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REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

2.1 INTRODUCTION

By early nineteen eighties a change in the second language pedagogy gave birth to the Communicative Approach which was a revolution against the traditional approaches. It aims at developing the learner's communicative competence. In other words, it is mainly concerned with developing the communicative ability in language learners. Howatt (1984) indicates that the original motivation for developing a Communicative Approach was remedial, an attempt to overcome the inadequacies of existing structural syllabi, materials and methods. However, the recent approach is organized on the basis of communicative functions. It does not ignore the role of grammar in the process of language teaching but questions the usefulness of grammatical rules without their application to real life situations.

2.2 CHARACTERISTICS OF THE COMMUNICATIVE APPROACH

The goal of Communicative Approach is to make learners communicatively competent. Of course, this has been the stated goal of many of the traditional methods, but in Communicative Approach the notion of what it takes to be communicatively competent is much expanded.

Communicative competence involves being able to use the language appropriately in a given social context. To do this students need knowledge of the linguistic forms, meanings, and functions.

In the Communicative Approach the teacher is seen as a facilitator of his students' learning. As such he has many roles to fulfil. He is a manager of classroom activities. In this role, one of his major responsibilities is to create situations that promote communication. During the activities he acts as an advisor, answering student's questions and monitoring their performance. At other times he might be a "co-communicator", engaging in the communicative activity along with the students (Little wood 1981).
Students are, above all, communicators. They are actively engaged in negotiating meaning - in trying to make them understood even when their knowledge of the target language is incomplete. They learn to communicate by communicating.

Moreover, the teacher's role is less dominant in a teacher-centered method. Students are seen as more responsible managers of their own learning. Students use the language a great deal through communicative activities such as games, role-plays and problems-solving tasks. Activities that are truly communicative, according to Morrow (in Johnson and Morrow 1981) have three features: information gap, choice, and feedback.

Another characteristic of the Communicative Approach is the use of authentic materials. It is considered desirable to give students an opportunity to develop strategies for understanding language as it is actually used by native speakers.

In the Communicative Approach activities are carried out by students in small groups. That means small numbers of students interact in order to maximize the time allotted to each student for learning to negotiate meaning. Also, teachers give students an opportunity to express their individuality by having them share ideas and opinions on a regular basis. This helps students to integrate the foreign language with their own personality and to feel emotionally secure with it. Furthermore, the student's native language has no particular role in the Communicative Approach. The students learn from these classroom management exchanges, and realize that the target language is a vehicle for communication, not just an object to be studied.
Littlewood (1981:38) indicates that in the Communicative Approach.

The meanings that learners need to express become less predictable. The teacher therefore has less change of equipping them with the specific language items that they will need. Also, learners must draw on a wider range of skills and strategies in order to get new meanings across. There is a gradual increase in the range of communicative functions that are likely to occur. Learners also need to develop greater skills for managing the interaction, e.g. signaling disagreement or interrupting without offence. There is increasing opportunity for learners to express their own individuality in discussions.

For a better understanding of the Communicative Approach let us list the characteristics of the Grammar - Translation Method and the Communicative Approach.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics of Grammar Translation Method</th>
<th>Characteristics of Communicative Approach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. A fundamental purpose of learning a foreign language is to be able to read its literature. Literary language is superior to spoken language.</td>
<td>1. Whenever possible, &quot;authentic language&quot; - language as it is used in a real context - should be introduced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. An important goal is to be able to translate each language into the other.</td>
<td>2. Being able to figure out the speaker's or writer's intention is part of being communicatively competent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The ability to communicate in the target language is not a goal of foreign language instruction</td>
<td>3. The target language is a vehicle for classroom communication, not just the object of study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The primary skills to be developed are reading and writing. Little attention is given to speaking and listening, and almost none to pronunciation.</td>
<td>4. One function can have many different linguistic forms. Since the focus of the course is on real language use, a variety of linguistic forms are presented together.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The teacher is the authority in the classroom. It is important that students get the correct answer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>It is possible to find native language equivalents for all target language works.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Learning is facilitated through attention to similarities between the target language and the native language.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>It is important for students to learn about the form of the target language.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Deductive application of an explicit grammar rule is a useful pedagogical technique.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Students should be conscious of the grammatical rules of the target language.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Wherever possible, verb conjugations and other grammatical paradigms should be committed to memory. (Larsen - Freeman 1986)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As mentioned earlier, Communicative Approach aims at developing the learner's communicative competence. In other words, it is mainly concerned with developing the communicative ability in English language learners. Canale and Swain (1980) and later in Canale (1983) state the four components (or subcategories) that make up communicative competence. The first two subcategories reflect the use of linguistic system itself. "Grammatical competence" is that aspect of communicative competence that encompasses knowledge of lexical items and rules of morphology, syntax, sentence grammar, semantics and phonology. It is the competence that we associate with mastering the linguistic code of a language or the "linguistic competence". The second sub category is "discourse competence" the complement of grammatical competence in many ways. It is the ability we have to connect sentences or utterances. In other words, it focuses on discourse or supra sentential (above the sentence) level i.e., those properties of language which bind the sentences together such as cohesion and coherence, whereas grammatical competence focuses on sentence level.

