

Communication Strategies Employed by EFL Learners in A Speaking Class

Syarifudin¹⁾, Nur Mukminatien²⁾, Sri Rachmajanti²⁾, A. Effendi Kadarisman²⁾

¹⁾IAIN Mataram-NTB

²⁾Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris-Universitas Negeri Malang

Jl. Lestari Gg. Umar No.2 Moncok-Ampenan, Mataram NTB. E-mail: lafudin@gmail.com

Abstract: The present study explored verbal and nonverbal communication strategies (CSs) employed by learners both as message senders (speakers) and as message receivers (listeners) in English in a speaking class. It employed a qualitative design with an ethnography of communication approach in a limited situation setting (speaking class). Thirty two students taking Speaking II subject at the English Education of IKIP Mataram were selected by using a purposeful technique. The techniques used to collect data consisted of non-participant observation and video recording. The research findings showed that there were eleven verbal CSs employed by message senders and six non-verbal. Furthermore, on the learners' strategies to deal with communication problems encountered by message receivers (listeners) were found as many as seven verbal strategies and seven nonverbal strategies

Key Words: communication strategies (CSs), EFL Learners, speaking course.

Abstrak: Penelitian ini mengeksplorasi strategi komunikasi verbal dan nonverbal yang digunakan oleh pembelajar baik sebagai pengirim pesan (pembicara) maupun sebagai penerima pesan (pendengar) untuk mengatasi masalah komunikasi dalam berkomunikasi berbahasa Inggris perkuliahan *speaking*. Penelitian ini menggunakan desain kualitatif dengan pendekatan etnografi komunikasi dalam situasi terbatas (perkuliahan *speaking*). Tiga puluh dua mahasiswa yang sedang mengambil mata kuliah *speaking* II pada jurusan Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris IKIP Mataram, dipilih dengan menggunakan *purposeful technique*. Teknik pengumpulan data terdiri dari observasi non partisipan dan merekam video. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa ada sebelas strategi verbal digunakan oleh pengirim pesan (pembicara). Sementara itu, ditemukan enam strategi nonverbal yang diterapkan oleh pembicara dalam mengatasi masalah komunikasi. Selanjutnya, ada tujuh strategi verbal yang diterapkan oleh pendengar dan ada tujuh strategi nonverbal yang diterapkan oleh pendengar:

Kata kunci: strategi komunikasi, siswa EFL, pembelajaran berbicara.

In the context of English as a Foreign Language (EFL), it has been widely claimed by most Indonesian learners across different levels of education that speaking is a difficult skill to learn. Shumin (2002:204) stated that "speaking a language is especially difficult for foreign language learners because effective oral communication requires the ability to use the language appropriately in social interactions". Shumin's statement may indicate that learners encounter problems in using the target language (TL) in oral communication if they do not have adequate communicative competence that underlies speaking proficiency.

Regarding the learners' problems in speaking English, there are some reasons why speaking is considered as a language skill which is difficult to be acquired by most of learners. One of the reasons is that speaking requires the ability to use the appropriate, acceptable and comprehensible oral language through communication in many kinds of opportunities. Opportunities are available for the learners who want to communicate in English both inside and outside the classroom activities, but in fact, the learners are sometimes reluctant to participate in speaking activities. This coincides with Ur (1996:121) who stated that there are some problems

with speaking activities in which learners are often inhibited about trying to say things in a foreign language in the classroom and afraid of making mistakes; they have no motive to express themselves beyond the guilty feeling that they should be speaking, and low or uneven participation. Supporting Ur, Padmadewi (1998) based on her investigation, asserted that learners attending a speaking class often felt anxious due to pressure from the speaking tasks that require them to present speaking tasks individually and spontaneously within limited time.

In a speaking class, although the learners have many communication problems, they are encouraged to participate in speaking English both monologue and dialogue speaking activities in order to habituate and familiarize them with communication in the target language (TL). A speaking class is one way of practicing and learning of speaking, but multitudes of opportunities for learning and practicing speaking or communication exist in context in which English needs to be used. In multitudes of opportunities someone can share to many others which engender speaking events in environment of natural setting. In communicating in English through taking turns speaking, the learners may encounter some problems, however, they may attempt to surmount the problems by using CSs.

Communication strategies have been an extremely important topic of discussion when it comes to second and foreign language learning, particularly in oral communication. The learners as speakers and as listeners may encounter various communication problems when they are limited competencies in the Target language (TL), and they may attempt to surmount the problems by employing some tricks or strategies to enhance the achievement of communication goals. In order to convey the messages and maintain them in a speaking activity until communication purposes are reached, the learners need to employ speaking strategies (SS) which are commonly referred to communication strategies (CSs).

Communication strategies are defined as “a mutual attempt of two interlocutors to agree on a meaning in situations where requisite meaning structures do not seem to be shared” (Tarone, 1983:65). Tarone’s perspective of CSs may be seen as attempts to bridge the gap between the linguistic knowledge of the speaker and the listener to the TL in real communication situation. Achievement/compensatory strategies may be used to bridge this

gap, while avoidance/reduction strategies may be used where the gap is perceived as unbridgeable. Similar to Tarone, Bialystok (1983:102) also defined CSs as “all attempts to manipulate a limited linguistic system in order to promote communication.” Bialystok’s perspective about CSs may be seen as demeanors for those cases in which communication is disrupted because of an inadequate linguistic knowledge and an impasse in the minds of what they are talking in the target language of both speakers and listeners. In addition, Faerch and Kasper (1983:212) defined CSs as “the potentially conscious plans for solving what to an individual presents itself as a problem in reaching a particular communicative goal.” According to them, when speakers cannot find a way to communicate without problems, they turn to strategies to deal with the problems they encounter while communicating.

The notion of CSs in second and foreign language acquisition is still a topic of different perspective that makes it appear in various theoretical perspectives. Concerning the various perspectives of CSs, Tarone (1983) viewed CSs from a discourse of analytical perspective and pursued an interactional approach. Tarone’s (1983) put CSs in two categories, namely avoidance and achievement strategies. Avoidance comprises topic avoidance and message abandonment; meanwhile achievement consists of approximation, word coinage, circumlocution, literal translation, language switch, appeal for assistance, and mime. Faerch and Kasper (1983) considered CSs as verbal plans within a speech production framework by adopting psycholinguistic approach. This coincides with Bialystok (1983) who regarded CSs as primary mental events and adopts a psycholinguistic approach to his analysis. Faerch and Kasper (1983) put CSs in four categories, namely formal reduction strategies (reduction of the linguistic system) such as phonological, morphological, syntactic, and lexical; functional reduction strategies (reduction of communicative goal) such as actional reduction, modal reduction, reduction of the propositional content (topic avoidance, message abandonment, and meaning replacement); compensatory strategies such as code switching, interlingual transfer, intralingual transfer, IL based strategies (generalization, paraphrase, word coinage, restructuring), cooperative strategies, non-linguistic strategies (e.g. mime, gesture, and sound-imitation); and retrieval strategies.

In spite of diversity, to arrive at a better understanding of why CSs have appeared such diverse approaches, this study looks closer and works at two major perspectives, namely the interactional and psycholinguistic perspectives. The interactional perspective pays attention to the way which learners use CSs during speaking acts which help them to improve negotiation of meaning. This perspective of CSs focuses on the interaction process between speakers and their interlocutors, and in particular the way in which meaning is negotiated by one or both parties (Nakatani and Goh, 2010:208). Meanwhile, the psycholinguistic perspective points out on mental processes underlying the learners' language behavior when dealing with problems of lexical and discourse in speaking acts. This perspective "examines learners' problem-solving behaviors arising from gaps in their lexical knowledge" (Nakatani and Goh, 2010:208). It regards the learners' problem solving behavior during communication of the TL as involving communication strategies, and learners have a tendency to use CSs to compensate for their lack of TL knowledge. For all that diversity of perspectives on CSs, the main useful insight about CSs is one set of verbal and nonverbal tactics or strategies in which the learners can employ to surmount the communication problems in order to enhance the achievement of communication goals.

