountered communicative difficulty, he was confirmed if the interlocutor understood what he meant by constantly doing eye contact and checking the interlocutor, and kept the flow of the conversation; however, he rarely used the expression "signaling direct appeal" (Sukirlan, 2014, p. 2037) like "What is this in English?" Later, he answered the reason why he did not ask for assistance directly was because he could not signal direct appeal whenever he was not sure that his intention was delivered correctly. In sum, the purposes of his indirect appeal for assistance were both confirmation and keeping the conversational flow.

The female focal participant also used indirect appeal for assistance, but as she had advanced English proficiency, her tendency differed from his. Encountering expressions or vocabulary that she did not know in English, she indirectly appealed for assistance through eye contact with the interlocutor, if silently asking for the expressions or vocabulary needed for delivering her message. On the other hand, if the expressions or vocabulary were not important in context, she applied avoidance, instead of applying appeal for assistance indirectly, to maintain the flow of communication. In the use of both appeal for assistance and avoidance strategies, the goal of both focal participants was to keep the conversational flow.

On the other hand, the three CSs which were used the least frequently before the CS training were word coinage ($M=2.16, SD=.93$), topic avoidance ($M=2.61, SD=1.22$),

and code-switching ($M=2.76, SD=1.18$). As briefly stated earlier, Surkirlan (2014) also found that word coinage was one of the least frequently used communication strategies.

The interview with the focal participants helped to infer the reason that some of the CSs were selected as the least frequently used ones. In the second interview, both focal participants shared their perception that code-switching would not be as efficient as other CSs in communication with English native speakers because the interlocutors may not comprehend code in Korean. Also, word-coinage was used less frequently than other strategies. Even though they perceived it as a useful tactics to overcome communicative difficulties, the participants found it more difficult to use in actual conversation because they required more lexical fluency, as they needed to coin new words. The female focal student observed in the second interview,

I know it would be useful to create new words or say it in a different way when I feel frustrated in a conversation. However, I rarely use these strategies because I want to use other ways that are simpler and easier.

[The female focal participant, the second interview]

In terms of topic avoidance, the two focal participants rejected the strategy but had different ideas. The female focal participant stated that it could be impolite to avoid the conversation topic when encountering communicative difficulty, particularly with an interlocutor with whom one has less intimacy. Also, she would not want the interlocutor to think her English proficiency was not good enough for her to discuss the topic. However, the male focal participant's reason for rejecting the strategy reflected his attitude toward taking on communication challenges. In the second interview he said,

It is not that you could be fluent in speaking with any other conversation topic. If I just avoid this topic, I will still be silent in other topics, because I am not able to talk actively about them.

[The male focal participant, the second interview]

It is notable that their reasons for avoiding using topic avoidance were different depending on their language proficiency.

It was also noteworthy that the female focal student, who had higher language proficiency, used CSs selectively and blended CSs in her English communications. For example, she first used the Korean term Tteok-bbok-kki in her English communication. Then, when an interlocutor could not understand her code-switching, she blended in other CSs such as circumlocution and approximation to reach her communicative goal and to maintain the flow of the communication. In other words, she selected CSs that suited certain situations and used alternatives when necessary. In the second interview, she explained her use of CSs as follows:

When doing the CS training, it was a little bit hard to communicate using only one CS, so I blended other CSs during the conversation. So, it would be helpful for me to use several CSs. I didn't have to practice them one by one. Some CSs could be new to me, but I could use some without realizing it. I would not think that "this is the strategy" when using it, and I would naturally use several strategies simultaneously.

[The female focal participant, the second interview]

Strategies can be combined to make communications more effective depending on the given context, such as the learner's experience or language proficiency. Specifically metacognitive strategies are reported to be clustered with other strategies or used consecutively (N. Kim, 2011; 2012). The female focal participant could use metacognition-driven strategy clusters effectively based on her linguistic experience and high language proficiency.