The last two subcategories define more functional aspects of communication." Sociolinguistic competence" is the knowledge of sociocultural rules. This type of competence requires an understanding of the social context in which participants use language, the information they share, and the functions of the interaction. They are concerned with style, register, appropriateness (degrees of politeness) and so on.

The fourth subcategory is "Strategic Competence", Canale and Swain (1980:40) describes strategic competence as "the verbal and non verbal communication strategies that may be called into action to compensate for breakdown in communication due to performance variable or due to insufficient competence".

However, in this study more attention will be given to strategic competence because it focuses on the students' communication breakdown in real communicative situation. That means it aims at equipping students with the needed techniques by using communication strategies, which are regarded as the mechanism of strategic competence.
2.3 COMMUNICATION STRATEGIES:

2.3.1 Definition of Communication Strategies (CSs):

One of the problems that has occupied researchers of CSs from the beginning concerns the identification of CSs. This issue is still controversial to date.

Poulisse (1994) indicates that of all definitions of CSs that have been offered so far, the one by Faerch and Kasper (1983: 36) is the most widely used. They define CSs as "Potential conscious plans for solving what presents itself as a problem in reaching a particular communicative goal". In this definition problem orientedness is adopted as a primary and potential consciousness as a secondary criterion.

In practice, this means that CSs can be identified when speakers are aware of a problem in their communication.

2.3.2. The Notion of Communication Strategies:

Selinkder (1972) coined the term "Communication Strategies" (CSs) in his seminal paper on "Interlingua", discussing strategies of second language "Communication" as one of the five central processes involved in L2 learning. However, it was Varadi (1973) who first empirically studied this phenomenon, namely, "Strategies of target language learner Communication". In 1973, he presented a paper at a small European Conference on "Message Adjustment" in which he considered the first systematic analysis of strategic language behavior. But that paper was not published till 1980. In the late seventies, Tarone, Cohen and Dumas (1976), Tarone (1977) published two studies on CS in which they provided the first definition of CS as well as the first lexical CS taxonomy.
Dornyei (1995) indicates that the real career of CSs started in the early eighties when Varadi published his article "Strategies of Target Language Learner Communication: Message Adjustment". Then followed by Canale and Swain (1980); Canale (1983), Faerch and Kasper (1983a) published an edited volume, "Strategies in Interlingua Communication" which pulled together the most important published papers on CSs at that time. Many publications appeared focusing primarily on identifying and classifying CSs. The most important research on CSs appeared in the second half of 1980s at the University of Nijmegen (Netherlands). The results of that research shed light on various aspects of CSs use and challenged some aspects of the previous taxonomies.

Bialystock (1990) and Poulisse's (1990) researchers were another important contribution in the field of CSs.

Finally, the second half of the 1990s brought further empirical and conceptual analyses of the teachability of CSs, which is introduced as a new dimensions in the field of second language teaching.