Accordingly, this study focuses on the investigation of CSs employed by the learners in a speaking class which aims to analyze the types of CSs employed by the learners both as message senders (speakers) and as message receivers (listeners) both verbal and nonverbal in communicating in English of taking turns speaking in pairs of natural classroom setting. It is based on the notion that learners' ability to use CSs to solve communication problems allows them to appear more adept in using the TL in oral communication.

METHOD

The present study employed a qualitative design with an ethnography of communication approach in a limited situation setting (speaking class) to English Education Departement students at Institute for Teacher Training and Educational Science (IKIP) of Mataram as the accessible subjects. Its aims at fulfilling data of the research focuses: types of verbal and nonverbal CSs employed by the learners both as message senders (speakers) and as message

receivers (listeners) in communicating in English. Thirty two students taking Speaking II course in one class at the departement were taken as the subjects by employing purposeful technique.

The techniques used to collect data consisted of non-participant observation: observing the learners' utterances and acts when communicating in English in taking turns speaking; and video recording: recording the learners' performances in taking turns speaking. To collect the data on the CSs employed by the learners, they were asked to speak in a pair (dialogue) based on given topics which were related to the syllabus of speaking II course

In analyzing field notes data, the following steps were done: (1). Making four lists (two lists for the speakers' utterances/verbal and acts/nonverbal, and two lists for the listeners' utterances/verbal and acts/nonverbal), showing the attempts to cope with the problems in conversation. (2). Grouping two lists of utterances and acts which are employed by the speakers as the attempts to cope with problems, considering the similarities of a part of utterances and acts being made. It was found that the attempts which made to achieve a particular purpose in their speaking (achievement strategies) and the attempts which not made to achieve communication purpose (avoidance strategies). (3). Grouping two lists of utterances and acts which were employed by the listeners. In this case, it might be found the particular attempts to understand the message (achievement strategies) or the attempts to avoid their communication by employed avoidance strategies. (4). Classifying the initial reported verbal strategies into CSs types for the speakers (from step 2). (5). Classifying the initial reported nonverbal strategies into CSs types for the speakers (from step 2). (6). Classifying the initial reported verbal strategies into CSs types for the listeners (from step 3). (7). Classifying the initial reported nonverbal strategies into CSs types for the listeners (from step 3). (8). Verifying and drawing inductive conclusion for further discussing in mainly qualitative descriptive. However, certain aspects of CSs which were most frequently employed by the learners were indicated by quantitative percentages.

In analyzing videos recorded data, the steps were similar with what the researcher did as in analyzing of fieldnotes data. However, in this analisis video recorded data, the researcher started from: (1). Reading through all the videos recorded data obtained from subjects' performances in order to get

an overall picture of communication problems which they faced, and what their utterances or acts (CSs) which they employed to cope with their problems in conversation. Video recording consisted of sixty four pairs of four topics namely, topic 1 (tourism, coded T1), topic 2 (education, coded T2), topic 3 (culture, coded T3), and topic 4 (politics, coded T4). Meanwhile, subjects' pairs were coded P1 to P16 in each topic, so it means that each topic consisted of sixteen pairs, for instance (T1.P1 to T4.P16), (T2.P1 to T4.P16), (T3.P1 to T3.P16), and (T4.P1 to T4.P16). (2). Looking at each video recorded of each pair and transcribing it in manuscript transcription carefully. The next steps were similar to what have been done in analyzing fieldnotes data.

RESULTS

Communication Strategies Employed by the Learners as Message Senders (Speakers)

Verbal Communication Strategies

Having done several steps of data analysis, it was found that the speakers employed eleven types of verbal CSs. Those strategies were topic avoidance, message abandonment, approximation, word coinage, circumlocution, language switch, appeal for assistance, paraphrase, self-correction, comprehension check, and self-repetition.

The learners employed **'topic avoidance'** and **'message abandonment'** as the avoidance strategies in taking turns speaking because of their insufficient TL competence. Topic avoidance was employed twice by two different subjects' pairs. The example of topic avoidance was presented in corpus T1.P16 in which Zahi and Wan rejected to talk about *"tourism"* by uttering Zahi's S: "I don't know /...s/". Meanwhile message abandonment was employed nine times by nine different subjects' pairs. The example of this strategy was T4.P9 Lilis's S utterance *"-/ is the same like you. No politics is good /...s/"*.

The first compensatory strategy in this study was **'approximation'**. Two utterances of corpus T1.P11: *"So, it means house is very traditional, ... apa lestarikan ./ become 'powering'."* And *"I think they 'good idea' to visit ./ traditional [traditional] thing of Sasak"*, were the examples of the use of approximation strategy. The first example revealed that the word *'powering'* was selected by T1.P11 (Ana) to replace the word

'preserve' and the second phrase *'good idea'* to replace the word *'want'* when these terms did not exist in her mind at that particular time.

The second compensatory strategy was **'word coinage'**. This strategy was utilized nine times by seven different the subjects pairs. The example of this strategy was *"I mean that so many officemen to be in corruption. It means that 'lawman' is still don't have [still don't have] /ah.../ 'advoc' for the corruptor"*, corpus T4.P16. The corpus demonstrated that the term *'officemen'* partially sounds like English but it was not English word. The subject, however, used this term to replace *'office employee'*. Then the subject also used terms *'lawman'* as well as *'advoc'* to replace the terms *'lawyer'* and *'punishment'*.

'Circumlocution' was the third compensatory strategy viewed as one of good solutions to solve the learners' insufficient English competence. The example of this strategy was showed by Riad's S utterance *"I don't know but like this when you plant rice, after rice grow up, you have to cut when rice grow up enough, we take the rice from the field."* When he was talking about a special culture in Sumbawa, unfortunately, he could not recall the phrase *'harvest ceremony'*. Hence, he exemplified his intended meaning by uttering those utterances and described the characteristics of the object.

The fourth compensatory category was **'language switch'** strategy. Surprisingly, most of the subjects in different pairs employed this strategy. The speakers substituted their utterances to the L1 words because they did not know the TL words when articulating their utterances. The example of this strategy was presented in corpus T2.P8 *"Saya belajar di IKIP Mataram kebetulan..."*. Gon as a speaker told his interlocutor Arbi about education in IKIP Mataram. He began the conversation by using English, and then switching his language into Indonesian.

'Appeal for assistance' was the fifth compensatory category, which was employed twelve times by twelve pairs of subjects as the speakers. This strategy was also one of the learners' efforts to come up with their limited knowledge on English. The example of this strategy was corpus T2.P2, in which Riad as a speaker uttered *"What in English ujian nasional, UN?"*

'Paraphrase' was the seventh compensatory strategy in this study. It referred to the rewording of

the message in an alternative, acceptable TL construction in order to avoid unknown lexical items. It appeared four times of four different subjects' pairs of conversation. The example of this strategy was in corpus T1.P11, in which Fitri S paraphrased 'small village' three times in order to make sure her interlocutor understood of what she has uttered. She paraphrased her language many times because of limited TL words to depict the speaking content to her interlocutor.

The eighth compensatory strategy in this study was '**self-correction**'. The speakers performed self-correction during communicating by revising their own inappropriate words and rules of a language in the way that speakers of the language used them. The strategy was employed eighteen times by seventeen different subjects' pairs. For example, the corpus T1.P1 "... I want ask about what is nice place there ./ [I mean a tourism place], and you can show me?" In this case, Riad just realized that the use of lexical 'nice' was quite general and inappropriate to be used in the context because they were talking about tourism, though it was accepted in under the circumstance. Accordingly, he revised his diction by uttering the appropriate language 'I mean a tourism place'.

'**Comprehension check**' was the ninth compensatory strategy in this study. It referred to the speaker's question for the interlocutor to know whether the interlocutor has a prior knowledge about the speaking context or the speaker exerted comprehension check to know that the interlocutor understood what the speaker has just uttered. This strategy is employed nine times by eight different subjects' pairs in conversation activities. For instance: "Do you know Selebrana beach?" as Sula's S utterance in corpus T1.P2. She exerts this strategy to see if her interlocutor has prior insight about the speaking context.

'**Self-Repetition**' was included in the tenth compensatory strategy of this study. In repetition, the speakers repeated a part or the whole of the utterance. Corpus T1.P2 was example of this strategy, in which Sula S repeated a part of her utterances such as "You can go there ./ [you can go there] ./ location is far but very good to ...".