Here, it was noticeable that she considered interpersonal and intrapersonal factors in choosing strategies. The interpersonal factors include the level of intimacy with the interlocutor and the interlocutor's knowledge of Korean; her intrapersonal factor included her language proficiency and how she presented it. As Mesgarshahr and Abdollahzadeh (2014) observe, "CSs help learners achieve a higher perception of their communicative competence" (p. 62).

2) Pre- and Post- Instruction Changes in the Uses of CSs

A paired-samples *t*-test was used to examine whether there was a significant difference in the participants' uses of CS between pre- and post-instruction. The result as shown in Table 4 shows that the average of CS use was 3.12 ($SD=.54$) before the training and 3.31 ($SD=.50$) after the training, indicating a statistically significant increase in the frequency of CS use ($t=-2.93, p=.005$).

TABLE 4
Uses of CS Between Pre- and Post-Training

	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Pre-test	51	3.12	.54	-2.93	.005
Post-test	51	3.31	.50		

As shown in Table 5, five items (lexical avoidance, approximation, word coinage/alternate phrasing, code-switching, non-verbal expression) showed significant change between pre- and post-training. The frequency of four strategies (approximation, word coinage/alternate phrasing, code-switching, non-verbal expression) showed the significant increase. However, the use of lexical avoidance decreased because they became able to use compensatory strategies such as code-switching or non-verbal expression, so avoidance naturally became less necessary. In the follow-up interview, the male focal participant men-

TABLE 5
Changes Between Pre- and Post-Training

	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i> (2-way)
Syntactic avoidance	.216	1.222	1.261	.213
Lexical avoidance	.588	1.268	3.314	.002
Topic avoidance	.020	1.273	.110	.913
Circumlocution	-.294	1.316	-1.596	.117
Approximation	-.569	1.100	-3.691	.001
Word coinage/Alternate phrasing	-.490	1.317	-2.658	.011
Code-switching	-.451	1.346	-2.392	.021
Non-verbal expression	-.490	.987	-3.545	.001
Appeal for assistance	-.039	.799	-.350	.727

tioned about the decrease of lexical avoidance as follows:

Sometimes, it was just difficult to avoid certain words that I didn't know, but it was easy to just say the words in Korean. And because I knew the interlocutor was Korean, when I encountered some words that I didn't know in English, I just said the words in Korean. Also, because it was not as if I could use only one strategy. I used other ones while using the avoidance strategy.

[The male focal participant, the second interview]

Perhaps because the students had previous learning experience with code-switching and non-verbal expression before the CS lessons, they used them naturally, as confirmed through the significant increase of code-switching, and non-verbal expression.

Furthermore, as the students' awareness of some CSs increased and they practiced them, their uses of the CSs also developed. The students were not aware of some CSs such as word coinage, code-switching, and non-verbal expression as communication strategies. Moreover, using approximation and word coinage/alternate phrasing, the students were able to perceive that the flow of conversation need not be limited by their own vocabulary knowledge at that time. Some students were not confident of coining words at first. However, as they perceived that the flow of communication continued by practicing word-coinage and approximation strategies, the use of these strategies increased.

Likewise, many students did not perceive code-switching and non-verbal expression as CSs, and some seemed surprised and confused. For example, the male focal participant expressed his confusion in the second interview. However, as they became aware that those CSs helped them maintain the flow of a conversation and solve their communicative difficulties and practiced them, their uses of them increased. In the second interview, the male focal participant commented on how he had internalized the use of CSs:

When practicing, sometimes I thought about using CSs before saying sometimes, but sometimes after I finished saying something in English, I thought, 'I used this strategy.'

[The male focal participant, the second interview]

Conscious or unconscious use of strategies also could reduce their apprehension in future English communications. In terms of non-verbal expression, some students already understood that body language could be used to alleviate their communicative problems but were not aware that it could work as a CS. With awareness, the students were able to incorporate the non-verbal strategy in their English communication, even though some students expressed difficulty becoming accustomed to it.