2.3.3. Typologies of CSs

Faerch and Kasper (1983) classify communication strategies into three major types:

1. Formal reduction strategies.
2. Functional Strategies and
3. Achievement Strategies.

1. Formal Reduction Strategies:

These are strategies used by learners to avoid producing non-fluent or incorrect utterances. Using such strategies, learners focus on the use of specific, limited rules or patterns that they can perfectly master. The purpose of utilizing these strategies, which deal with linguistic aspects of the target language, i.e., phonology, morphology, syntax and lexis, is to avoid errors and to facilitate speech.
2. Functional Reduction strategies:

These strategies are used when the learners have experienced problems in the planning phase (due to insufficient linguistic resources) or the execution phase (retrieval problems). The aim of such strategies is to avoid rather than to achieve.

3. Achievement strategies:

Whereas the previous two kinds of strategies are to solve communication problems using avoidance, achievement strategies make use of communication resources expansion. They are used both in the planning and executive phase. Achievement strategies used in the planning phase are called compensatory strategies. They are classified as follows:

a. Code Switching: Tarone, Cohen and Dumas (1983) refer to it as language switch. This means a change by a speaker from one language or variety to another one. It can take place in a conversation when one speaker uses one language and the other speaker answers in a different language. A person may start speaking one language and then change to another one in the middle of their speech or sometimes even in the middle of a sentence.

b. Interlanguage transfer: It is similar to code switching but rather it includes the shift to a combination of linguistic features of the native language and the interlanguage. Here, the learner combines a word in their native language with a word in the foreign language that has similar spelling or pronunciation but with different meaning. For example, the Danish word "history" which means "story" may be matched with the English word "history".

c. Inter intralingual transfer: This strategy includes over generalization of grammatical rules. For example, the words "people" and "information" will be pluralized as "peoples" and "information" which means the learner did not master the exceptions of the grammatical rules of the target language.
d. Interlanguage - based strategies: These are strategies affected by problems that learners face in their interlanguage system. To solve these problems, learners may use: generalization, paraphrase, and/or word coinage (using new words of the individual's own to express what that individual wants to say, e.g. "inner clothes" for "under wear")

e. Cooperative strategies: Such strategies are used when learners fail to communicate successfully, and ask for help from the listener, the teacher, a friend and so on.

f. Non-Linguistic strategies: In face to face communication, the learners may use non-verbal mime, gesture and signals.

Whereas achievement strategies aiming at solving problems at the planning phase are called compensatory strategies, achievement strategies used to overcome obstacles in the execution phase are called retrieval strategies. The retrieval strategies are categorized in Faerch and Kasper (1983) as follows:

1. Waiting for the term to appear, appealing to formal similarity, retrieving via semantic fields, searching via other language, retrieving from learning situations and sensory procedures.

Little wood (1984) offers a typology containing eight strategies they are:

1. Avoid Communication
2. Adjust the message
3. Use paraphrase
4. Use approximation
5. Create new words
6. Switch to the native language
7. Use non-linguistic resource
8. Seek help
He (ibid) suggests that when the learner is aware of gaps or weaknesses in his linguistic repertoire and when he feels that others are competing for turns he chooses to avoid participating in the discussion of the topic. When the learner cannot avoid participating, he may choose to adjust the message to the linguistic resources available to him. For example, he may omit some information which he is unable to express or may express it less precisely by slightly changing the meaning. He may also describe a word or a concept for which he does not know the target language expression, which is called paraphrase. For example, if he does not know the word "kettle" he may use a definition such as "a thing we boil water in". In place of word, sometimes the learner may use a word or a phrase which is very close to the target language expression (the strategy of approximation). For example, if the learner wants to refer to a "water-pipe" but does not know the word, then he may call it a "Pipe".

Corder (1981: 104-106) points out that all strategies used by learners fall under two macro-strategies. They are:

1. Message adjustment or risk avoidance or
2. Resource expansion or risk - running strategies.

He maintains that when the learner is faced with a situation where his linguistic resources do not permit him to express himself successfully the learner has only two options open for him. He can either tailor / adjust the message to the linguistic resources available to him (the strategy of message adjustment) or he can attempt to increase his resources by one means or another in order to realize his communicative intentions (the strategy of resource expansion).
In message adjustment the learner either refuses to enter into or continue a discourse with some field or topic because of a feeling of total linguistic inadequacy (which is called strategy of topic avoidance) or he tries but gives up or says something slightly different from what was intended. These are message abandonment and semantic avoidance strategies respectively. Here the learner compromises on the message. In resource expansion the learner attempts to increase his resources by one way or another in order to realize his communicative intentions rather than compromise on the intended message.