Nonverbal Communication Strategies

One further feature needs depicting here is related to nonverbal CSs in which oral communication

take place through facial expression (smiling), gestures (head nodding, head shaking, hand moving, thumb up, and drawing something).

Facial expressions which appeared in form of 'Smiling' was categorized as the nonverbal CSs in this study. '**Smiling**' occurred three times of three different pairs of subjects in conversation activity. One for instance was corpus T1.P3 in which Fuji S smiled when saying "... come to enjoy there /em./ {smiling} in Senggigi beach".

Gestures which appeared in forms of 'head nodding', 'head shaking', 'hand moving', and 'drawing something' were categorized as nonverbal strategies in this study. '**Head nodding**' was employed four times by four different pairs of subjects as the speakers in taking turns speaking. An example of it is what Alfi S utilizes in corpus T2.P16 by stating "... as of communication about student and teacher/—/ {head nodding} ...". '**Head shaking**' appeared only twice by two pair of subjects as a speaker. Sarli's S utterance "I forget" while shaking her head in corpus T3.P1 is an example of this strategy. '**Hand moving**' was utilized eighteen times by eighteen different subjects' pairs. For instance, corpus T1.P12 was appointed to show if the speaker faced the difficulty in eliciting of TL term, she used long filled pause /eh.../ and lengthening of syllable can/—/ and moving of both spread hands forwards body while thinking the desired language. It indicated that Isma S could not recall TL 'swim' so she moved of both spread hands forwards he body to illustrate the term. Next, in spite of its appearance only once by a pair of subjects, however '**thumb up**' was categorized nonverbal strategy in this study. The example is corpus T3.P4 like what performed by Zahi S through his utterance "I am/—/ a reporter". When he uttering this message he used lengthening of syllables 'I am/—/' while employing this strategy. Furthermore, for all that '**drawing something**' was found only once used by a pair of subjects, it was categorized as nonverbal strategy in this study. In corpus T2.P2 showed that a speaker (Riad S) described about final exam. When he talking about "... not only grade/—/ for paper but also grade behavior of student itself." he uses lengthening of syllables 'grade/—/' while drawing something indicates that he had the problem of TL.

Communication Strategies Employed by the Learners as Message Receivers (Listeners)

Verbal Communication Strategies

On the ground of the results of observation and recorded videos data analysis, the listeners employed seven types of verbal strategies: language switch, appeal for assistance, asking the speaker for clarification, asking the speaker for repetition, asking the speaker to add message, guessing the speaker's message, and specifying the speaker's message.

'**Language switch**' was the first compensatory strategy employed by the listeners in conversation. It was found ten times of ten different subject's pairs as the listeners who employed this strategy. They exerted their own language to overcome lexical deficiencies of the TL. Corpus T1.P4 Pian L asked for repetition to the speaker by switching his language into L1 lexical "*Apa tadi?*" was example of this strategy.

'**Appeal for assistance**', which appeared only twice of two subjects pairs as listeners was also categorized as the second compensatory strategy. It was one of the learners' efforts to come up with their limited knowledge on English. Corpus T4.P3 illustrated the example of this strategy as Hadi's L utterance "*Say what*" because he needed more messages from the speaker.

In this study, '**asking the speaker for clarification**' strategy was the third compensatory strategy for the listeners. It appeared eighteen times of eighteen different pairs of subjects in taking turns speaking. For instance, corpus T2.P4, Etha L asked the speaker to clarify his message by uttering "*So, education is important to our lives—!*" Etha needed further explanation from the speaker's message, so he asked the speaker to clarify the message.

'**Asking the speaker for repetition**' was categorized as the fourth compensatory strategy for the listener in this study. Five subjects of different pairs employed five times this strategy. A sample of this strategy was corpus T1.P15, in which Opia L asked the speaker Jana S to repeat her message by uttering "*question again—!*". She was still unable to catch the point of speaker's language, so she asked the speaker to repeat her message.

'**Asking the speaker to add message**' was employed eight times by eight different pairs of subjects in this study. It was categorized as the fifth compensatory strategy for the listeners. The

example of this strategy was presented in corpus T1.P1. Riadi L (T1.P1) seemed to need more message from the speaker (Sarli) by uttering "*How about beautiful?*"; since the speaker's message was inadequate for understanding of what she has delivered and she also used lengthening of syllables "*is/—/*" indicating she faced difficulty in delivering her message, so as soon as possible the listener (Riad) asked her to add message.

It was in needed of more understanding about the speaking content for the listener in '**guessing the speaker's message**'. In that speaker sometimes was unable to elicit the TL term which needed of delivering the message. This strategy was categorized as the sixth compensatory strategy. The sample of this strategy was corpus T1.P2, in which Sula L polished up the speaker's message by guessing the term '*place to visit*' to complete the speaker's utterance "*Do you know [do you know] some/—/ places?*" Hadi S elicits lengthening of syllables '*some/—/*' while thinking the TL term to be used, and as soon as Sula L completes the message by guessing the words "*Places to visit?*"

'**Specifying the Speaker's Message**' was included as the seventh compensatory category for the listener. Although it appeared only twice of two different subjects pairs, but it was very imperative to detect the listeners' dynamic personality and speaking behavior in oral communication. The example of this strategy was corpus T1.P15. Opia's L utterance "*Beach—!*" was the spontaneous utterance on the speaker's question to her. Jana S asked her interlocutor (Opia L) "*Where is the interesting plate that makes you happy there?*" This question was still considered in general, so the listener (Opia L) specified the speaker's question into the particular place by uttering "*Beach—!*"

Nonverbal Communication Strategies

In this study, eight types of the findings and data related to nonverbal CSs employed by the listeners in taking turns speaking were found out, such as facial expressions (smiling), eye contact (gazing towards the speaker), gestures (head nodding, head shaking, and hand moving), and posture (backward position and forward position).

Facial expressions employed in forms of 'smiling' was categorized as nonverbal CSs in this study. '**Smiling**' appeared thirty two times of thirty two different pairs of subjects as listeners in taking

turns speaking. The example, corpus T1.P2 was subject's feeling happiness as performed by Hadi L "Yeah, yeah. {smiling}" in which he smiled to respond the speaker's message.

'**Gazing towards the Speaker**' was the one of eye contact type which employed twice by two different subjects' pairs in conversation. The sample of this strategy was corpus T1.P10, in which Yati L performed such as "*Ah—!{gazing towards the speaker}*" to ask the speaker to repeat what she has said in the first time.

Gestures which appeared in forms of head nodding, head shaking, and hand moving were nonverbal CSs type. '**Head nodding**' employed twenty times by twenty different pairs of subjects. The example of it was corpus T1.P4 showed that listener (Pian L) understood of what the speaker has said by uttering "*Okay!*". Next, '**head shaking**' appeared six times of six subject's pairs as the listeners in conversation. Isma's L performance in corpus T2.P12 who shook her head when listening the speaker's message "*... what different knowledge in senior high school and in campus*" was an example of this strategy. In addition, '**hand moving**' was employed three times by three different subjects' pairs. For instance, corpus T1.P7 was appointed to show if the speaker (Hafi S) faced difficulty in recalling the TL terms, so he exerted long filled pause /em.../. In responding to this utterance, the listener (Alfi L) uttered "*And then!*" while gazing towards the speaker and moving his right flat hand to ask the speaker to continue speaking.

Posture which appeared in form of 'backward position' and 'forward position' was categorized as nonverbal CSs in this study. '**Backward position**' appeared only once of one pair of subjects as a listener. Corpus T1.P1 was a sample of this strategy as shown by Sarli's posture when she listened the speaker's (Riad) utterance "*... I am ./ I am ./ {smiling}*" In his utterance Riad exerted short unfilled pause ./ twice and smiled. The utterance make the listener is impatient to wait his message, so she uttered "*Auri—!*" while going backward position. Furthermore, '**forward position**' employed five times by five different subjects' pairs. A sample of it was corpus T1.P12 performed by the listener's (Meti) posture when she listened the speaker's (Isma) utterance "*... the beautiful place many there*". The listener was unable to catch the speaker's

message, so she uttered "*How?*" while going forward position to the speaker.