This study shows that once the learners became aware of each CS, they started to practice it, so it eventually ameliorated their communication difficulties, confirming Mesgarshahr and Abdollahzadeh's (2014) finding that "CSs make learners feel less communication apprehension" (p. 62). Hence, training that raises learners' awareness of CSs and strengthens their applications of them through practice may have positive impact on their communicative competence and willingness to communicate. For example, once they are aware that appeal for assistance is a communication strategy, learners can be trained to use standardized expressions, such as "What is this in English?" and "How do you say this in English?" Therefore, this study demonstrates that raising learners' awareness of CSs, training them to apply the strategies, and providing opportunities for practice can enhance their communication abilities.

V. CONCLUSION

This study examines the effects of explicit training of seven CSs on EFL students' willingness to communicate (WTC) and their strategy use. With respect to the increase of their willingness to communicate after the CS instruction, the participants had the chance to learn new coping

strategies to address communicative breakdowns so that they could find themselves more confident about how to maintain L2 communication. In this sense, CS instruction makes them feel more secure and contributes to their level of willingness to communicate in L2. Furthermore, based on the most and least frequently used CSs before and after the seven weeks of CS training, a significant increase in the use of four communication strategies was found, including approximation, word-coinage, code-switching, and non-verbal expression. Known as resource deficit-related strategies (Dorneyi & Scott, 1997), these are also reported to be used frequently by L2 learners (Pornpibul, 2005; Wongsawang, 2001). Such strategies allowed them to compensate for their limited linguistic deficiency. Another possible reasons for change during the training were probed through pre- and post-interviews featuring think-aloud protocols with two focal participants, which indicated that the increase in the use of these four CSs was closely related to the learners' increased awareness of them, and that the CS practices of the focal participants were similar to uses by all participants.

However, effectiveness of the seven-week of the CS training needs to be verified more thoroughly in terms of the extended duration of CS training. This is because the seven-week CS training period might not have been long enough for them to practice applying the CSs as their own. Although they were constantly encouraged to use the CSs outside of the classroom, they would have difficulty doing so because in their linguistic environment, English was a foreign language, rarely used in daily communications, as indicated by male focal participant's testimony in the second interview. For future studies, therefore, it is recommended that the CS training should be taught for a longer period to investigate the effectiveness of CS training more accurately.

To ensure that students have opportunities to apply the CSs outside of the classroom, they may be given specific assignments to practice them in their L1, especially as this study demonstrated the importance of increasing awareness of the CSs. This approach, focusing on the characteristics of each CS, would enable students to internalize their use prior to immersion in English speaking environments and their application of the strategies in their L2. In that way, more explicit effectiveness of the CS training can be shown in the future studies. For example, syntactic/lexical avoidance and appeal for assistance were frequently used by the two focal participants when speaking in their L2, as they had already used them in their L1, suggesting they had transferred them. However, they had not used other CSs, such as code-switching and word coinage, so these were not available for transfer from L1 to L2. Thus, being explicitly assigned to practice specific novel CSs in their L1 may prepare students to transfer them to their L2. Through such an approach, the efficacy of teaching CSs could be enhanced so as to "empower students to participate in communication by helping them to not give up in the conversation" (Faucette, 2001, p. 27).