2.3.4 The Effect of CSs on Oral Communicative Competence

There is a little agreement on the role of CSs should play in foreign language classrooms. Some people have propagated the view that learners should receive explicit instruction as to what CSs are and what kind of CSs they could use.

Research on effects of this kind of direct instruction is scant and contradictory. Some investigators claim that learner's communicative abilities were greatly improved after they received instruction in CSs use. For example Savignon (1972), Buch (1989), Chen (1990), Rost and Ross (1991), Dornyei and Thurrell (1991), Dornyei and Thurrell (1994), Dornyei (1995), Dornyei and Scott (1997) all call them "coping strategies",

Other investigators have argued that there is no need to explicitly teach CSs since second language (L2) learners who generally know how and when to use CSs in their first language (L1) are able to transfer their strategic competence to L2 situations.

They know what kind of descriptions to give to unknown words and know that transfer strategies are likely to be successful. Thus, L2 learners do not so much need to develop their strategic competence, but rather need to learn how to perform it.
Chen (1990) rejects the idea that Strategic Competence is transferable from L1 to L2. His argument is that learners employ CSs every now and then, but may not be able to use the appropriate CSs spontaneously. Dornyei (1995) supports Chen's point of view when he argues that learners come to the L2 classroom with the skill of "reading" in their L1. So why do we have to teach them to read in the target language since they have already acquired the skill?

O'Malley (1987: 143) provides some evidence for the teachability of strategic competence. He indicates that:

Teachers should be confident that there exist a number of strategies which can be embedded into their existing curricula, that can be taught to students with only modest extra effort, and that can improve the overall class performance. Further research should be directed to refining the strategy training approaches, identifying effects associated with individual strategies, and determining procedures for strengthening the impact of the strategies on student outcomes.

O'Malley and Chamot (1990: 184) emphasize that learning strategy training should be direct, that is "students should be appraised of the goals of strategy instruction and should be made aware of the strategies they are being taught".

Chen (1990) agrees with Faerch and Kasper (1983) that strategic competence could be taught explicitly in the L2 classroom. He sees that it is possible to do something about our teaching methods to make it conducive to the development of learners' Strategic Competence. That means teaching the learners how to use CSs appropriately and effectively as part of the classroom syllabus. Bialystok (1983) argues that strategy training could enable the learners to get more experiences of CSs use that would enable them to recognize particular communicative problems and employ particular CSs, which are the most effective ones to solve these problems.
Rost and Ross (1991) support the idea of teaching CSs explicitly. They came to this conclusion from their study of using CSs for teaching listening comprehension to a group of learners "Identification - task strategies". Their findings indicate that the strategies they implemented in their study are highly teachable.

Some studies did investigate the potential usefulness of the specific training of CSs, and prove evidence that explicit instruction can increase both the quality and quantity of communicative competence.

2.5 PIONEERING STUDIES IN CSS TRAINING

Savignon (1972) was one of the pioneers in this field. She seems to have realized that the mastery of the mechanics of a language did not ensure the ability to use the language for communication. She also observed that the traditional teaching practice did not help or lead to authentic communication. Therefore, she started to think of the possibility of creating authenticity in second language teaching in the classroom. That means producing some materials for teaching verbal exchange based on real life situations. She was concerned mainly with the skills that are needed to get ones' meaning across, to do things in the second language, to say what one really wants to say. She conducted an experiment in which she studied the communicative skills and grammar skills of three groups of college students enrolled in an introductory audio-lingual French Course in the United States. All three groups received the same number of hours of instruction in the standard (formal and grammatical) program, but one group had an additional class-hour per week devoted to communicative tasks (where the emphasis was mainly on getting one's meaning across). The second group got an additional hour to a "Culture lab" program and the third spent an additional hour in a language laboratory program. We will refer to these groups as the communicative competence (CC) group, the culture group, and the grammatical competence group.
She found that although there was no significant difference among groups on tests of grammatical competence, the "CC" group scored significantly higher than the other two groups on four communicative tests she developed. Savigonon's finding was that students who had received training in communicative skills felt better prepared to use their limited knowledge of French to (its best) advantage. Freed from an overt concern with linguistic accuracy; they were able to communicate in French whereas the other control groups were not.