DISCUSSION

The discussion emphasizes on CSs employed by the learners as message senders (speakers) and as message receivers (listeners) both verbal and nonverbal in taking turns speaking activities. They are supported by the relevant theoretical bases and the previous studies.

Communication Strategies Employed by the Learners as Message Senders (Speakers)

Verbal Communication Strategies

The discussion of verbal CSs includes the topic avoidance, message abandonment, approximation, word coinage, circumlocution, language switch, appealing for assistance, paraphrase, self-correction, comprehension check, and self-repetition.

'**Topic avoidance**' which performed by avoidance behavior was employed twice (1.05%) by two different subjects' pairs because they faced problems due to limited TL linguistic resources. By avoiding the topic, the learners would not continue their communication in order to avoid the problems. The learners have started speaking, but they were unable to continue because of limited TL words and structures as well as having no idea about the topic.

Looking at finding in corpus T1.P16 ("I don't know /...s/"), it was unearthed that Zahi and Wan as speaker and listener rejected to talk about "*tourism*" by uttering "I don't know /...s/", used long unfilled pause when they performed conversation to each other. The subjects used this strategy to reject the given topic because they were unable to recall the TL words related to the topic. The finding above supports the theory of CSs that an avoidance strategy, the learner simply tries not to talk about the concepts for which the TL item or structure is not known (Tarone, 1983).

'**Message abandonment**' was employed nine times (4.71%) by nine different subjects' pairs in this study. It was one of the avoidance strategies (Tarone, 1983) and one reduction of the propositional content strategy (Faerch & Kasper, 1983). Subjects employed this strategy in oral communication because of their insufficient linguistic competence of target language.

Actually, the subjects have tried to talk about the topic, but they were unable to continue talking and stopped in the mid-utterance. They talked in the incomplete utterance because of encountering a difficulty with the TL words or rules that they need to use in communicating for next message.

Concerning the finding in corpus T4.P9, (“... No politics is good /...s/”) in which (Lilis and Dina) showed that actually they have started to say about politics, but unfortunately, they could not continue it and stop in the middle utterance. This case showed when Dina S asked Lilis L about the topic, Lilis only responded it in a little bit utterance by saying “*Is the same like you. No politics is good*” then using long unfilled pause which indicated she encountered a difficulty to the TL words and structures. The subjects were unable to continue their conversation when they performed it in taking turns speaking about politics.

‘**Approximation**’ was a strategy that the learner employed as an attempt to facilitate in conveying message to listeners in order to be easy understood by rewording their message. It appeared twenty four times (12.57%) of seventeen different subjects pairs of conversation. This strategy was used to face down the problem in lexical meaning transmission by using a TL word or structure which shared semantic features with the intended TL word instead. In this study, even though the alternative words that the learners used sound inappropriate, they seemed to successfully help the listener to catch the general meaning of what the speaker has said. Finding in corpus T1.P11, (“*So, it means house is very traditional, ... apa lestarikan /./ become powering*”); in which Ana S in conveying message used word “*powering*” to replace the word “*preserve*” in her utterance, as well as she also used “*good idea*” to replace the word “*want*” when delivering the message “*I think they good idea to visit /./ traditional [traditional] thing of Sasak*”.

The use of approximation strategy revealed that the words “*powering*” and “*good idea*” instead of using the words “*preserve*” and “*want*” when these words did not exist in her mind at that particular time. Even though the alternative items that the learners used sound inappropriate, they seemed successfully help the listener to catch the general meaning of what the speaker said. In these cases, the speaker selected a word that provided an approximate translation of the unknown concept by referring to a similar but known item.

‘**Word coinage**’ was a strategy that created by speakers through creating a new word from selecting a TL term or term features that were known in their mind when conveying message to make the listeners comprehend of what have just uttered. This strategy was employed nine times (4.71%) by seven different subjects’ pairs. It was used to overcome the difficulty in transmitting of the meaning of particular lexical in message by making efforts to make up a new word or expression form by combining the known TL items into morphology to engender the intended meaning.

Focusing on finding in corpus T4.P16, it was recognized that the speaker (Sarli S) created three new words ‘*officemen, lawman, and advoc*’ in her utterance “*I mean that so many officemen to be in corruption. It means that ‘lawman’ is still don’t have [still don’t have] /ah.../ ‘advoc’ for the corruptor*”. In this utterance, the speaker created the words ‘*officeman*’, ‘*lawman*’ and ‘*advoc*’ to replace the words ‘*office employee*’, ‘*lawyer*’, and ‘*punishment*’. The three new words demonstrated that the words ‘*officemen*’, ‘*lawman*’, and ‘*ad hoc*’ partially sound like the appropriate words in this context but they were inappropriate English words. The speaker created new expression in order to convey the meaning of the message.

‘**Circumlocution**’ was a compensatory strategy that viewed as one of good solutions to solve the learners’ limited TL knowledge. It occurred seven times (3.67%) of seven different subjects’ pairs. It deals with describing the characters or elements of the object or action instead of using the appropriate TL item or structure. This kind of CS used when the speaker described the characters or elements of the object or action as opposed to exert the appropriate TL word and structure. In other words, this strategy used by a speaker who does not know or is unable to recall a word but wants to express a concept. In place of using a circumlocution, the speaker delineated a brief sequence of words to express the same meaning.

Looking at finding in corpus T3.P2 that inspired to comment that this strategy was unique because the speakers were unable to elicit the desired item, however, they were able to express a sequence of words to have the meaning of an item. Riad’s S utterance in corpus T3.P2 “*I don’t know but like this when you plant rice, after rice grow up, you have to cut when rice grow up enough, we take*

the rice from the field.” indicated that he has a problem to elicit a TL term when he was talking about a special culture in Sumbawa; unfortunately, he could not recall this desired term. Riadi as a speaker describes the characteristics of the object because he could not recall the phrase “*harvest ceremony*”. He used this strategy to give a description about the term that he wanted to convey to the listener, however, the listener still could not understand of a concept.

In EFL speaking class in which English is used as the medium of communication among the learners, they may always switch TL into L1 or another language (**language switch**). The speakers sometimes substitute their stretches of utterances from single word up to complete alteration to their own words because they do not know the TL words when articulating their utterances. They exerted their own language to face down their TL lexical deficiencies and because of wanting, the communication sustains in keeping the conversation running properly.

The findings on this strategy surprisingly show that the speakers employed language switch seventy times (36.65%) by forty one different subjects’ pairs. The speakers substituted their utterances to the L1 words because they did not know the TL words when articulating their utterances. They exerted their own language to face down lexical deficiencies of the TL and keep their communication running well in a properly manner. Finding in corpus T2.P8 showed that Gon S told his interlocutor Arbi L about education in IKIP Mataram. He began conversation by using English, and then switching his message into Indonesian like his utterance “*May be IKIP Mataram ./ it is very good. Because IKIP Mataram mempunyai dosen yang didatangkan dari luar negeri yang mengajarkan kita*”. Gon S sometimes substituted his sequence of utterances by using both English and Indonesian in conveying message to listener (Arbi L). He exerted his own language because of limited target language knowledge; particular related to word and structure as the ability underlying the use of a language.

With respect to ‘**appeal for assistance**’, the speakers sought assistance from the listeners an effort to face down their difficulties in expressing message either directly or indirectly. In this case, the speakers asked for the correct terms or structure as well as the continuum of message before ending of communication. This strategy employed twelve times (6.26%) by twelve pairs of subjects as the

speakers. It was also one of the learners’ efforts to come up with their limited knowledge on TL. In addition to ask their pairs in conversation, the speakers conveyed it both English and Indonesian.

The finding revealed this strategy was corpus T2.P2, Riad’s S utterance “*What in English ujian nasional, UN?*” On the finding when describing about education in Indonesia Riad S has difficulty in elicit “*ujian nasional*” in English, so he appealed assistance to his interlocutor Hadi L. Unfortunately, Hadi as the listener was unable to help him to give an appropriate TL expression for “*ujian nasional*”. On the contrary, Hadi L asked for clarification about the terms to the speaker by uttering “*Ujian Nasional*”. Suddenly the speaker responded by switching his language into Indonesian “*Ya, ujian nasional*” then using long unfilled pause while thinking the desired term. At the state, he was unable to recall the needed term, but as soon as he described the characteristics of the item by uttering “*may be test in the end of school.*”

‘**Paraphrasing**’ appeared four times (2.09%) of four different subjects’ pairs in this study. By using a paraphrasing strategy, the speaker attempted to the rewording of the message in an alternative, acceptable TL construction in order to avoid unknown lexical items. In other words, the paraphrasing strategy used to clarify a term by giving explanation and exemplification.