REFERENCES

- Alderson, J., & Bachman, L. (2004). Preface. In S. Luoma (Ed.), *Assessing speaking* (pp. ix-xi). Cambridge University Press.
- Bialystok, E. (1990). *Communication strategies: A psychological analysis of second language use*. Blackwell.
- Brett, A. G. (2001). Teaching communication strategies to beginners. *Language Learning Journal*, 24(1), 53-61.
- Burgoon, J. K. (1976). The unwillingness to communicate scale: Development and validation. *Communication Monographs*, 43(1), 60-69.
- Burroughs, N. F., Marie, V., & McCroskey, J. C. (2003). Relationships of self-perceived communication competence and communication apprehension with willingness to communicate: A comparison with first and second languages in Micronesia. *Communication Research Reports*, 20(3), 230-239.
- Canale, M., & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics*, 1(1), 1-47.
- Cervantes, C. A. R., & Rodriguez, R. R. (2012). The use of communication strategies in the beginner EFL classroom. *Gist Education and Learning Research Journal*, 6, 111-128.
- Chamot, A. U., Anstrom, K., Bartoshesly, A., Belanger, A., Delett, J., Karwan, V., & Keatley, C. (2003). *The elementary immersion learning strategies resource guide*. NCRLC. <https://carla.umn.edu/immersion/documents/eils-guide.pdf>
- Charos, C. (1994). *Personality and individual differences as predictors of second language communication: A causal analysis*. Unpublished Honors Thesis, University of Ottawa, Canada.
- Cohen, A. D., & Weaver, S. J. (2006). *Styles- and strategies-based instruction: A teachers' guide*. Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press.
- Dorneyi, Z. (1995). On the teachability of communication strategies. *TESOL Quarterly*, 29(1), 55-84.
- Dorneyi, Z., & Scott, M. L. (1997). Communication strategies in a second language: Definitions and taxonomies. *Language Learning*, 47(1), 173-210.
- Dorneyi, Z., & Thurrell, S. (1991). Strategic competence and how to teach it. *ELT Journal*, 45(1), 16-23.
- Dorneyi, Z., & Thurrell, S. (1994). Teaching conversational skills intensively: Course content and rationale. *ELT Journal*, 48(1), 40-49.
- Ellis, R. (1984). Communication strategies and the evaluation of communicative performance. *ELT Journal*, 38(1), 39-44.
- Faerch, C., & Kasper, G. (1983). Plans and strategies in foreign language communication. In C. Faerch & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Strategies in interlanguage communication* (pp. 20-60). Longman.
- Faerch, C., & Kasper, G. (1984). Two ways of defining