Buch (1989) observed that some learners manage to participate in the Target Language (TL) communicative situations, whereas the majority fail though they have more or less the same socio-economic, educational and linguistic background and almost the same linguistic repertoire. Therefore, she conducted a study to develop the ability of using CSs in learners who were inhibited from using CSs (and thus, fail to participate in TL communicative situations). In her study, she prepared a set of activities on the assumption that in performing those activities learners would resort to various CSs. However, inorder to find out whether the proposed activities are teachable in the classroom situation and whether they contribute to the development of use of CS, a 14-day pilot teaching program was carried out at Gujarat Land Society Institution of English (GLSIE), Ahmedabad. Seven learners from more or less the same socio-economic background were chosen for the pilot program. The learners were informed about the purpose of the pilot program and the kind of activities they were going to be involved in.

The use of CSs was not taught explicitly or separately. It was encouraged and induced by allowing learners to use CSs, by the teacher using CSs in her own conversation and by demonstrating the use of CSs when learners fell short of TL expression.
The use of mother tongue (MT) was not only allowed but also encouraged in the initial stages. The teacher also used MT in the beginning and gradually switched over completely, to the TL and also her learners were asked to interact only in the TL in the later stages.

These activities were also observed by one more observer who was a senior researcher in the area of English Language Teaching. The researcher came to the conclusion that the outcome of the pilot program was successful. That means, the use of CSs enabled the learners to express themselves better. Moreover, it increased the learner’s participation in the classroom activities which enhanced TL interaction. Besides, the task and activities (used in the pilot program) interested the learners and they could involve learners in target language interaction. A positive change with regard to learner’s language behavior was also noticed towards the end of the program. That means strategy training helps the learners to participate in TL communicative situation effectively.

Dornyei and Thurrell (1991) conducted an empirical study on the teachability of CSs. They believe that CSs can be taught in classroom for L2 learners explicitly as well as implicitly. In 1991 they reported their experiment on teaching some aspects of “message adjustment” and resource expansion skills. They taught:

(a) Fillers
(b) Going off the point (avoiding giving information)
(c) Paraphrase and circumlocution
   i) explanation
   ii) definition
   iii) paraphrasing
   iv) appeal for help
(a) Fillers

Dornyei and Thurrell (1991) used the term “fillers” to refer to hesitation devices, pauses, etc., but this term was developed further in Dornyei (1995) and replaced by “stalling or time-gaining strategies”. Latter the term included different aspects that allow the speaker to think properly of the next work or words.

It gives more time for “maneuvering” and for carrying on the conversation in times of difficulty. Time gaining, for example, gives the speaker/learner a good chance to re-plan his ideas according to the situation.

These fillers or time-gaining expressions are ranged from very short structures (Well, I mean, actually, you know), to what are almost phrases (As a matter of fact, to be quite honest, now let me think, I’ll tell you what, I see what you mean, etc.).

Dornyei and Thurrell (ibid.) Suggest that the use of these devices can be encouraged right from the early stages. The teacher should make his learners aware of the usefulness of fillers whenever possible.

(b) Going off the point

This strategy trains the learners how to evade an answer smoothly when they do not want to, or simply cannot, answer a question. Moreover, it trains them how to steer the conversation in a desired direction. This, of course, will enable the learners to control the conversation even if something unexpected occurs.

The teacher addresses a student with a question that asks for specific information. For example, "How old are you?" The student must respond in two or three sentences without actually giving that particular information. A possible answer might be, for example, “well, that’s an interesting question, "Isn’t it strange, how people always feel that they need to know the age of a person?" "I don’t really think that age is important at all".
They also suggest that there should be some preparation time in the first stage of these activities. The preparation time should be decreased gradually till the learners get used to these activities.