Finding in corpus T1.P11 indicated that the speaker has a problem when describing the content of speaking. The paraphrase strategy employed to clarify a term by giving explanation and exemplification. Finding of Fitri’s S utterance “*Sade village is a small village. Why I said small village because in the small village there are not many people, there are not many house, but there are many tourists*”. Fitri S paraphrased “*small village*” three times when depicting the Sade village in order to make sure her interlocutor understood of what she meant. This strategy was employed because of her insufficient knowledge of TL and she did not have any idea about the context of what they were talking, so she paraphrased some terms while thinking for the next terms for being utilized to facilitate the listener understood the message was being delivered.

‘**Self-correction strategy**’ is categorized as communication strategy that usually exerted in a taking turns speaking. In this study, this strategy was employed eighteen times (9.42%) by seventeen different subjects’ pairs. The learners as the speakers performed self-correction during oral communication

by revising their own inappropriate words and rules of a language in the way that speakers of the language used them.

Looking at finding in corpus T1.P1 about Riad's S utterance "... I want ask about what is nice place there ./ [I mean a tourism place], and you can show me?". In this case, Riad just realized that the use of lexical "nice" was quite general and inappropriate used in this context because they were talking about tourism place, though it accepted in under the circumstance. Accordingly, he revised his diction by uttering the appropriate language "I mean a tourism place" in order to facilitate the listener easier to understand more specific message. The speaker corrected his language because he thought that he exerted the appropriate words referring to general meaning that made the listener complicated in giving response. Through this strategy, the speaker rectified and corrected himself the message before the listener signals non-misunderstanding, appeals for assistance or asking for clarification of the message.

'**Comprehension check**' in this study referred to the speaker's question for the interlocutor to know whether the interlocutor has a prior knowledge about the speaking context or the speaker exerted comprehension check to know that the interlocutor understood of what the speaker has uttered. This strategy was employed nine times (4.71%) by eight different subjects' pairs in conversation activities.

Having focused on finding in T1.P2, Sula's S utterance "Do you know Selebrana beach?" was recognized that the speaker (Sula) used comprehension check to the listener (Hadi L). Comprehension check was as an action, directly followed the speaker's utterance designed to obtain the listener's understanding that the utterance has been correctly heard or understood by him. The analysis of CSs episodes revealed that, in order to check for comprehension, the listener (Hadi L) directly responded of what was asked. This Hadi's reaction "Ah, I don't know" indicated that he did know of what the speaker asked to him.

In relation to '**self-repetition strategy**', speakers sometimes repeated some words or phrases when communicating if they encountered difficulty in recalling the desired TL terms. In this study it was utilized twenty five times (13.09%) by twenty one different subjects' speaking pairs. In repetition, the speakers repeated a part or the whole of the utterances while thinking for eliciting the next terms to be used in conveying the message. By using

repetition, the speakers could eliminate long filled pauses /em.../ and long unfilled pauses /.../.

Viewing on finding in corpus T1.P2 in which Sula's S utterance "You can go there ./ [you can go there] ./ location is far but very good to ..." indicated that the speaker in her utterance repeated the sentence "you can go there" and he used short unfilled pause signal ./ . This happened because the speaker sometimes talked while thinking the sequence of next utterance; otherwise, she faced of breaking down in delivering message in a whole content.

Nonverbal Communication Strategies

The discussion of nonverbal CSs comprises facial expression (smiling) and gestures (head nodding, head shaking, hand moving, thumb up, and drawing something).

'**Smiling**' was a part of facial expressions employed three times (7.32%) of three different pairs of subjects as the speakers in taking turns speaking in this study. Smiling was a simple matter in using when face to face communication, but it was an effective strategy to engender meaning of either emphasizing the verbal message or conveying the independent meaning instead of using verbal term to enhance the effectiveness of communication.

Fuji as the speaker in corpus T1.P3 smiled when saying "So many people come to enjoy /em./ {smiling} in Senggigi beach". It showed that she seemed has so vivid personality when delineating thing about Senggigi beach because of its beautiful and interesting place that made people enjoy if coming to the place, but she could not elicit the appropriate TL words to describe the condition of Senggigi beach. However, her message made her interlocutor Atri L smiled too and felt respect making them relaxed during communication. Smile here referred to the feeling of enjoyable and interesting place of Senggigi beach.

'**Nodding of head**' was a part of gesture which employed four times (9.76%) by four different pairs of subjects as the speakers in conversation. Using gestures like head nodding for the speakers indicated that either accompanying their utterances or asking the interlocutors to speak. Nodding of head could be taken completely different of each people depends upon where they live which engenders a particular culture in nodding the head.

Finding in corpus T2.P16 in which Alfi's S utterance "I think education in Indonesia ./ cost

is very big because [because] /eh.../ as of communication about student and teacher/—/ {head nodding} so/—/.../” as an example finding of this study. In this finding showed that the speaker used lengthening of syllable teacher/—/ indicated that he faced difficulty in eliciting the next words then nodding his head to the interlocutor (Hafi L) as a signal that he asked the listener to speak or complete of what was being uttered. By nodding of head, the speakers could use a way of expression that translates in visible form part of what is meant by head nodding.

‘Shaking of head’ which was a part of gesture appeared only twice (4.88%) of two pair of subjects as a speaker in taking turns speaking. The speakers used head shaking to indicate that there was something happened to them concurrently with their utterances while shaking head; while the listeners nodded their head to indicate that nothing happening to them concurrently with silence while shaking head.

Looking at finding in corpus T3.P1 Sarli’ S utterance “... *May be if I think sorong serah like /em.../ what is in your culture? I forget {head shaking}*”. Sarli uttered, “*I forget*” while shaking her head indicated that she forgot the needed term for being used in next message. It meant that there was something happened to her (forgot or unable to recall the desired term) concurrently with utterance while shaking his head. The mixtures of head nodding gesture and utterance as verbal and nonverbal expressions give greater specificity to convince the listener of what happened in oral communication.

‘Hand moving’ was a part of gesture employed eighteen times (43.90%) by eighteen different subjects’ pairs. The speakers employed this strategy when either uttering verbal message concurrently with moving their hands to accompany the verbal terms or only moving hands without uttering anything to substitute the verbal term in expressing the meaning of message. Hand moving as a part nonverbal communication can substitute the verbal communication in a variety of ways.

Finding in corpus T1.P12 (“... there is /eh.../ you can/—/”) was appointed to show if the speaker encountered the difficulty in eliciting of TL words, she exerted long filled pause /eh.../ and lengthening of syllable can/—/ and moving of both spread hands forwards body while thinking the desired language. It indicated that Isma S was unable to recall the TL word “*swim*” so she moved of both spread hands forward her body to illustrate the desired word. The speaker’s gesture made the listener Meti L noticed

of what she has expressed and facilitated her easily to understand the message meaning.

In spite of its appearance only once (2.44%) by a pair of subjects in taking turns speaking, **‘thumb up’** was categorized as the sixth nonverbal strategy in this study. Thumb up categorized as a gesture of nonverbal strategy either can substitute a verbal term without uttering it but has the same meaning or supports a verbal term concurrently with the raising up thumb when uttering a verbal term in expressing the meaning of message. The speaker sometimes used thumb up to impress of what was said or to broadcast the independent meaning of a message.

Focusing on finding in corpus T3.P4, it recognized that the speaker (Zahi S) used this strategy when uttering “*I am from Copulate Jenny. I am/—/ {thumb up} a reporter.*” What performed by Zahi S through his utterance “*I am/—/*” while raising his thumb up showed that he conveyed an implicit meaning as a sequence of a reporter phrase. In spite of using lengthening of syllables “*I am/—/*” before uttering a reporter, he was able to use a nonverbal strategy while thinking the next phrase “*a reporter*”. It indicated that he wanted to convince the listener (Jana L) that he was a top or good reporter, as soon as the listener nodded her head to indicate that she comprehended of what the speaker conveyed and performed.