- communication strategies. *Language Learning*, 34(1), 45-63.
- Faucette, P. (2001). A pedagogical perspective on communication strategies: Benefits of training and an analysis of English language teaching materials. *Second Language Studies*, 19(2), 1-40.
- Firth, A., & Wagner, J. (1997). On discourse, communication, and (some) fundamental concepts in SLA research. *The Modern Language Journal*, 81(3), 285-300.
- Han, Jiyoung, & Lee, Kilryoung. (2012). Effects of communicative strategies instruction on Korean EFL college students. *Modern English Education*, 13(3), 39-62.
- Hua, T. K., Nor, N. F. M., & Jaradat, M. N. (2012). Communication strategies among EFL students—An examination of frequency of use and types of strategies used. *GEMA Online Journal of Language Studies*, 12(3), 831-848.
- Jackson, H., & Stockwell, P. (2011). *An introduction to the nature and functions of language*. Continuum International Publishing Group.
- Kellerman, E. (1991). Compensatory strategies in second language research: A critique, a revision, and some (non-) implications for the classroom. In R. Phillipson, E. Kellerman, L. Selinker, M. Sharwood Smith, & M. Swain (Eds.), *Foreign/second language pedagogy research* (pp. 142-161). Multilingual Matters.
- Kim, NamHee. (2011). *Integrated metacognitive online reading strategy use by Korean EFL university students*. [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Indiana University.
- Kim, NamHee. (2012). Gender differences in the use of metacognition-driven reading strategy clusters and chains. *Studies in British and American Language and Literature*, 103, 137-158.
- Li, Hai-lian. (2005). Willingness to communicate and oral performance of Korean EFL students. *English Language Teaching*, 30, 94-110.
- MacIntyre, P. D. (1994). Variables underlying willingness to communicate: A causal analysis. *Communication Research Reports*, 11(2), 135-142.
- MacIntyre, P. D. (2007). Willingness to communicate in the second language: Understanding the decision to speak as a volitional process. *The Modern Language Journal*, 91(4), 564-576.
- MacIntyre, P. D., Dornyei, Z., Clement, R., & Noels, K. A. (1998). Conceptualizing willingness to communicate in a L2: A situational model of L2 confidence and affiliation. *The Modern Language Journal*, 82(4), 545-562.
- MacIntyre, P. D., & Legatto, J. J. (2011). A dynamic system approach to willingness to communicate: Developing an idiodynamic method to capture rapidly changing affect. *Applied Linguistics*, 32(2), 149-171.
- Maleki, A. (2007). Teachability of communication strategies: An Iranian experience. *System*, 35(4), 583-594.
- McCroskey, J. C. (1992). Reliability and validity of the willingness to communicate scale. *Communication Quarterly*, 40(1), 16-25.
- McCroskey, J. C., & Baer, J. E. (1985). *Willingness to communicate: The construct and its measurement*. [Paper presentation]. The Annual Convention of the Speech Communication Association, Denver, CO.
- McCroskey, J. C., & Richmond, V. P. (1987). Willingness to communicate. In J. C. McCroskey & J. A. Daly (Eds.), *Personality and interpersonal communication* (pp. 129-156). Sage.
- Mei, A., & Nathalang, S. S. (2010). Use of communication strategies by Chinese EFL learners. *Chinese Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 33(3), 110-125.
- Mesgarshahr, A., & Abdollahzadeh, E. (2014). The impact of teaching communication strategies of EFL learners' willingness to communicate. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, 4(1), 51-76.
- Nakatani, Y. (2005). The effect of awareness-raising training on oral communication strategy use. *The Modern Language Journal*, 89(1), 76-91.
- Nunan, D., & Bailey, K. M. (2009). *Exploring second language classroom research: A comprehensive guide*. Heinle, Cengage Learning.
- Oxford, R., Crookall, D., Cohen, A., Lavine, R., Nyikos, M., & Sutter, W. (1990). Strategy training for language learners: Six situational case studies and a training model. *Foreign Language Annals*, 23(3), 197-216.
- Pearson, P. D., & Dole, J. A. (1987). Explicit comprehension instruction: A review of research and a new conceptualization of instruction. *The Elementary School Journal*, 88(2), 151-165.
- Peng, J., & Woodrow, L. (2010). Willingness to communicate in English: A model in the Chinese EFL classroom context. *Language Learning*, 60(4), 834-876.
- Pornpibul, N. (2005). Quantitative and qualitative views of EFL learners' strategies: A focus on communication strategies. *Journal of English Studies*, 2, 64-87.
- Rossiter, M. (2003) "It's like chicken but bigger": Effects of communication strategy in the ESL classroom. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 60(2), 105-121.
- Salomone, A. M., & Marsal, F. (1997). How to avoid language breakdown? Circumlocution! *Foreign Language Annals*, 30(4), 473-484.
- Selinker, L. (1972). Interlanguage. *International Review of Applied Linguistics and Language Teaching*, 10(3), 209-230.
- Shumin, K. (2002). *Factors to consider: Developing adult EFL students' speaking abilities*. Cambridge University Press.
- Sukirlan, M. (2014). Teaching communication strategies in an EFL class of tertiary level. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 4(1), 2033-2041.
- Tarone, E. (1984). Teaching strategic competence in the foreign language classroom. In S. Savignon & M.

- Berns (Eds.), *Initiatives in communicative language teaching* (pp. 127-136). Addison Wesley.
- Tarone, E. (2005). Speaking in a second language. In E. Hinkel (Ed.) *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 485-502), Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Tarone, E., & Yule, G. (1989). *Focus on the language learner*. Oxford University Press.
- Teng, H-C. (2012). A study on the teachability of EFL communication strategies. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Science*, 45, 3566-3570.
- Willems, G. (1987). Communication strategies and their significance in foreign language teaching. *System*, 15(3), 351-364.
- Wongsawang, P. (2001). Culture-specific notions in L2 communication strategies. *Second Language Studies*, 19(2), 111-135.
- Yashima, T., Zenuk-Nishide, L., & Shimizu, K. (2004). The influence of attitudes and affect on willingness to communicate and second language communication. *Language Learning*, 54(1), 119-152.