(c) **Paraphrase (circumlocution)**

i. **Explanation**

Dornyei and Thurrell (1991) suggest that the teacher could hand out a slip of paper to each student with the name of an object on each slip. Everybody in turn must try to ‘explain’ their word to the others without actually saying what it is. Students jot down their guesses for all the words and the winner is the person whose word has been found out by most of the students.

ii. **Definition**

Similarly, the learners can be trained to “define” objects. For example, in pairs, students are given the name of an object (e.g., car) which they must define by using relative clauses (e.g., ‘A car is a vehicle in which you can travel’). Each pair in turn reads out their definition, while the other pairs check whether it is precise enough. If it is not - that is, if they can find another object that the definition suits (e.g., ‘bus’ in this case) they bet a point and for another point they must give a more specific definition (e.g., ‘a car is a small vehicle in which you can travel’). Again, this new definition is also open for discussion.

iii. **Paraphrase, for example**

So you are saying that ....

You mean .....etc.

This is a very useful strategy for learners to clarify what they have heard and to invite the interlocutor to help if they have misunderstood something.
iv. Appeal for help: when the student asks his teacher or interlocutor to provide him with the needed word or expression.

(d) Interruption

Student 1 asks a question; student 2 interrupts by asking him/her to repeat a word again, for example:

S1 : London is the Capital .... ?
S2 : Sorry, can you repeat the word after the Capital?

Or what does the word ‘capital’ mean? Or Did you say that London is the capital of .... ? Etc.

Saraswati (1991:117) came to the conclusion from her study which she conducted on an Indian post-doctoral research scholar at Edinburgh that:

Since communication strategies play a significant role in communication, it may be useful to build in enough challenge into course materials in order to create conditions congenial for the use of strategic competence.

Similarly, Faerch and Kasper (1983:55) indicate that:

If by teaching we also mean making learners conscious about aspects of their (already existing) behavior, it is obvious that we should teach them about strategies.

Dornyei and Thurrell (1994) believe that a given conversation course, taught directly, needs to be based on four categories of conversational skills. The following is a description of these skills.

1. Conversational rules and structures.
2. Conversational strategies.
3. Functions and meanings in conversation.
4. Social and cultural contexts.
Dornyei (1995:163-164) suggests the following which can be used as guidelines for teaching CSs explicitly. These strategies can be summarized as follows:

1. Raising learners' awareness about the nature and communicative potential of CSs.

   This can be done by making learners aware/conscious of strategies already in their repertoire, sensitizing them to the appropriate situation where these could be useful, and making them realize that these strategies could actually work. Faerch and Kasper (1986: 187) quoted in Dornyei (1995:63) also emphasize the need to increase learners “metacommunicative awareness” with respect to strategy use.

2. Encouraging students to be willing to take risks and use CSs; that is, to manipulate available language without being afraid of making errors.

3. Providing L2 models of the use of certain CSs through demonstration, listening materials and videos, and getting learners to identify, categorize, and evaluate strategies used by native speakers or other L2 speakers.

4. Highlighting cross-cultural differences in CSs use might involve various degrees of stylistic appropriateness associated with CSs (e.g. in some languages particular CSs may be seen as indications of bad style), differences in the frequency of certain CSs in the speaker's L1 and L2, as well as differences in the verbalization of particular CS.

5. Teaching CSs directly by presenting linguistic devices to verbalize CSs which have a finite range of surface structure realizations. Dornyei and Thurrell (1992) consider the autoimmunization of basic structures such as: "its kind of / sort of / the thing you use for ....".
It's what/when you.... It's something you do/say when ..... Necessary for circumlocution.

One good way of collecting such sets is by asking learners to perform strategies in their L1 and then trying to find L2 equivalents for the structures and core lexis they used.

5. Providing opportunities for practice in strategy use appears to be necessary because CSs can only fulfil their function as immediate first-aid devices if their use has reached an automatic stage.

In fact, a lack of awareness of socio-cultural rules can often be the source of much more trouble and embarrassment for language learners than gaps in their knowledge of grammar. If learners are made aware of these cultural differences they will avoid many serious problems such as misunderstanding as well as communication breakdown. Therefore, learners need to learn what they may do and what they may not do when they speak with the speakers of the target language.

For example, Saudi students do not like a lot of “eye-contact” when they address their interlocutor(s) especially when they speak to the members of the opposite sex. They try to avoid eye-contact as much as possible, whereas this is regarded as bad manners in the culture of the target language. However, this causes many problems and communication breakdown.