For all that it was found out only once (2.44%) used by a pair of subjects in conversation activities, **‘drawing something’** was categorized as a gesture of nonverbal strategy in this study. The speaker employed this strategy to delineate something or a concept to substitute the verbal message in expressing of meaning.

Finding in corpus T2.P2 showed that a speaker Riad S described about final exam. When he told about “... *not only grade/—/ for paper but also grade behavior of student itself.*” he used lengthening of syllables “*grade/—/*” while drawing something which indicated that he has a problem of the desired target language. The speaker drew something as such writing by pen on the paper with right hand to illustrate the students’ grades that could be evaluated by written test, or writing on the paper. It was done because he could not elicit the terms were needed to convey the verbal message. He further asked the listener about the context of speaking by uttering “*What do you think, should ujian nasional still in our education system?*” The situation made the listener (Hadi L) asked the speaker for repeating his question. However, the conversation

ran well in the proper manner up to the end of speaking. Drawing something is a part of gestures for either substituting of using verbal language or supporting verbal message and expressing independent meaning sometimes occurred in face-to-face communication. The use of gesture should be viewed as a dynamic of speakers' speaking behavior in taking turns speaking which allows the learners improvise their verbal and nonverbal language.

Communication Strategies Employed by the Learners as Message Senders (Listeners)

Verbal Communication Strategies

The discussion of verbal CSs employed by the listeners includes language switch, appeal for assistance, asking the speaker for clarification, asking the speaker for repetition, asking the speaker to add the language, guessing the speaker's message, and specifying the speaker's message.

'**Language switch**' that was employed ten times (18.18%) of ten different subjects' pairs as the listener was the first compensatory strategy in this study. They substituted their utterances to the Indonesian words because they did not know the TL words. Most of the listeners employed this strategy in responding spontaneously of what the speakers have said, such as asking for clarification, appeal for assistance, and asking the speakers to add message. They exerted their own language to overcome lexical deficiencies of the target language.

The finding in corpus T1.P4 Pian L asked for repetition to the speaker by switching his language into Indonesian words "*Apa tadi?*". Before responding of the speaker's question Pian L seemed has yet to catch the question, so he asked the speaker for repetition and by using his L1 (Indonesian). The speaker repeated his question immediately "*What in the interest thing about Senggigi beach?*" On the question, the listener Pian L finally smiled and tried to answer the question. That fact showed that the conversation was reputed running well in proper way because of both speaker and listener understood to each other.

'**Appeal for assistance**' which appeared only twice (3.64%) of two subjects pairs as the listeners, was categorized as the second compensatory strategy for the listeners. It was one of the learners' efforts to come up with their limited knowledge on English. The listeners employed this strategy because

they still need message from speakers making them asked help to speakers in attempting to dissolve their difficulties in expressing message in their turns

The finding revealed this strategy was in corpus T4.P3, Hadi's L utterance "*Say what?*" On the finding when listening of speaker's description about politics in Indonesia, Hadi L has difficulty to comprehend the speaker's utterance, so he appealed assistance to his interlocutor Pian S by uttering "*Say what?*". It utilized because he has no idea about the content of speaking to express the message when his taking turn. Fortunately, Pian S was able to continue his message by saying "*When we are choose /eh.../ the leader in Indonesia can use political... I think that's all?*". At that state, the listener was not able to express his idea again until the conversation end.

'**Asking the Speaker for Clarification Strategy**' was the third compensatory strategy for the subjects as the listeners. It appeared eighteen times (29.09%) of eighteen pairs of subjects as the listeners in taking turns speaking. When the listeners could not directly understand the speakers' utterances, they could show this by means of asking for clarification, that is, an expression designed to elicit clarification of the speakers' preceding message. Asking for clarification is an illustration of needing more specific message for the listeners in understanding of what the speakers' idea about the speaking context.

Looking at finding in corpus T2.P4, it was unearthed that Etha L still could not comprehend well or still needed more specific meaning of what was being delivered by the speaker (Riya S). He showed his non-acceptance of the speaker's statement "*Education in Indonesia is very good in ./ in school /.../ education is very important.*" Etha L needed further explanation of the speaker's message, so he asked the speaker to clarify the message by uttering, "*so, education is important to our lives—!*". The speaker responded to this request by expanding his initial message in order to convince his interlocutor. So, at the end of the conversation, both the speaker and the listener accepted to each other's contributions, thus building a mutual belief that the message originally intended by the speaker has been successfully understood by the listener.

'**Asking the Speaker for Repetition**' was a strategy employed by the listeners because of being unable to comprehend message from the speakers. Whether either because the listeners has insufficient knowledge of TL making them difficult to understand

message or because of the speakers' unclear message delivered making the listeners very complicated to understand it. Five subjects as the listeners of different pairs employed five times (9.09%) this strategy. This was the single most effective strategy because it is very simple for listeners ask the speakers to repeat what they have spoken in the first time if they lack of understanding of the message.

Finding in corpus T1.P15, shows Opia L asked the speaker Jana to repeat her message by uttering "*question again—!*". It was done because she was unable to catch the speaker's utterance which included a question for her, such as "... *what is the tourism place do you have?*", Opia L used short filled pause /am./ and long filled pause /am.../ while thinking terms to respond the question, unfortunately she could not elicit them. The fact showed that the listener has a problem in taking turn speaking making her asked the speaker to repeat her question. That situation demanded the speaker repeated a part of an utterance by adding some new terms to facilitate the listener understood it. This fact could be seen of her further utterance "... *Anything the tourism place you have been visited you can say that*". Of repeating the utterance, it made the listener comprehended what she should be asserted in her speaking turn. After doing that, the listener seemed has already understood of the speaker's question about tourism places in her village.

The discussion of '**asking the speaker to add message strategy**' which was employed eight times (14.55%) by eight different pairs of subjects in the conversation was considered important to include some expression examples of it, such as "how about ...?", "what is the second ...?", "continuing!", "what?", "find what?", and so forth. This strategy may be similar with the asking the speaker to continue speaking; it is done by the listeners because they needed more information or message from the speakers in order to understand more detail about the speaking context.

Finding for this strategy represented of corpus T1.P1. Riadi L as the listener seemed to need more message from the speaker (Sarli S) by uttering "*How about beautiful?*" Riadi L who looked to need more explanation about the speaking context requests the speaker to add his message in order to know more about description of speaking context-tourism place in Lombok. The speaker responded to this request by expanding his initial message in order to convince

the listener, such as his utterance "*Beautiful because is so clean, the water white state and good wave and there are some cafes and places for your...*" Of the speaker's further explanation showed more detail rather than previous utterance, it made the listener comprehended on needed message about speaking context which they were talking about.

'**Guessing the speaker's message**' was categorized as the compensatory strategy employed ten times (18.18%) by ten of different subjects' pairs in this study. It needs of more understanding about speaking contents for listener in guessing the speaker's message. In that speaker sometimes is unable to elicit the TL expression that needed to deliver the message.

Looking at the finding of this strategy, corpus T1.P2 ("*Place to visit?*"), in which Sula L as the listener polished up the speaker's message "*Do you know [do you know] some/—/ places?*" by guessing the words "*place to visit?*" Hadi elicited lengthening of syllables '*some/—/*' while thinking the TL words, and as soon as Sula L completed the message by guessing words "*Places to visit?*". Sula L seemed may has better TL knowledge than Hadi S, it could be seen of their speaking performances, in which Sula was much better than Hadi's performance making her was able to guess the message because she was more often connecting her thinking to the speaker's message as well as understanding of what the speaker was being conveyed.

'**Specifying the Speaker's Message Strategy**' was included as the compensatory category for the listener in this study. Although it appeared only twice (3.64%) of two different subjects' pairs, but it was very imperative to detect the listeners' dynamic personality and speaking behavior in spoken communication. Being aware of employing this strategy that understanding of general message from the speakers may involve difficulty to depict a large number of responses, so that, the listener immediately to specify the message in order to facilitate in eliciting the sequence of responses.