APPENDIX I
CS Questionnaire

문항	1	2	3	4	5
1. 나는 영어로 이야기를 할 때 언어적 어려움이 생기면 문장을 완결 짓지 않고 넘어가 버린다. (예: "We should know the difference between... Umm... Never mind.")					
2. 나는 영어로 이야기를 할 때 자신이 없는 어려운 문법을 피한다. (예: 현재완료, 과거완료와 같이 복잡한 문법 구조 사용 대신 단순 과거형으로 사용)					
3. 나는 영어로 이야기를 할 때 자신이 없는 특정 어휘를 피한다. (예: I lost my road. Uh... I lost. I lost. I got lost.)					
4. 나는 영어로 이야기를 할 때 메시지를 전달하는데 어려움을 느끼면 의도적으로 주제를 피한다. (예: By the way, what did we talk about last week?)					
5. 나는 영어로 이야기를 할 때 사물이나 행동의 자질들을 기술, 묘사, 또는 예를 들어 설명한다. (예: corkscrew 대신에 the thing you open bottles with 라고 표현)					
6. 나는 영어로 이야기를 할 때 영어단어의 의미에 최대한 비슷한 의미를 가지는 대체 어휘를 사용한다. (예: ship을 sailboat로 표현)					
7. 나는 영어로 이야기를 할 때 내가 상상하여 영어 규칙에는 의거하지만 실제로는 존재하지 않는 새로운 단어를 만들어 낸다. (예: vegetarian을 vegetarianist로 표현)					
8. 나는 영어로 이야기를 할 때 우리말의 단어나 표현들을 문자 그대로 번역하여 사용한다. (예: 시험을 보다를 see an exam로 표현)					
9. 나는 영어로 이야기를 할 때 모국어의 단어를 사용하여 이를 영어화 시켜 사용한다. (예: I am 공부ing.)					
10. 나는 영어로 이야기를 할 때 모국어의 단어를 그대로 문장에 넣어 사용한다. (예: I went to the 박물관.)					
11. 나는 영어로 이야기를 할 때 몸짓, 표정, 소리를 흉내 내어 발화를 보충한다.					
12. 나는 영어로 대화 중 단어가 생각나지 않을 때 대화의 상대방에게 직접적 혹은 간접적으로 도움을 요청한다. (예: What do you call?) (억양 올리기, 시선마주치기, 당황한 표정을 지으면서)					

1: 전혀 그렇지 않다, 2: 그렇지 않다, 3: 보통이다, 4: 그렇다, 5: 매우 그렇다

APPENDIX II
WTC Questionnaire

다음 스무 문항들은 여러 상황에서 영어로 의사소통 할 생각이 있는지를 알아보기 위한 것입니다. 각 항목에 대해 여러분들이 실제로 영어로 얼마나 의사소통 할 생각이 있는지를 0~10사이의 숫자로 기입해 주세요.

(0=영어로 대화할 생각이 전혀 없음, 5=보통, 10=영어로 대화할 생각이 항상 있음)

- _____ 1. 주유소에서 직원과 이야기 할 때
- _____ 2. 의사와 이야기 할 때
- _____ 3. 낯선 사람들과 대화 나눌 때
- _____ 4. 줄을 서 있다가 만난 아는 사람과 대화 나눌 때
- _____ 5. 가게에서 판매원과 이야기 할 때
- _____ 6. 친한 친구들과의 큰 규모의 모임에서 이야기 할 때
- _____ 7. 경찰관과 이야기 할 때
- _____ 8. 낯선 사람과의 작은 규모의 모임에서 이야기 할 때
- _____ 9. 줄을 서 있다가 만난 친한 친구와 대화 나눌 때
- _____ 10. 레스토랑에서 웨이터와 이야기 할 때 (주문할 때)
- _____ 11. 아는 사람과의 큰 규모의 모임에서 이야기 할 때
- _____ 12. 줄을 서 있다가 만난 낯선 사람과 이야기 할 때
- _____ 13. 교수님과 대화 나눌 때
- _____ 14. 친한 친구들과 대화 나눌 때
- _____ 15. 지인들과 작은 규모의 모임에서 이야기 할 때
- _____ 16. 학교 경비원과 이야기 할 때
- _____ 17. 낯선 사람들과의 큰 규모의 모임에서 이야기 할 때
- _____ 18. 배우자 (혹은 여자친구/남자친구)와 이야기 할 때
- _____ 19. 친한 친구와의 작은 규모의 모임에서 이야기 할 때
- _____ 20. 낯선 사람들과 이야기 할 때