Another example which causes communication breakdown in “turn-taking and interruption”. In fact, there are subtle rules and signals to determine who talks, when and for how long in the target language. However, the language classroom does not offer too many opportunities for Saudi students to develop their awareness of turn-taking rules. Therefore, learners make a lot of interruptions in the middle of the talk and disturb the interlocutors to the extent that in many cases it causes some problems. Therefore, it is necessary to train learners how and where to interrupt in order not to appear to be rude. For example:
I am sorry to interrupt you but....
- Well, I do agree with you but...
- Yes, that's right but.....
- Sorry, do you mean.....? etc.

To sum up, teaching Communication Strategies, directly or explicitly in the Saudi tertiary level teaching situation, can be very useful and effective for the following reasons:

1. Saudi students are not exposed to the real environment of the target language. Therefore they need to be taught how to use CSs in order to solve their communication problems when they occur.

2. Learner’s L1 and L2 in Saudi are not cognate languages. In other words, there is a language distance between student’s native language and the target language and that will not help students make successful transfer as in the case in European languages. For example, French learners of English may transfer successfully the French word “Attention” /ɔˈten/ into the L2 /əˈten/ as it exists in both languages with some difference in Pronunciation.

3. There are cross-cultural differences between students’ L1 and L2 and that leads in many cases to misunderstanding and communication breakdown. In fact, there are so many culture-specific “do’s and don’ts” that learners are constantly faced with in the target language.

2.5 SIMILARITIES AND DIFFERENCES BETWEEN COMMUNICATION STRATEGIES AND LEARNING STRATEGIES.

Tarone (1981: 288-289) makes a distinction between “Communication Strategies and Learning Strategies” as follows:

RS
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Communication Strategies: "A mutual attempt of two interlocutors to agree on a meaning in a situation where requisite meaning structures do not seem to be sharing (linguistic and sociolinguistic role structure)."

Learning Strategies: "An attempt to develop linguistic and sociolinguistic competence in the target language (TL) to incorporate these into one's Interlingua system."

The basis of the classification is one of function or purpose: Learning Strategies are used to learn: Communication Strategies are "communication" or "use" oriented strategies. Though this classification is controversial (Bialystok and Sherwood Smith 1988; Bialystok 1990 etc.), this distinction is respected in the research studies. Some researchers' focus very much on "Communication Strategies: e.g., Tarone, Faerch, Kasper, etc.

Tarone (1994) points out that Communication Strategies are used by the learner to resolve communication problems when the interlingua system seems unequal that the linguistic item needed is not available to him, he can resort to a variety of strategies of communication in getting that meaning across. So, for example, if the learner wants to refer to an electrical cord in English and does not know the exact lexical item to use in referring to it, he can call it 'a tube' or a wire with two plugs in each side'.

The learner uses learning strategies in a conscious attempt to master the target language. One such strategy of learning is learner's conscious comparison of what they produce in it. Examples of learning strategies are the use of mnemonics to remember target vocabulary, memorizing textbook dialogues, use of flash cards, and so on. Clearly, such strategies are often successful, but they can also result in error. Memorized lists can get confused with one another, for example, the mnemonic mediator word may become confused with the TL Word. An example of the latter might be that an English-speaking learner of Spanish might use a mediator word pot in order to remember that the Spanish word for duck is pato-but might end up using pot in interlingua references to a duck.
It is not surprising that Interlingua researchers have trouble making distinction among the various types of strategies and procedures. Sharwood Smith (1979) expresses her doubt regarding our inadequate knowledge about strategy as such, not to talk of the distinction between strategies of learning and strategies of communication.

Corder (1981) indicates that many researchers regard both these terms as near-synonyms, may be because of the fact that, in both cases, the data base is the same i.e., utterances in the Interlingua of the language learner. We might think of another reason why learning is not kept distinct from communication in interlingua literature. Wode’s (1981) notion that second language ability develops through communication at least in informal contexts, presupposes that a particular act of verbal behavior can have both learning and communicative functions for the second language learner.

Selinker (1972) makes a distinction between strategies of learning and strategies of communication. He draws our attention to both these terms as two distinct inferable phenomena in the learner’s interlingua. He (ibid) not only emphasizes this distinction but also suggests that both these strategies are related. Selinker (1984: 339) reviews the relationship between communication strategies and learning strategies and concludes that: “The distinction in principle is seductive, but seems to be impossible to distinguish in practice.”