Finding in corpus T1.P15 showed that Opia's L utterance "*Beach—!*" was the spontaneous utterance on the speaker's question to her. Jana S asked her interlocutor (Opia L) "*Where is the interesting plate that makes you happy there?*" This question still considered in general, so the listener (Opia L) specified the speaker's question into the particular place by uttering "*Beach—!*". Because of the

general question from the speaker, the listener may consider that it was appropriate if giving response in particular context. The listener may be aware that she was uninterested to respond the general meaning of such question, specifying it might be necessitated in order to facilitate in recalling and giving the sequence of particular responses to make the message more meaningfully.

Nonverbal Communication Strategies

On the nonverbal CSs, the discussion consists of facial expression (smiling), eye contact (gazing towards the speaker), gestures (head nodding, head shaking, and hand moving), and posture (backward position and forward position).

'Smiling' was a part of facial expressions employed thirty two times (41.03%) by thirty two different pairs of subjects as the listeners in conversation activity in this study. It was a simple nonverbal language that usually used in oral communication and is an effective strategy to engender meaning of either supporting verbal language or conveying independent meaning instead of using verbal term to make communication effectively. The listeners smiled because of either their happiness/agreement or not understanding/disagreement of message from their interlocutors (speakers). Smiling also gives the listeners self-confidence and helps put them in the right frame of mind when comprehending message from their pairs.

Finding in corpus T1.P2 ("Yeah, yeah {smiling}") was subject's feeling happiness/agreement as was performed by Hadi as the listener, in which he smiled in response the speaker's message "... I think you want to know if you visit there" or what the speaker has suggested to him. The listener (Hadi L) seemed to be interested when hearing things about Selebrana beach because of its beautiful panorama and interesting place making him enjoy if visiting the place.

'Gazing towards the speaker' which was employed twice (2.56%) by two different subjects' pairs as the listener in taking turns speaking is the one of eye contact types in this study. Since visual sense is considered important to engender the meaning of a message, eye contact as a nonverbal device is a one way in conveying the meaning in oral communication.

Finding in corpus T1.P10 in which Yati L as the listener performed like "Ah—! {gazing towards the speaker}" when hearing the speaker's (Yani S)

utterance "What make Gili Trawangan beautiful?" Yani L used this strategy because she has yet to understand a question from the speaker. She gazed to speaker for asking the speaker to repeat what she has said in the first time. It was done because of her less comprehending of the speakers' question that made her was unable to answer the question directly. Fortunately, the speaker immediately released her second question that enabled the listener comprehends and on what she has to be commented on it. In spite of her problem in receiving the message, the listener finally understood and elicited her response by uttering "Oh—/!"

'Nodding of head' which was employed twenty times (25.64%) by twenty different pairs of subjects as the listeners in taking turns speaking is a part of gestures nonverbal CS. Using gesture as is head nodding for the listeners indicates that either their understanding or not understanding of message from the speakers. It can be used completely different among each one of learners depends upon what he/she wants to express in engendering a particular meaning of the message through nodding of the head. Nodding of head when hearing something indicates that it agrees and understands of what being uttered by speakers. Another meaning of using head nodding for the listeners is to indicate that they may ask the speakers to continue speaking in order the communication running in properly manner.

Finding in corpus T1.P4 showed that the listener (Pian L) nodded his head when hearing the speaker's utterance "... may be specific place about Gili Meno, Gili Trawangan, and other. Give to me specific." It indicated that the listener has understood about the speaker's message by uttering "Okay!" while nodding his head. When his speaking turn, he responded of the request by explaining his message "...very famous because there are very many visitors go there...". In spite of the learners sometimes used a few inappropriate TL rules in taking turn speaking, their communication was still transpired on a proper manner and gave meaning that made them understood to each other.

'Shaking of head' which appeared six times (7.69%) of six pairs of subjects as the listener in taking turns speaking was included to nonverbal gestures. Head shaking as a nonverbal CSs used by the listeners may be different of what used by the speakers because of the listeners' role as the message receiver who comprehend message. If the listeners do not understand or disagree of the speakers'

message they may respond with nonverbally instead of using verbally.

Isma's L performance "*{head shaking} Can you question again?*" in corpus T2.P12 shown that she shook her head then asking the speaker for repetition when listening the speaker's message "... *what different knowledge in senior high school and in campus*" indicated that she has yet to understand of what the speaker's request. On the listener's request, the speaker immediately repeated his question by switching his language into L1 (Indonesian) such as "Apa perbedaan knowledge in campus and/—/ apa pelajaranya ya? That the second question made listener asked the speaker for clarification of key term by saying "knowledge!" This clarification request made the speaker has to repeat his third question by repeating the second question. Of the third repeated question then making the listener understood and smiled, then she tried to respond the question by describing the speaking context.

'**Hand moving**' was a part of gesture nonverbal strategy employed three times (3.85%) by three different subjects' pairs. The listener employed this strategy when hearing the incomplete message from the speaker that indicated that the listener needed more or complete message to facilitate in comprehending a sequence of message. This strategy employed without uttering anything to substitute the verbal words in a variety of ways to convey the meaning in oral communication.

Finding in corpus T1.P7 was appointed to show if the speaker (Hafi S) faced the difficulty in recalling the TL words to answer his interlocutor's (Alfi) question about "*What character village is your village?*" Hafi S considered as the false start when trying to answer the question by uttering "*/-/ Cool / em.../*", he exerted long filled pause */em.../* indicated that he was unable to continue his message. Being seen the speaker's hesitation phenomena, the listener (Alfi L) as soon as giving response by uttering "*And then!*" while gazing towards the speaker and moving his right flat hand to ask speaker to continue speaking. Because the speaker was unable to give complete message, Alfi in his speaking turn, asking his interlocutor (Hafi) again by switching his language into L1 totally such as "*Terletak dimana desa anda?*" That questing in L1 made Alfi's interlocutor (Hafi) tried to delineate the speaking context in L1 mostly; however, he sometimes combined with TL expression.

In spite of its appearance only once (1.28%) of one pair of subjects in conversation activities, '**backward position**' was categorized as the posture nonverbal CS in this study. The listener used this strategy because she was disappointed on the speaker who conveyed the incomplete and unclear message that made the listener could not understand of what he has just uttered. This action meant to ask the speaker to repeat his utterance in order to engender useful meaning in taking turns speaking.

Finding in corpus T1.P1 depicted Sarli's posture when hearing the speaker's (Riad) utterance "... *I want ask you about something in your place. I am ./ I am ./ {smiling}*" In his utterance Riad exerted short unfilled pause *./* twice and smiled indicating that he faced difficulty in recalling the TL words for delivering his message. For that matter made the listener (Sarli L) was disappointed to the speaker who conveyed incomplete and unclear message making her is unable to comprehend it, so she uttered "*Auri/—/*" while going backward position. The listener did it because she hoped that the speaker repeated his utterance by using the appropriate TL word and grammar that contain benefit meaning to enhance the achievement of communication goals. Having seen the listener's action, the speaker repeated his utterance immediately by uttering "... *I want ask about what is nice place there./ [I mean a tourism place], and you can show me?*" Hearing the speaker's utterance, the listener responded it immediately by saying "Okay" while nodding of her head. It established a good rapport between speaker and listener that made their communication went on in a properly manner up to the communication ended.

'**Forward position**' which was employed five times (6.41%) by five different subjects' pairs as listeners in conversation activities was categorized as the posture nonverbal CS in this study. The listeners utilized this strategy because they were not able to catch the clear message from the speakers that delivered in an incomplete and an unclear utterance making listeners must go forward position in front the speakers in order to get clear message from them. This act was meant for asking the speakers to speak in clear and complete message to facilitate the listeners comprehend of what they were conveyed to engender proper meaning in spoken communication.

Looking at finding in corpus T1.P12 performed by the listener's (Meti) posture when she listened

the speaker's (Isma) utterance "... *the beautiful place many there*". The listener was unable to catch the speaker's message, so she uttered "How?" while going forward position to the speaker. Since the act performed by the listener, the speaker as soon as adding her utterance by saying "Tree, tree, and Sana Segal /.../" then laughing. This strategy is employed by the listeners because they want the speakers can speak clearly as well as using complete message to facilitate them in understanding it, then when their speaking turns, they could recall response in the appropriate TL words and rules which engendered useful meaning to maintain the communication transpired in a proper manner. Finally, their betterment of the message and good rapport make their communication running well and they seem involved in understanding to each other when communicating in English.

CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

Conclusions

There are eleven categories of verbal communication strategies employed by the learners as message senders (speakers); they are topic avoidance, message abandonment, approximation, word coinage, circumlocution, language switch, appeal for assistance, paraphrasing, self-correction, comprehension check, and self-repetition. Of eleven verbal strategies, language switch is the most frequently employed by the speakers. Meanwhile, six categories of strategies are related to nonverbal CSs employed by the speakers, namely smiling, head nodding, head shaking, hand moving, thumb up, and drawing something. Of six nonverbal strategies, hand moving is the most frequently used by the speakers. With regard to CSs employed by the learners as message receivers (listeners), verbal CSs consist of seven categories of strategies: language switch, appeal for assistance, asking the speaker for clarification, asking the speaker for repetition, asking the speaker to add language, guessing the speaker's message, and specifying the speaker's message. Meanwhile, in relation to nonverbal CSs employed by the listeners, seven strategies are found. Those are smiling, gazing towards the speaker, head nodding, head shaking, hand moving, backward position, and forward position. Of seven verbal strategies and seven nonverbal strategies, asking the speaker for clarification and smiling are the most

frequently employed by the listeners. Furthermore, the modification of CSs adopted from Tarone (1983) and Faerch and Kasper (1983) typologies of CSs, five new verbal strategies are revealed in this study: asking the speaker for clarification, asking the speaker for repetition, asking the speaker to add language, guessing the speaker's message, and specifying the speaker's message. These new categories have contributed to the descriptions of how the listeners performed taking turns speaking in English.

Suggestions

The researcher would like to make several recommendations for several parties such as Speaking course lecturers at IKIP Mataram and the future researchers.

For the Speaking subject lecturers at IKIP Mataram, it is suggested that they should know that CSs do play important role in oral communication for both lecturers and learners. This can help lecturers to enhance their teaching practice and learners to improve their speaking proficiency. In teaching speaking the lecturers are suggested that they need to include communication strategy as a part of strategy/tactic in spoken communication. By including it, the learners are expected to be able to enhance their insights, knowledge, and experience on the process of speaking acquisition in order to generate ideas to improve their communicative competencies as the ability underlying speaking proficiency. It is also suggested that speaking subject lecturers should teach the learners how to increase their speaking proficiency through drilling how to memorize, connect, and use TL lexical, morphological, syntactic, and phonological aspects in a series of sentences or utterances to form a meaningful whole in proper way in taking turns speaking.

For future researchers, albeit this study is limited on elaborating the types of CSs, it can be used as the starting point for the future researchers to explore other aspects of CSs of speaking. Furthermore, it is considered important to suggest those who want to conduct the study in this field. It is suggested that future researchers to explore more CSs by conducting different research designs, subjects, and settings; the effectiveness of CSs training, CSs used by EFL learners with native speaker of English either in a speaking class or in other contexts; CSs viewed from different sexes (gender), CSs viewed from different

learning styles, and CSs viewed from different motivation; these are various fields of investigation.

REFERENCES

- Bialystok, Ellen. 1983. Some factors in the selection and implementation of communication strategies. In Claus Faerch & Gabriele Kasper (Eds.), *Strategies in Interlanguage Communication* (p. 100-118). New York: Longman Inc.
- Bialystok, Ellen. 1990. *Communication strategies: A Psychological Analysis of Second Language Use*. Cambridge: Basil Blackwell.
- Dornyei, Zoltan. 1995. *On the teachability of communication strategies*. TESOL Quarterly, (Online), 29: 55-85, (<http://www.docjax.com>), retrieved March 14, 2011
- Dornyei, Zoltan & Scott, Mary Lee. 1997. Review Article *Communication strategies in Second Language: Definitions and Taxonomies*. Language Learning, (Online), 47 (1): 173-202, (<http://www.docjax.com>), retrieved March 14, 2011.
- Faerch, Clause & Kasper, Gabriele. 1983. On identifying communication strategies in interlanguage production. In Claus Faerch & Gabriele Kasper (Eds.), *Strategies in Interlanguage Communication* (p. 210-238). New York:
- Huang, Chiung-Ping. 2010. *Exploring Factors Affecting the Use of Oral Communication Strategies*, (Online), (<http://www.docjax.com>), retrieved December 10, 2011.
- Johnson, Donna M. 1992. *Approaches to Research in Second Language Learning*. New York: Longman.
- Kamiya, Masashito. 2007. *The Role of Communicative Competence in L2 Learning*. (Online), (<http://www.docjax.com>), retrieved March 14, 2011
- Karimnia, Amin & Zade, Shahram Salehi. 2007. Communication Strategies: English Language Department in Irak. *Iranian Journal of Language Studies*, (Online), 1 (4): 287-298, (<http://www.docjax.com>), retrieved February 17, 2012.
- Lincoln, Y.S. & Guba, E.G. 1985. *Naturalistic Inquiry*. London: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Lerner, Gene H. (Ed.) 2004. *Conversational Analysis: Studies from the first generation*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Liddicoat, Anthony J. 2007. *An Introduction to Conversation Analysis*. London: Continuum.
- Luft, J, Ingham, H. 2012. Non-verbal Communication. "The Johari window, a graphic model of interpersonal awareness", *Proceedings of the western training laboratory in group development*. Los Angeles: UCLA. (Online), (<http://www.wanterfall.com>), retrieved December 14, 2012
- Mei, An & Nathalang, Sanooch. 2010. Use of Communication Strategies by Chinese EFL Learners. *Chinese Journal of Applied Linguistics (Biomonthly)*, (Online), 33 (3): 110-125, (<http://www.docjax.com>), retrieved February 17, 2012.
- Miles, M. B & Huberman, A.M. 1984. *Qualitative Data Analysis*. California: Sage Publication Inc.
- Nakatani, Yasuo. 2006. Developing an Oral Communication Strategy Inventory. *The Modern Language Journal*, (Online), 90 (ii): 151-168, (<http://www.docjax.com>), retrieved December 14, 2011.
- Nakatani, Yasuo & Goh, Christine. 2007. A review of oral communication strategies: focus on interactionist and psycholinguistic perspectives. In Andrew D. Cohen & Ernesto Macaro (Eds.), *Language Learner Strategies: Thirty Years of Research and Practice* (p. 207-227). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Padmadewi, N. N. 1998. Students' anxiety in speaking class and ways of minimizing it. *Jurnal Ilmu Pendidikan*, 5 (Supplementary Edition, 60-67).
- Rabab'ah, Ghaleb. 2001. Communication Problems Facing Arab Learners of English. *Journal of Language and Learning*, (Online), (<http://www.pdf.finder.com>), retrieved December 10, 2011.
- Shumin, Kang. 2002. Factors to Consider: Developing Adult EFL Students' Speaking Abilities. In Jack C. Richards and Willy A. Renandya (Eds.), *Methodology in Language Teaching: An Anthology of Current Practice* (204-211). Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Somsai, Surapa & Intaraprasert, Channarong. 2011. *Strategies for coping with face-to-face oral communication problem employed by Thai university students majoring in English*. GEMA Online Journal of Language Studies, (Online), 11 (3), (<http://www.docjax.com>), retrieved December 14, 2011.
- Tarone, Elaine. 1983. Some thoughts on the notion of communication strategy. In Claus Faerch & Gabriele Kasper (Eds.), *Strategies in Interlanguage Communication* (p. 61-74). New York: Longman Inc.
- Thompson, Neil. 2003. *Communication and Language: A handbook of theory and practice*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Tutyandari, C. 2005. *Breaking the silence of the students in an English language class*. Paper presented at

- the 53rd TEFLIN International conference, Yogyakarta, Indonesia.
- Ur, Penny. 1996. *A Course in Language Teaching: Practical and Theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ya-ni, Zhang. 2007. Communication Strategies and Foreign Language Learning. *US-China Foreign Language*, (Online), 5 No.4 (Serial No.43): 43-48, (<http://www.pdf.finder.com>), retrieved December 10, 2011.
- Wooffitt, Robin. 2005. *Conversation Analysis and Discourse Analysis: A Comparative and Critical Introduction*. London: Sage Publication.