Selinker (1984: 340) points out that;

It is reasonable to suppose that interlingua communication strategies must at times further learning, but apparently no one has any idea how this happens.

However, Corder (1977: 12) highlights the importance of keeping the strategies of learning and communication quite separate. He refers strategies of learning as “the mental processes whereby a learner creates for himself or discovers a language system underlying the data he is exposed to”. Whereas he refers to Communication Strategies as “the devices whereby he exploits whatever linguistic knowledge he possesses to achieve his communicative ends”.
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2.6 THE EFFECT OF LEARNING STRATEGIES ON ORAL COMMUNICATIVE COMPETENCE

It is well-established in the literature of Second Language Acquisition that the pioneering studies regarding Second Language Learning Strategies were the ones that deal with "The Good Language Learner", e.g. (Rubin 1975; Stern 1975, Naiman et al. 1978). These studies investigated the strategies used by good language learners and also included some personality factors of the good language learners.

These early studies were concerned with the identification and description of learner strategies used by L2 learners (O'Malley, et al., 1990). In this regard taxonomies, typologies, etc., appeared in the literature, e.g. Rubin (1981), Naiman and Tedesco (1978), Fillmore (1979).

The early 1980s witnessed the proliferation of research studies concerning language strategies. The number of studies was increasing towards the middle of the 1980s. Some researchers started to theorize and establish some concept that is now widely used. O'Malley and Russo (1985) used the terms: Cognitive, metacognitive, and socio-Affective Strategies. Oxford (1985) used a six category classificatory system: cognitive, memory and compensatory strategies (direct strategies) and metacognitive, social, and affective strategies (indirect strategies). Oxford (1986) also compiled an inventory of language learning strategies, which has been used widely by researchers. It is called "Strategy Inventory for Language Learning" (SILL).

Some other researchers used different classification systems. Bialystok (1981) classified four types of strategies: "functional practice", "formal practice", "monitoring" and "inferencing".
2.7 LEARNING STRATEGIES AND CONSCIOUSNESS

In the literature on language learning strategies many researchers define learning strategies as "potentially conscious" behavior, actions, techniques, etc. (Ellis 1986; O'Malley and Chamot 1990; Oxford 1990, 1989). Rubin (1987:45) states:

Research into learner strategies rests on the assumption that both explicit and implicit assumption that both explicit and implicit knowledge can contribute to learning....

The debate on the role of consciousness in language learning has been continuing for more than a decade. Schmidt (1990, 1993) sees that there are different forms of consciousness in language learning. One example is "noticing". He argues that the "input" cannot be turned into "intake" if there is no "noticing". For pedagogical purposes, Smith (1981) calls for "consciousness - rising" among the learners of L2. He lists different types of consciousness - raising, e.g., supplying the right form by the teacher, and letting the learner correct himself. These concepts depend very much on how the learner should become responsible for his own learning. The learner here will definitely use all resources to achieve his goal. Planning, evaluating etc., will be among the strategies he will use.

However, Huang (1987) studied the learning strategies used for developing oral proficiency. There were 60 subjects in the study in China. The subjects were given an oral test "interview" and questionnaires to report the learning strategies. The results showed that subjects who used "functional practice" strategies (such as communicating with others reading for meaning, etc). More often performed better in oral communication. Reading was also found as "the most significant predictor of oral proficiency". This study followed Bialystock studies of functional and formal practice strategies, monitoring and inferenceing (1979, 1981). Bialystock (1981) included an "oral test" in her study and found that functional practices strategies had an effect on oral proficiency.
Oxford (1995: 378) reports that "the correlation was low but significant between cognitive strategies and speaking proficiency". On a different line of research Dodour (1992) investigated in an experimental study the effect of learning strategies training on speaking proficiency. The subjects were 122 first year and fourth year Egyptian B.A. (English) students. The first year students were divided into two groups (Control and Experimental groups) and so were the fourth year group. The results showed that statistically significant difference was found between the groups who had strategy training and those who did not have. The groups that had training were better in oral performance.